# 1NC

### 1NC – Th

#### Interpretation – the aff must specify what type of Private Actor Appropriation they affect.

#### Appropriation is extremely vague – no legal precedent means no normal means

Pershing 19, Abigail D. "Interpreting the Outer Space Treaty's Non-Appropriation Principle: Customary International Law from 1967 to Today." Yale J. Int'l L. 44 (2019): 149. (Robina Fellow at European Court of Human Rights. European Court of Human Rights Yale Law School)//Elmer

Though the Outer Space Treaty flatly prohibits national appropriation of space,150 it leaves unanswered many questions as to what actually counts as appropriation. As far back as 1969, scholars wondered about the implications of this article.151 While it is clear that a nation may not claim ownership of the moon, other questions are not so clear. Does the prohibition extend to collecting scientific samples?152 Does creating space debris count as appropriation by occupation? While the answers to these questions are most likely no, simply because of the difficulties that would be caused otherwise, there are some questions that are more difficult to answer, and more pressing. As commercial space flight becomes more and more prevalent,153 the question of whether private entities can appropriate property in space becomes very important. Whereas once it took a nation to get into space, it will soon take only a corporation, and scholars have pondered whether these entities will be able to claim property in space.154 Though this seems allowable, since the treaty only prohibits “national appropriation,”155 allowing such appropriation would lead to an absurd result. This is because the only value that lies in recognition of a claim is the ability to have that claim enforced.156 If a nation recognized and enforced such a claim, this enforcement would constitute state action.157 It would serve to exclude members of other nations and would thus serve as a form of national appropriation, even though the nation never attempted to directly appropriate the property.158 Furthermore, the Outer Space Treaty also requires that non-governmental entities must be authorized and monitored by the entities’ home countries to operate in space.159 Since a nation cannot authorize its citizens to act in contradiction to international law, a nation would not be allowed to license a private entity to appropriate property in space.160 While this nonappropriation principle is great for allowing free access to space, thereby encouraging research and development in the field, it makes it difficult to create or police a solution to the space debris problem. A viable solution will have to work without becoming an appropriation. There is, however, very little substantive law on what actually counts as appropriation in the context of space.161 So, the best way to see what is and is not allowed is to look both at the general international law regarding appropriations and to look at the past actions of space actors to see what has been allowed (or at least tolerated) and what has been prohibited or rejected.

#### Violation: they don’t

#### Standards:

#### a] Shiftiness – vague plan wording wrecks Neg Ground since it’s impossible to know which DAs link or which CPs are competitive since different types of appropriation like Space Mining, Space Col, and Satellites – the 1AR can squirrel out of links by saying they don’t affect a certain type of appropriation, or they don’t reduce private appropriation enough to trigger the link.

#### Fairness is a voter – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate.

#### Drop the debater – it deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

#### Use competing interps – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms

### 1NC – CP

#### CP: The appropriation of outer space by Non-United States based private entities is unjust.

#### Commercial Space Race favors American Companies that cements space dominance – shift away endangers our lead – losing green-lights Chinese Dominance across the board.

Autry and Kwast 19 Greg Autry and Steve Kwast 8-22-2019 "America Is Losing the Second Space Race to China" (Greg Autry, a clinical professor of space leadership, policy, and business at Arizona State University’s Thunderbird School of Global Management, and Steve Kwast)//Elmer

America Is Losing the Second Space Race to China The private sector can give the United States a much-needed rocket boost. The current U.S. space defense strategy is inadequate and on a path to failure. President Donald Trump’s vision for a Space Force is big enough. As he said on June 18, “It is not enough to merely have an American presence in space. We must have American dominance in space.” But the Air Force is not matching this vision. Instead, the leadership is currently focused on incremental improvements to existing equipment and organizational structures. Dominating the vast and dynamic environment of space will require revolutionary capabilities and resources far deeper than traditional Department of Defense thinking can fund, manage, or even conceive of. Success depends on a much more active partnership with the commercial space industry— and its disruptive capabilities. U.S. military space planners are preparing to repeat a conflict they imagined back in the 1980s, which never actually occurred, against a vanished Soviet empire. Meanwhile, China is executing a winning strategy in the world of today. It is burning hard toward domination of the future space markets that will define the next century. They are planning infrastructure in space that will control 21st-century telecommunications, energy, transportation, and manufacturing. In doing so, they will acquire trillion-dollar revenues as well as the deep capabilities that come from continuous operational experience in space. This will deliver space dominance and global hegemony to China’s authoritarian rulers. Despite the fact that many in the policy and intelligence communities understand exactly what China is doing and have been trying to alert leadership, Air Force leadership has convinced the White House to fund only a slightly better satellite command with the same leadership, while sticking a new label onto their outmoded thinking. A U.S. Space Force or Corps with a satellite command will never fulfill Trump’s call to dominate space. Air Force leadership is demonstrating the same hubris that Gen. George Custer used in convincing Congress, over President Ulysses S. Grant’s better experience intuition, that he could overtake the Black Hills with repeating rifles and artillery. That strategy of technological overconfidence inflamed conflict rather than subduing it, and the 7th Cavalry were wiped out at the Battle of the Little Bighorn. The West was actually won by the settlers, ranchers, miners, and railroad barons who were able to convert the wealth of the territory itself into the means of holding it. They laid the groundwork that made the 20th century the American Century and delivered freedom to millions of people in Europe and Asia. Of course, they also trampled the indigenous people of the American West in their wake—but empty space comes with no such bloody cost. The very emptiness and wealth of this new, if not quite final, frontier, however, means that competition for resources and strategic locations in cislunar space (between the Earth and moon) will be intense over the next two decades. The outcome of this competition will determine the fate of humanity in the next century. China’s impending dominance will neutralize U.S. geopolitical power by allowing Beijing to control global information flows from the high ground of space. Imagine a school in Bolivia or a farmer in Kenya choosing between paying for a U.S. satellite internet or image provider or receiving those services for free as a “gift of the Chinese people.” It will be of little concern to global consumers that the news they receive is slanted or that searches for “free speech” link to articles about corruption in Western democracies. Nor will they care if concentration camps in Tibet and the Uighur areas of western China are obscured, or if U.S. military action is presented as tyranny and Chinese expansion is described as peacekeeping or liberation. China’s aggressive investment in space solar power will allow it to provide cheap, clean power to the world, displacing U.S. energy firms while placing a second yoke around the developing world. Significantly, such orbital power stations have dual use potential and, if properly designed, could serve as powerful offensive weapons platforms. China’s first step in this process is to conquer the growing small space launch market. Beijing is providing nominally commercial firms with government-manufactured, mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles they can use to dump launch services on the market below cost. These start-ups are already undercutting U.S. pricing by 80 percent. Based on its previous success in using dumping to take out U.S. developed industries such as solar power modules and drones, China will quickly move upstream to attack the leading U.S. launch providers and secure a global commercial monopoly. Owning the launch market will give them an unsurmountable advantage against U.S. competitors in satellite internet, imaging, and power. The United States can still build a strategy to win. At this moment, it holds the competitive advantage in every critical space technology and has the finest set of commercial space firms in the world. It has pockets of innovative military thinkers within groups like the Defense Innovation Unit, under Mike Griffin, the Pentagon’s top research and development official. If the United States simply protects the intellectual property its creative minds unleash and defend its truly free markets from strategic mercantilist attack, it will not lose this new space race. The United States has done this before. It beat Germany to the nuclear bomb, it beat the Soviet Union to the nuclear triad, and it won the first space race. None of those victories was achieved by embracing the existing bureaucracy. Each of them depended on the president of the day following the only proven path to victory in a technological domain: establish a small team with a positively disruptive mindset and empower that team to investigate a wide range of new concepts, work with emerging technologies, and test innovative strategies. Today that means giving a dedicated Space Force the freedom to easily partner with commercial firms and leverage the private capital in building sustainable infrastructure that actually reduces the likelihood of conflict while securing a better economic future for the nation and the world.

#### Global hegemony solves Extinction.

Ikenberry 20 John Ikenberry 6-9-2020 “The Next Liberal Order: The Age of Contagion Demands More Internationalism, Not Less” <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2020-06-09/next-liberal-order> (Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University and Global Eminence Scholar at Kyung Hee University, in South Korea)//Elmer

The rivalry between the United States and China will preoccupy the world for decades, and the problems of anarchy cannot be wished away. But for the United States and its partners, a far greater challenge lies in what might be called “the problems of modernity”: the deep, worldwide transformations unleashed by the forces of science, technology, and industrialism, or what the sociologist Ernest Gellner once described as a “tidal wave” pushing and pulling modern societies into an increasingly complex and interconnected world system. Washington and its partners are threatened less by rival great powers than by emergent, interconnected, and cascading transnational dangers. Climate change, pandemic diseases, financial crises, failed states, nuclear proliferation—all reverberate far beyond any individual country. So do the effects of automation and global production chains on capitalist societies, the dangers of the coming revolution in artificial intelligence, and other, as-yet-unimagined upheavals. The coronavirus is the poster child of these transnational dangers: it does not respect borders, and one cannot hide from it or defeat it in war. Countries facing a global outbreak are only as safe as the least safe among them. For better or worse, the United States and the rest of the world are in it together. Past American leaders understood that the global problems of modernity called for a global solution and set about building a worldwide network of alliances and multilateral institutions. But for many observers, the result of these efforts—the liberal international order—has been a failure. For some, it is tied to the neoliberal policies that produced financial crises and rising economic inequality; for others, it evokes disastrous military interventions and endless wars. The bet that China would integrate as a “responsible stakeholder” into a U.S.-led liberal order is widely seen to have failed, too. Little wonder that the liberal vision has lost its appeal. Liberal internationalists need to acknowledge these missteps and failures. Under the auspices of the liberal international order, the United States has intervened too much, regulated too little, and delivered less than it promised. But what do its detractors have to offer? Despite its faults, no other organizing principle currently under debate comes close to liberal internationalism in making the case for a decent and cooperative world order that encourages the enlightened pursuit of national interests. Ironically, the critics’ complaints make sense only within a system that embraces self-determination, individual rights, economic security, and the rule of law—the very cornerstones of liberal internationalism. The current order may not have realized these principles across the board, but flaws and failures are inherent in all political orders. What is unique about the postwar liberal order is its capacity for self-correction. Even a deeply flawed liberal system provides the institutions through which it can be brought closer to its founding ideals. However serious the liberal order’s shortcomings may be, they pale in comparison to its achievements. Over seven decades, it has lifted more boats—manifest in economic growth and rising incomes—than any other order in world history. It provided a framework for struggling industrial societies in Europe and elsewhere to transform themselves into modern social democracies. Japan and West Germany were integrated into a common security community and went on to fashion distinctive national identities as peaceful great powers. Western Europe subdued old hatreds and launched a grand project of union. European colonial rule in Africa and Asia largely came to an end. The G-7 system of cooperation among Japan, Europe, and North America fostered growth and managed a sequence of trade and financial crises. Beginning in the 1980s, countries across East Asia, Latin America, and eastern Europe opened up their political and economic systems and joined the broader order. The United States experienced its greatest successes as a world power, culminating in the peaceful end to the Cold War, and countries around the globe wanted more, not less, U.S. leadership. This is not an order that one should eagerly escort off the stage. Any alternative is worse and causes great power war. The major alternatives to a modernized world order supported by the United States appear unlikely, unappealing, or both. A Chinese-led order, for example, would be an illiberal one, characterized by authoritarian domestic political systems and statist economies that place a premium on maintaining domestic stability. There would be a return to spheres of influence, with China attempting to domi-nate its region, likely resulting in clashes with other regional powers, such as India, Japan, and Vietnam, which would probably build up their conventional or even nuclear forces. A new democratic, rules-based order fashioned and led by medium powers in Europe and Asia, as well as Canada, however attractive a concept, would simply lack the military capacity and domestic political will to get very far. A more likely alternative is a world with little order—a world of deeper disarray. Protectionism, nationalism, and populism would gain, and democracy would lose. Conflict within and across borders would become more common, and rivalry between great powers would increase. Cooperation on global challenges would be all but precluded. If this picture sounds familiar, that is because it increasingly corresponds to the world of today. The deterioration of a world order can set in motion trends that spell catastrophe. World War I broke out some 60 years after the Concert of Europe had for all intents and purposes broken down in Crimea. What we are seeing today resembles the mid-nineteenth century in important ways: the post– World War II, post–Cold War order cannot be restored, but the world is not yet on the edge of a systemic crisis. Now is the time to make sure one never materializes, be it from a breakdown in U.S.-Chinese relations, a clash with Russia, a conflagration in the Middle East, or the cumulative effects of climate change. The good news is that it is far from inevitable that the world will eventually arrive at a catastrophe; the bad news is that it is far from certain that it will not.

#### Specifically---collapsing US heg means Russia fills in.

Mamuka Tsereteli 18. Tsereteli is a Senior Research Fellow of the Central Asia-Caucasus Institute at American Foreign Policy Institute in Washington, D.C. 2018. “Can Russia’s Quest for the New International Order Succeed?” Orbis, vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 204–219.

At the core of the conflict between the West and Russia is the fundamental disagreement of the current Russian leadership with the post-Cold War European order. Russia is changing realities on the ground to create conditions that will lead to negotiations on a new security architecture for Europe and the entire Northern Hemisphere. The Russian idea of this new system of security is to limit the sovereignty of the countries in its neighborhood and prevent the penetration of Western hard and soft power, as well as its system of values and governance, in the former Soviet space, an area that Russia considers as its sphere of strategic interest. Russian leadership has on several occasions communicated this message to the international community.1 President Vladimir Putin, in his widely publicized 2007 speech at the Munich Security Conference, expressed Russia’s dissatisfaction with the existing “unipolar” character of the world order. He followed with a harsh criticism of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and Western countries in general. He had already criticized the West’s push to fulfill all the conditions of the 1999 revised treaty on Conventional Arm Forces in Europe (CFE), including the removal of all Russian forces from Georgia and Moldova. But most importantly, he stated that “we have reached that decisive moment when we must seriously think about the architecture of global security.”2 While the speech was publicized widely, world leaders did not take Putin’s statement seriously enough. The Russian leader had a plan that could lead to new realities, forcing others to pay more attention to Russian statements and actions. Implementation of that plan continues to this day. The Russian Federation took the first significant step to shake the existing European status quo in 2007 when Russia officially suspended its participation in the CFE treaty. This move was followed by the events in Georgia in 2008 when the Russian military invaded the territory of the sovereign country and maintained its military presence there after active conflict ended. Russia simultaneously recognized Abkhazia and South Ossetia, two regions of Georgia, as independent states. All of these actions were publicized as a Russian response to recognizing Kosovo’s independence against the will of Serbia. The same argument was used in 2014. Russian leadership considered NATO’s commitment to Georgia and Ukraine at the 2008 Bucharest summit as a threat to Russia’s security interests. The immediate objective of the Russian Federation was to stop the Eastward expansion of European security and economic institutions. Its long-term goal was to push for a new security arrangement with NATO, the EU, and United States which would recognize Russian supremacy over the sovereign rights of the countries in Russia’s neighborhood. Under the premise of protecting its own sovereignty vis-àvis supra-national organizations and “universal” values,3 the Russian Federation has sought arrangements with Western powers designed to limit the sovereignty of neighboring states. Russia considers this process a legitimate method of ensuring its own security. Sovereignty in this context is understood as the supreme authority within a territory which is exercised in both internal development and external relations.4 The current international relations system is based on the sovereign rights of nation states, both internally and externally sovereign, to ally, trade, conclude agreements, open borders, etc., as well as on the Westphalian premise that interfering in other states’ governing prerogatives is illegitimate.5 The Russian Federation is using military force, coercion, and economic and energy supply disruptions to limit the sovereignty of other countries to prevent their integration into Western led institutions. Russia’s status as the prevailing military power is an essential element of Russian strategy. For Russia, asymmetry in power is a source of asymmetry in sovereignty. Experience of Russian policies vis-à-vis its neighbors, as well as military invasions in Ukraine and Georgia, demonstrates that today’s Russia aggressively pursues power politics to restore control over former Soviet Union space. The West needs a clear strategy to bring Russia back into the system of international norms, and rules and power politics should be part of it. Matching Russian military power in the Black Sea region will send a message that Moscow will understand. Ultimately, various sides need to come back to the basics of the Helsinki process, and the sovereignty of the nation states should remain as a fundamental principle of the stability in Europe.

#### Russian expansion installs a global white supremacist empire.

Lee Edwin Coursey 18. International affairs and history analyst and software engineer in the field of artificial intelligence. 01-07-18. “Russia’s Plan for World Domination – and America’s Unwitting Cooperation With It.” LeeCoWeb. https://www.leecoweb.com/russian\_plan/

In the aftermath of the Cold War, Russia experienced a crushing recession that left millions unemployed. The subsequent vacuum in the decades that followed saw the rapid expansion of the European Union and its single free market eastward. The EU now includes several former Soviet states, including some immediately bordering Russia (e.g., Estonia and Latvia.) More importantly, from a Russian security perspective, the NATO military alliance also expanded aggressively eastward after the Cold War, adding over a dozen European countries as members between 1999 and 2017. This expansion has put NATO allies, and NATO weapons, into countries immediately bordering Russia. The spread of western ideals such as free speech, free and open elections, and multiculturalism into eastern Europe are perceived as a threat to Russian culture and Russian influence. From the Russian point of view, the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War was both a humiliating defeat and a harsh rebuke of Soviet-style Communism. A new post-Soviet, neo-fascist political philosophy rose from the ashes of Communism, and Russia is actively engaged in pursuing this philosophy. Their goal is nothing less than the creation of a new Eurasian Empire controlled by, and answering to, Russia. A New Blueprint (or “Putin’s To-Do List”) The Russian political elite could not tolerate the growing threat on their western border, but they needed a new geopolitical strategy – one that would establish goals and methods different from those that had failed the Soviet Union. In 1997, Aleksandr Dugin articulated and defined that new Russian strategy in a 600-page treatise entitled Foundations of Geopolitics. According to historian and Hoover Institution specialist John B. Dunlop, “There has probably not been another book published in Russia during the post-communist period which has exerted an influence on Russian military, police, and statist foreign policy elites comparable to that of Aleksandr Dugin’s 1997 neo-fascist treatise.” The Foundations of Geopolitics sold out in four editions, and continues to be assigned as a textbook at the General Staff Academy and other military universities in Russia. [source] Eurasian-ism As espoused by Dugin, Russia’s ultimate goal should be nothing less than rule of the world by ethnic Russians, based on a Eurasian empire extending from “Dublin to Vladivostok.” The philosophical basis for this empire will include the rejection of “Atlanticism,” identification of America as a common enemy, and refusal to allow traditional liberal political ideals (e.g., freedom of the press, freedom of speech, free markets, civil rights, etc.,) to affect Russia’s society or political system. According to political scientist Andreas Umland, the Russian political elites, headed by Vladimir Putin, view Dugin’s new Eurasian Empire not as a restoration of an idealized Russian Empire, but as a replacement for the Soviet Union. Eurasianism provides an ideological basis for a new form of Russian imperialism. As for strategic stepping stones toward a new Russian empire, Dugin offers a long list objectives. I have listed just a few of these below: Separate the United Kingdom from Europe. Russian annexation of Ukraine. A strategic alliance between Russia and Iran. Create “geopolitical shocks” within Turkey. Russian annexation of Tibet, Mongolia, and Manchuria. Finland should be absorbed into Russia. Encourage Germany and France to cooperate with each other and isolate themselves from Europe. Dismember the nation of Georgia. Geopolitical defeat of the United States Sound familiar? In terms of tactics, Foundations of Geopolitics recommends subversion of America and its alliances by encouraging and supporting separatism, isolationism, nationalism, and the creation of factions. It also calls for supporting radical separatist movements in western countries, including support for organizations that espouse extremist, racist, and sectarian ideals. Here is a passage taken directly from Dugin’s Foundations of Geopolitics (via Dunlop): “It is especially important to introduce geopolitical disorder into internal American activity, encouraging all kinds of separatism and ethnic, social and racial conflicts, actively supporting all dissident movements — extremist, racist, and sectarian groups, thus destabilizing internal political processes in the U.S. It would also make sense simultaneously to support isolationist tendencies in American politics.” Evidence Russia Is Actively Pursuing Dugin’s Strategy Russia’s actions, both overt and covert, offer strong indications that her political and military leaders are actively pursuing the strategy described in Foundations. The overt actions include: Russian invasion of the nation of Georgia (2008.) Russian annexation of the Crimea region of Ukraine (2014.) Economic and military support for anti-western regimes in Syria and Iran. As for covert (or disguised) actions by the Russian government in support of the Foundations strategy, consider these recent findings from western intelligence and news agencies: BREXIT: “More than 150,000 Russian-language Twitter accounts posted tens of thousands of messages in English urging Britain to leave the European Union in the days before last year’s referendum on the issue. … Most of the messages sought to inflame fears about Muslims and immigrants to help drive the vote.” – New York Times, 15-NOV-2017 US ELECTIONS: “Posts that circulated to a targeted, swing-state audience on Facebook railed against illegal immigrants and claimed “the only viable option is to elect Trump.” They were shared by what looked like a grassroots American, anti-immigrant group called Secured Borders, but Congressional investigators say the group is actually a Russian fabrication designed to influence American voters during and after the presidential election.” – ABC News, 27-SEP-2017 US ELECTIONS: “Russian agents intending to sow discord among American citizens disseminated inflammatory posts that reached 126 million users on Facebook, published more than 131,000 messages on Twitter and uploaded over 1,000 videos to Google’s YouTube service.” – New York Times, 30-OCT-2017 US ELECTIONS: “In July 2015, Russian intelligence gained access to Democratic National Committee (DNC) networks and maintained that access until at least June 2016.” – Findings from the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, 6-JAN-2017 US SOCIAL UNREST: “Two Russian Facebook pages organized dueling rallies in front of the Islamic Da’wah Center of Houston. Heart of Texas, a Russian-controlled Facebook group that promoted Texas secession, leaned into an image of the state as a land of guns and barbecue and amassed hundreds of thousands of followers. One of their ads on Facebook announced a noon rally on May 21, 2016 to “Stop Islamification of Texas.” A separate Russian-sponsored group, United Muslims of America, advertised a “Save Islamic Knowledge” rally for the same place and time. – The Texas Tribune, 1-NOV-2017 US SOCIAL UNREST: “A social media campaign calling itself “Blacktivist” and linked to the Russian government used both Facebook and Twitter in an apparent attempt to amplify racial tensions during the U.S. presidential election. Both Blacktivist accounts regularly shared content intended to stoke outrage. “Black people should wake up as soon as possible,” one post on the Twitter account read. “Black families are divided and destroyed by mass incarceration and death of black men,” another read. The accounts also posted videos of police violence against African Americans. These fake accounts provide further evidence that Russian-linked social media accounts saw racial tensions as something to be exploited in order to achieve the broader Russian goal of dividing Americans and creating chaos.” CNN, 28-SEP-2017 NOTE TO READERS: Even in light of the information above, I DO NOT necessarily believe that Hillary Clinton would have won the 2016 US Presidential election in the absence of Russian interference – I simply do not have enough data from which to draw that conclusion. I am however certain that Russia wanted Trump to win and spent millions of dollars on propaganda directed at Americans toward that end. How We (Americans) Are Helping Russia Achieve Its Imperialistic Goals Russian propaganda and incitements to separatism are spread through social media, and their success depends on our willingness to reflexively share stories that outrage us. As unwitting agents for Russia, each of us is helping spread the seeds of our own political and economic demise. Hundreds of fake Facebook accounts operating from within Russia purchased $100,000 worth of Facebook ads between mid-2015 and early 2017. These fake Facebook accounts managed to reach 126 million Facebook users during this time frame. Besides their sheer volume, one of the most striking aspects of the ads purchased by these fake accounts is their alignment with the strategy described in Foundations of Geopolitics, namely the creation of division and mistrust among Americans. Alex Stamos, the Chief Information Security Officer for Facebook, issued a statement about the ad placements on September 6, 2017. In it, he made these observations: The vast majority of ads run by these accounts didn’t specifically reference the US presidential election, voting or a particular candidate. Rather, the ads and accounts appeared to focus on amplifying divisive social and political messages across the ideological spectrum — touching on topics from LGBT matters to race issues to immigration to gun rights.

#### That will be drastically worse than the US.

Richard **Arnold 15**. Muskingum University. 05/2015. “Systematic Racist Violence in Russia between ‘Hate Crime’ and ‘Ethnic Conflict.’” Theoretical Criminology, edited by Gavin Slade and Matthew Light, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 239–256.

Scope and characteristics of systematic racist violence in Russia One of the most visible social movements in contemporary Russia, especially following the invasion of Crimea under the pretext of saving ethnic Russians from the allegedly ‘fascist’ Ukrainian government, is the extreme nationalist or ‘skinhead’ movement. After the fall of the Soviet Union, many observers worried about a so-called ‘Weimar Russia’ scenario (Brubaker, 1996; Luks, 2008; Yanov, 1995), noting the similarities between Germany after the First World War and Russia after the Cold War. Both cases featured legends about an internal enemy, a rejection of the West as a model of development, an ethnic diaspora living outside of the country, a transition from a highly regimented to a more open society, and the revenge of former elites. Although this analogy should not be overdrawn (see Luks, 2008), a further parallel between the two cases lies in the explosion of Russia’s skinhead subculture from about the year 2000. Shnirel’man (2007, 28; citing Tarasov, 2006: 19) estimates the number of skinheads in Russia in 1996 at between 7000 and 8000.5 By 2007, this number had grown to 60,000–65,000, or, as noted above, roughly half the world’s total skinhead population, with organized groups in some 85 Russian cities. Moreover, racist violence by skinhead groups now occurs in Russia on a near-daily basis. Although there are no official published statistics, annual reports from a major NGO, Moscow’s SOVA Center (Verkhovskii, 2005, 2006, 2007; Verkhovskii et al., 2010, 2012, 2013), catalogue incidents of skinhead violence. The level of racist violence was highest between 2005 and 2009, after which (as I describe below) the state belatedly stepped up its policing efforts. In 2007, SOVA recorded skinheads as killing 97 people and beating 623. In 2009, the respective numbers were 94 and 443. This number may be an underestimate, as SOVA compiles its data from reports in regional newspapers and regional networks of monitoring experts (Arnold, 2010b). It is likely that many incidents of racist violence do not get included in these regional data, and thus in SOVA reports, because victims are afraid to report their attacks. To measure the scale of underreporting, Amnesty International conducted a survey of ethnic minorities in Moscow, finding that just 61 of 204 racist attacks were reported to the police (McClintock, 2005: 70). These data make Russia the most violent country in the former Soviet Union for ethnic and racial minorities, far outstripping the next most dangerous country, Ukraine, where, even accounting for the difference in population size (roughly one-third of Russia’s), the statistics are much lower. In 2006, for instance, 522 people were beaten in Russia and 66 killed in racist crimes. For comparison, in Ukraine there were 12 beaten and two killed. In 2008, in Russia 434 people were beaten and 97 killed. In the same year in Ukraine, there were 79 beaten and four killed (Umland and Shekhovtsov, 2013: 48). While there has been a decline in racist violence since its peak in 2008, skinheads still remain a potent force in Russia, with 187 deaths and 206 people wounded in 2012 (Verkhovskii et al., 2013: 130–137). Racist groups still thrive in Russia and form a substantial portion of the social support for Putin’s ‘Novorossia’ policy of reuniting ethnic Russians in eastern Ukraine (see Arnold, 2014c). Comparisons with the West are more difficult. The best available resource, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) report on systematic racist violence for 2012, recorded nine violent hate crimes in Austria, 98 hate crimes of violence in Germany, one case in the United States, and 10 in the United Kingdom. The same report estimated violent racist crimes in Russia at over 120. The level of racist violence in contemporary Russia is thus the highest in the OSCE. These statistics are almost certainly undercounted for every country and especially so in Russia.6 In looking for historical parallels, one author reports that ‘during the 1980s … the tally of skinhead violence [in the United States] included 121 murders of blacks and gays in urban areas across the nation, 302 racial assaults, and 301 cross burnings’ (Bowling, 1998; Wooden, 1991, cf. Hamm, 1993: 3). The level of racist violence for one year in Russia is thus higher than the entire decade in the United States where Americans were most concerned about this violence. Thus, Russia experiences a very high level of racist violence compared to other OECD countries. Statistics on the number of racist crimes, moreover, do not capture the qualitative differences between them, which further reveal the systematic nature of Russian racist violence. Elsewhere (Arnold, 2009), I have disaggregated the concept ‘ethnic violence’ (of which racist violence is a part) committed by skinheads into four ideal-types: symbolic violence; lynching; pogrom; and massacre. Symbolic violence refers to non-widespread property damage such as graffiti, and pogrom to widespread property damage. Lynching refers to the murder or physical injury of persons. Finally, massacre refers to widespread physical injury and killing of persons. The type of skinhead violence varies by the ethnicity of the subject. Most symbolic violence is used against Jews, as in the spate of anti-Semitic signs erected in Russia by the side of highways from 2002 to 2005. Most lynching is used against Africans, as in the 2002 beating of an African-American US embassy guard. Most pogrom-style violence is used against migrants from the Caucasus and Central Asia, as in the 2002 skinhead raid on the Tsaritsino open-air market in Moscow, the 2006 pogrom in the town of Kondopoga, and the 2013 pogrom in Birulyevo, a Moscow suburb. Massacre is most commonly used against the Roma, as in a 2006 incident outside Volgograd when skinheads armed with iron bars beat eight Roma in their camp. This use of racist violence to send such inter-community messages reflects its systemic nature. Explaining the proliferation of skinheads in Russia and abroad Several aspects of post-Soviet social change contribute to racist violence and skinhead proliferation. Part of the attraction of the skinhead subculture in Russia comes from (mainly) young people’s problems of anomie and alienation. One of the most commonly cited causes of skinhead groups in the West is economic decline (Bowling, 1998: 54; Hamm, 1993: 215–216). Unemployed youths with time on their hands need outlets for their frustration. Just as the rise of the skinhead movements in Britain and the United States coincided with industrial decline, Russia experienced an even more precipitous economic decline in the 1990s. Despite economic recovery in the 2000s, unemployment, poor career prospects, and lack of entertainment options remain a problem for many Russian young people. Without the ideological glue of communism, social bonds have frayed as Russian society struggles to find new social legitimations. Elsewhere in the world, racist ideas have historically appealed to young men unhappy with their prospects, as studies of white supremacism in the United States have shown (Hamm, 1993: 211–213). In Russia, however, the 1990s economic and ideological collapse was more severe than any analogous transformation in contemporary western societies, so that organized racism truly emerged as an ‘alternative to Communism’ (Shnirel’man, 2007: 58). As with homicide (see Lysova and Shchitov, this issue), Russia’s persistently high levels of racist violence thus reflect not so much temporary economic hardship as the continuing failure to create an appealing alternative to the communist system. As in other developed countries, Russian skinhead groups violently reject immigration (and internal migration) by ethnic minorities. Extremist groups regularly refer to a ‘genocide’ of ethnic Russians,7 playing on widespread racialized fears of demographic decline. In 1993 Russia’s population stood at 148.6 million but by 2012 had declined to 143 million, the largest peacetime population decline ever recorded in any modern country (Heleniak, 2013). The decline is largely explained by low fertility rates and a low male life expectancy (which in the 2000s fell to 57.5 years). To make up for the labor shortfall, Russia has experienced increased immigration from other post-Soviet countries, most of whom are drawn from non-Russian ethnic groups, such as Armenians, Azeris, and Georgians from the Caucasus, and Uzbeks, Kyrgyz, and Tajiks from Central Asia. Heleniak offers the claim (which Russian officials are fond of repeating) that Russia now has the secondlargest number of immigrants in the world after the United States, including some five to six million undocumented immigrants. The official Muslim population grew from 7.9 percent of the total in the 1989 census to 10.2 percent in 2012, a likely underestimate, given heavily Muslim undocumented immigration from Central Asia. Could one, then, argue that Russia’s skinhead violence was somehow directly produced by higher levels of immigration and resulting ethnic and cultural changes? To be sure, immigration clearly figures into the rise of Russian skinheads, just as the original skinhead movement itself grew out of the ‘Teddy Boy’ subculture that emerged in post- Second World War Britain in part as a reaction to what was then a new phenomenon, large-scale non-white immigration from the Commonwealth (Hamm, 1993: 15–17). However, the ‘fact of’ immigration should be distinguished from the ‘response to’ it in seeking to explain the extreme growth of systematic racist violence in post-1991 Russia. If immigration itself, or even large-scale non-white immigration, produced such violence, then countries of immigration such as Canada and Australia would today be world leaders in such violence. Thus, as an analytical matter, Russia’s skinhead problem is puzzlingly large even for a major immigration-receiving country. In consequence, it is more promising to consider how immigration is received in a given society than to treat immigration as an objective cause of racist violence. Only a discursive and political analysis can explain why Russian society has become particularly fertile ground for such violence. Discursive and ideological factors Pseudo-scientific racism has a longer pedigree in Russia than one might suppose. Although in the USSR such racism was largely constrained by the regime’s official ‘socialist internationalism’, racist ideas entered Russian intellectual life even before the fall of communism. The ‘Soviet Theory of Ethnos’, formulated in the late 1970s, claimed that ethnic distinctions were real and immutable, and had evolved in dialogue with the local environment (Tishkov, 1997). Thus, Lev Gumilev (1990) theorized in Ethnogenesis and the Biosphere that the behavior of ancient nomadic tribes could be traced to fluctuations in solar radiation based on their geographic location. This was fertile soil for more doctrinaire racist thinking. By 1997, there were 10 neo-pagan groups in Moscow and Leningrad alone. The neo-pagans and in particular their most prominent figure, Aleksandr Dugin, preserved theories espoused by Nazi thinkers. Dugin is a former professor at Moscow State University, the chief ideologist of the ‘Eurasian’ movement in Russia, a consultant for the Kremlin, and frequent participant in televised debates.8 In this milieu, the idea of the ‘Great White Race’ appeared with specifically Eurasian characteristics (Moroz, 2005). In the post-Soviet era, such views have become more widespread and have won official backing. Indeed, since the 1990s, the idea of the Aryan origin of the Russian people has discreetly entered into academic studies of history … In 1999 [several individuals] founded an organization Biblioteka rasovoi mysli (‘library of racial thinking’) which publishes nineteenth and twentieth century works on physical anthropology, some of them by Russians but primarily by Western authors. (Laruelle, 2010: 26) These Aryan ideas have evidently played out in at least some documented acts of racist violence. For example, anti-Semitic neo-pagan literature was found in the possession of a young man who walked into a synagogue in 2006, shouting ‘I will kill Jews’, and stabbed several congregants (Shnirel’man, 2007: 88–89). Such ideas may also influence Russian government policy, as think-tanks espousing racist ideas have emerged.9 As a related matter, officially promoted Russian chauvinism has made a substantial comeback during the presidency of Vladimir Putin. Some authors describe Putin’s ideology as ‘civilizational nationalism’—the idea that Russia represents a different and better version of modernity than the West (Verkhovskii and Payin, 2012) and has its own Sonderweg, or special historical path. Such a ‘special path’ was implicit in the claim by Putin’s chief ideologist, Vladislav Surkov, that Russia is a ‘sovereign democracy’ that does not need to imitate the institutions of liberal democracy. This ‘civilizational nationalism’ is attractive to the Kremlin because it helps square a particular ideological circle. While the direct endorsement of ethnic Russian chauvinism (or overt racism) might be destabilizing for a multiethnic country such as Russia and would lead to condemnation from western officials, the claim that Russia is distinct from the West and does not need its institutions gives the regime an ideological basis that some people in Russia find appealing, and also deflects criticisms of Putin’s undemocratic practices. In addition to this official endorsement of exclusionary nationalism, particular official attitudes toward the management of ethnic diversity and geographic mobility may facilitate the rise of skinheads. These attitudes predate the current Russian regime. While the Soviet Union formally endorsed ethnic diversity, it adopted a primordialist view of ethnicity as unchanging and linked to specific historic ‘homelands’ in which particular ethnic groups could flourish. This ideology was reflected in the ethno-federal structure of the USSR, with 15 republics ostensibly determined by the dominant ethnic groups within them, as well as formally autonomous ethnic homelands for the non-Slavic ethnic groups within the Russian republic (Slezkine, 1994). Even in the post-Soviet period, Tishkov (1997) argues that primordial conceptions of ethnicity still dominate the Russian intellectual establishment. This can be seen in the widely popular concept of ‘ethnic distance,’ identified by Payin and Susarov (1996: 53), namely ‘the cultural differences between the representatives of different ethnic groups that limit capacities for mutual adaptation’. Such a position implicitly presents hostile interactions as an inevitable part of inter-cultural encounters. Russian officials exhibit hostility to the emergence of new cultural practices as a result of migration. The Soviet government strictly regulated emigration, immigration, and internal migration using a complex system of internal passports and ‘residence permits’ (propiska) (Light, 2012b). Soviet migration policies also entailed the mass displacement of populations for reasons of state. Hill (2003) argues that the Soviet leadership conceived of territory without a population as a security risk and so relocated vast numbers of people to Siberia, where there was neither the climate nor the economic base to support them. In addition, although Soviet migration management had a number of goals, including political surveillance and economic mobilization, it was also used to govern specific ethnic groups, such as the ‘punished peoples’ whom Stalin subjected to internal exile during the Second World War (Polian, 2004). Although the 1993 post-Soviet Russian constitution repudiated the previous draconian migration restrictions, their residue remains in much policy and practice. Thus, some regions of Russia, such as the southern province of Krasnodar, continue to limit residence rights based on ethnicity, although such restrictions are formally illegal (Kuznetsov and Popov, 2008). Moreover, much official discourse is still premised on assumptions derived from Soviet policies concerning the geographic boundaries of particular cultures. This means, in effect, that certain cultural practices, or certain people, are ‘out of place’, even when they are legally present. In consequence, although migration per se is not new in contemporary Russia (as the Soviet Union also featured extensive internal migration), neither Russian society as a whole nor political elites are well prepared to accept the consequences of post-Soviet migration, whether in the appearance of new ethnic minorities throughout Russia, or the cultural or religious practices of such new migrant communities. For example, the population of Soviet-era Moscow was overwhelmingly ethnically Russian, although Moscow was the capital of a multi-ethnic state in which Russians were barely half the national population (Colton, 1995: 407). Today, post-Soviet migration has created a truly multiethnic Moscow, with millions of residents from Central Asia and the Caucasus and the largest Muslim population of any European city. Yet the Moscow government and many residents continue to reject public expressions of non-Russian culture, often in highly 248 Theoretical Criminology 19(2) racist terms (Light, 2010; Vendina, 2013). Likewise, although post-Soviet migration has produced Muslim communities in new regions of Russia, their right to practice their religion is widely infringed, often through the official argument that Islam is not a traditional religion of the region (Light, 2012a). Thus, the effects of increased non-ethnic Russian immigration on racist violence are not direct, but rather are mediated through official ambivalence about racial and cultural equality and the rights of migrants. Primordial concepts of identity, geographically circumscribed ethnic homelands, and ‘ethnic distance’ provide tacit legitimation for racist violence, or at least limit the extent to which official condemnation of racist violence can be effective. Although the exact influence of such attitudes on systematic racist violence would be difficult to capture, they are clearly part of the milieu in which it flourishes. They are also reflected in lax enforcement policies that have facilitated the infiltration of Russia by western skinhead groups, as I chart below. Official passivity and international connections No country has a sterling record when it comes to fighting racist violence. Scholarly analysis should consider the degree of official involvement or complicity in such violence, as well as the historical trajectory of the official response. In the United Kingdom, it took a series of violent events (most notably the 1993 death of Stephen Lawrence) to make the police take the problem of violent racism seriously (Bowling, 1998). Formally non-state but effectively state-sanctioned violence—widespread lynching of African- Americans—continued in the United States from the end of the Civil War through the 1960s. And many western societies, including the United States, continue to experience racialized police violence against minorities. Even so, in post-Soviet Russia, it has proved especially challenging to build a professional police force capable and willing to investigate racist violence effectively. In part, this is because racist attitudes are widespread in the police themselves and openly displayed, as evidenced in a study of police ethnic profiling on the Moscow metro which found ‘the most extreme and egregious ethnic profiling ever documented through a statistical survey of the practice’ (Open Society, 2006: 31). Light (2010) links such profiling to violent police extortion practices targeting minorities with the tacit approval of city officials. Other factors are also important. In part, investigation and prosecution of hate crimes may suffer from broader problems of police management and service (see Light et al., this issue). The Russian government has consciously refrained from aggressive prosecution of racist hate crimes, probably because such prosecutions would interfere with the official promotion of Russian nationalism (Schenk, 2010: 114). The government has often preferred to bring charges of ‘hooliganism’ rather than charges of racist violence, even when the latter would clearly have been appropriate, suggesting an unwillingness to acknowledge the problem or tackle it seriously. Yet it is not all bad news. Since 2009, for instance, the state has begun prosecuting racist violence with greater vigor in an attempt to defang the neo-Nazi movement, after several high-profile skinhead attacks on officials (Verkhovskii et al., 2013). Thus, in 2010, there were 91 hate crimes convictions affecting 297 people, and in 2011, 61 convictions affecting 193 people. These figures can be compared with the 23 convictions Arnold 249 affecting 65 people in 2007, when hate crimes were at their most frequent. Nonetheless, the increase in prosecution may just reflect concerns about the potential of racist organizations to challenge the state itself rather than a fundamental change in official policy, let alone a newfound desire to protect ethnic minorities against racial violence. One effect of the official unwillingness to confront racist violence has been the infiltration into Russia of international racist organizations. In the early 1990s, racist groups in the United States, Britain, and Germany began establishing branches in Russia (Belikov, 2011). Shnirel’man (2007: 23) identifies 1997 as a turning point, when Russian skinheads started to ‘get regular support from their European and American brethren’. Such support initially came from the American Ku Klux Klan and German skinhead groups such as ‘The Right Union’ and ‘Young Vikings’, who gave their Russian counterparts literature, uniforms, and audio-cassettes with recorded speeches about ‘white internationalism’. Other skinhead groups, such as the British ‘Blood and Honor/Combat 18’ and ‘The White Bulldogs’ also set up Russian ‘franchises’. A special Russian forum has existed on the international skinhead ‘Stormfront’ website since 2002. There is evidence that such transnational racism motivates systematic violent racism in Russia. Thus, in October 2013, some youths attacked the Biru-za shopping center in southern Moscow, while shouting ‘White power!’—in English. Moreover, prominent western and Russian racists have become increasingly friendly over the years, sometimes with official involvement. At an international racist convention in 2006, attended by former Louisiana state senator and leader of the Ku Klux Klan David Duke, Russia was designated as the ‘white world’s future’ and the ‘great hope’ of the white race (Arnold and Romanova, 2013). The conference concluded with exhortations to construct a new racially homogenous home in Russia, styled the ‘white Eurasia’ or ‘white Siberia’. Other international meetings of western and Russian racists have followed, with a 2007 conference in Yalta, and presentations in Belgium by Russian racist ideologue Pavel Tulaev. Likewise, in October 2014, the ‘Eurasianist’ Aleksandr Dugin met with US and European racists in Budapest (Arnold, 2014a). Figures close to the Kremlin have also funded similar racist and homophobic conferences (Shekhovtsov, 2015). Indeed, the Kremlin has been courting the leaders of European Far Right parties, such as Marine Le Pen, leader of the French Front Nationale; Nick Griffin, the leader of the British National Party; leaders of the Belgian racist movement Vlaams Belang; and Gabor Vona of Hungary’s racist party, Jobbik (Shekhovtsov, 2015). Members of these parties helped monitor the ‘referendum’ in Crimea on its annexation by Russia in 2014, suggesting that the Russian government can now mobilize international right-wing support for its policies.10

### 1NC – CP

#### CP: The appropriation of outer space by private entities except for Large Satellite Constellations in Lower Earth Orbit is unjust.

#### Terrestrial Internet Cables are vulnerable now – risks access.

Griffiths 19 James Griffiths 7-26-2019 "The global internet is powered by vast undersea cables. But they’re vulnerable." <https://www.cnn.com/2019/07/25/asia/internet-undersea-cables-intl-hnk/index.html> (CNN Analyst)//ELmer

Hong Kong (CNN) - On July 29, 1858, two steam-powered battleships met in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean. There, they connected two ends of a 4,000 kilometer (2,500 mile) long, 1.5 centimeter (0.6 inch) wide cable, linking for the first time the European and North American continents by telegraph. Just over two weeks later, the UK’s Queen Victoria sent a congratulatory message to then US President James Buchanan, which was followed by a parade through the streets of New York, featuring a replica of a ship which helped lay the cable and fireworks over City Hall. In their inaugural cables, Queen Victoria hailed the “great international work” by the two countries, the culmination of almost two decades of effort, while Buchanan lauded a “triumph more glorious, because far more useful to mankind, than was ever won by conqueror on the field of battle. The message took over 17 hours to deliver, at 2 minutes and 5 seconds per letter by Morse code, and the cable operated for less than a month due to a variety of technical failures, but a global communications revolution had begun. By 1866, new cables were transmitting 6 to 8 words a minute, which would rise to more than 40 words before the end of the century. In 1956, Transatlantic No. 1 (TAT-1), the first underwater telephone cable, was laid, and by 1988, TAT-8 was transmitting 280 megabytes per second – about 15 times the speed of an average US household internet connection – over fiber optics, which use light to transmit data at breakneck speeds. In 2018, the Marea cable began operating between Bilbao, Spain, and the US state of Virginia, with transmission speeds of up to 160 terabits per second – 16 million times faster than the average home internet connection. Today, there are around 380 underwater cables in operation around the world, spanning a length of over 1.2 million kilometers (745,645 miles). Underwater cables are the invisible force driving the modern internet, with many in recent years being funded by internet giants such as Facebook, Google, Microsoft and Amazon. They carry almost all our communications and yet – in a world of wireless networking and smartphones – we are barely aware that they exist. Yet as the internet has become more mobile and wireless, the amount of data traveling across undersea cables has increased exponentially. “Most people are absolutely amazed” by the degree to which the internet is still cable-based, said Byron Clatterbuck, chief executive of Seacom, a multinational telecommunications firm responsible for laying many of the undersea cables connecting Africa to the rest of the world. “People are so mobile and always looking for Wi-Fi,” he said. “They don’t think about it, they don’t understand the workings of this massive mesh of cables working together. “They only notice when it’s cut.” Network down In 2012, Hurricane Sandy slammed into the US East Coast, causing an estimated $71 billion in damage and knocking out several key exchanges where undersea cables linked North America and Europe. “It was a major disruption,” Frank Rey, director of global network strategy for Microsoft’s Cloud Infrastructure and Operations division, said in a statement. “The entire network between North America and Europe was isolated for a number of hours. For us, the storm brought to light a potential challenge in the consolidation of transatlantic cables that all landed in New York and New Jersey.” For its newest cable, Marea, Microsoft chose to base its US operation further down the coast in Virginia, away from the cluster of cables to minimize disruption should another massive storm hit New York. But most often when a cable goes down nature is not to blame. There are about 200 such failures each year and the vast majority are caused by humans. “Two-thirds of cable failures are caused by accidental human activities, fishing nets and trawling and also ships’ anchors,” said Tim Stronge, vice-president of research at TeleGeography, a telecoms market research firm. “The next largest category is natural disaster, mother nature – sometimes earthquakes but also underwater landslides.” A magnitude-7.0 earthquake off the southwest coast off Taiwan in 2006, along with aftershocks, cut eight submarine cables which caused internet outages and disruption in Taiwan, Hong Kong, China, Japan, Korea and the Philippines. Stronge said the reason most people are not aware of these failures is because the whole industry is designed with it in mind. Companies that rely heavily on undersea cables spread their data across multiple routes, so that if one goes down, customers are not cut off. How a cable gets laid Laying a cable is a years-long process which costs millions of dollars, said Seacom’s Clatterbuck. The process begins by looking at naval charts to plot the best route. Cables are safest in deep water where they can rest on a relatively flat seabed, and won’t rub against rocks or be at risk of other disturbances. “The deeper the better,” Clatterbuck said. “When you can lay the cable down in deep water you rarely have any problems. It goes down on the bottom of the seabed and just stays there.” Things become more difficult the closer you get to shore. A cable that is only a few centimeters thick on the bottom of the ocean must be armored from its environment as reaches the landing station that links it with the country’s internet backbone. “Imagine a long garden hose, inside of which are very small tubes that house a very, very thin fiber pair,” Clatterbuck said. That hose is wrapped in copper, which conducts the direct current that powers the cable and its repeaters, sometimes up to 10,000 volts. “The fibers are wrapped in urethane and wrapped in copper and wrapped again in urethane,” he said. “If we’re going to have to put that cable on a shoreline that is very shallow and has a lot of rocks, you’re now going to have to armor coat that cable so no one can hack through it.” Cables in less hospitable areas can be far thicker than garden hoses, wrapped in extra plastic, kevlar armor plating, and stainless steel to ensure they can’t be broken. Depending on the coast, cable companies might also have to build concrete trenches far out to sea, to tuck the cable in to protect it from being bashed against rocks. “Before the cable-laying vessels go out they send out another specialized ship that maps the sea floor in the area when they want to go,” said TeleGeography’s Stronge. “They want to avoid areas where there’s a lot of undersea currents, certainly want to avoid volcanic areas, and avoid a lot of elevation change on the sea floor.” Once the route is plotted and checked, and the shore connections are secure, huge cable laying ships begin passing out the equipment. “Imagine spools of spools of garden hose along with a lot of these repeaters the size of an old travel trunk,” Clatterbuck said. “Sometimes it can take a month to load the cable onto a ship.” The 6,600 kilometer (4,000 mile) Marea cable weighs over 4.6 million kilograms (10.2 million pounds), or the equivalent of 34 blue whales, according to Microsoft, which co-funded the project with Facebook. It took more than two years to lay the entire thing. Malicious cuts The blackout came without warning. In February 2008, a whole swath of North Africa and the Persian Gulf suddenly went offline, or saw internet speeds slow to a painful crawl. This disruption was eventually traced to damage to three undersea cables off the Egyptian coast. At least one – linking Dubai and Oman – was severed by an abandoned, 5,400 kilogram (6-ton) anchor, the cable’s owner said. But the cause of the other damage was never explained, with suggestions it could have been the work of saboteurs. That raises the issue of another threat to undersea cables: deliberate human attacks. In a 2017 paper for the right-wing think tank Policy Exchange, British lawmaker Rishi Sunak wrote that “security remains a challenge” for undersea cables. “Funneled through exposed choke points (often with minimal protection) and their isolated deep-sea locations entirely public, the arteries upon which the Internet and our modern world depends have been left highly vulnerable,” he said. “The threat of these vulnerabilities being exploited is growing. A successful attack would deal a crippling blow to Britain’s security and prosperity.” However, with more than 50 cables connected to the UK alone, Clatterbuck was skeptical about how useful a deliberate outage could be in a time of war, pointing to the level of coordination and resources required to cut multiple cables at once. “If you wanted to sabotage the global internet or cut off a particular place you’d have to do it simultaneously on multiple cables,” he said. “You’d be focusing on the hardest aspect of disrupting a network.”

#### Mega-constellations provide fast, affordable internet that bridges digital divide – independently, competition lowers prices across the board.

Novo 21 Paula Novo 3-31-2021 "Will Starlink Change the Internet?' <https://www.highspeedoptions.com/resources/insights/will-starlink-change-the-internet> (With over four years of broadband experience, Paula Novo is the Site Editor and Senior Writer for HighSpeedOptions. She has helped develop the criterion by which HighSpeedOptions reviews and recommends internet service providers, striving to simplify and guide the user’s decision toward the best communications services. Paula also leads HighSpeedOptions coverage of the digital divide, ISP reviews, and broadband policy.)//Elmer

While it’s not the first – and won’t be the last – company to test low Earth orbit satellites, Starlink, the satellite internet division of SpaceX, is making waves in the telecommunications industry for its residential beta program launched in 2020. As the first U.S.-based firm to successfully bring LEO internet to market, Starlink shows promise where others have heroically failed. Every satellite company in history to launch a low Earth orbit (LEO) constellation has gone bankrupt, except for Starlink, that is. Said best in a tweet by Elon Musk, founder and CEO of this venture, “Starlink is a staggeringly difficult technical and economic endeavor. However, if we don’t fail, the cost to end-users will improve every year.” In the span of a decade, broadband moved from a “nice-to-have” to a “must-have” – the COVID-19 pandemic simply speeding up the clock on its shift towards a utility. Yet, we’re a far cry away from total connectivity. Due to availability and cost issues (to name a few), millions of Americans don’t have access to reliable internet, which further widens the education and wealth gaps. If successful, Starlink – and LEO satellite internet as a whole – may be the first real solution for billions of people missing out on the benefits of broadband. Current State of the Telecom Industry Despite advances in technology, the telecom industry is lagging behind. And, contrary to what internet service providers and the media report, the United States’ internet options are still very limited. The three biggest hurdles standing in the way of real progress include access, affordability, and lack of competition. Access According to the Federal Communications Commission’s (FCC) 2020 Broadband Deployment Report, roughly 6% of all Americans have zero access to fixed broadband at home. And, of those without access, a majority live in rural areas. That’s about 19 million people who, even if they could afford to subscribe to internet service, are out of luck. The FCC defines broadband speeds as just 25 Mbps down and 3 Mbps up, which may be fast enough to check emails but won’t reliably support your Breaking Bad marathon. You can see how living in an underserved area, then, can severely limit a person’s job prospects, schooling, and social connections. Still, we can’t rate internet access without also looking at affordability. While some 19 million Americans do not have access at all, as many as one in three Americans choose to not subscribe to internet service, citing cost as a leading factor. Affordability FCC data shows that nearly 35% of Americans, or about 114 million people, do not subscribe to broadband service at their homes. Affordability – or lack thereof – is often cited as the main driver for this decision. Despite government intervention via efforts like the FCC Lifeline Program and ISP subsidies to incentivize network expansions, America still seems to lag behind other developed countries when it comes to internet cost. In a 2020 study by New America, it turns out that we pay quite a bit more for internet service than most developed countries in Asia and Europe, regardless of speed. Before factoring in data caps and other ancillary ISP fees, we pay “nearly twice as much as European countries for high-speed internet.” Naturally, the ballooning question pops up – How did we fall behind? Lack of Competition The lack of competition today may be the single greatest obstacle preventing the telecom industry (read: ISPs and consumers) from thriving. A long history of privately-owned infrastructures and government regulations has enabled monopolies to quash competition in the marketplace and ignore the demand for innovation. Unsurprisingly, the Institute of Self-Reliance released a new report finding that two of the largest broadband companies in the U.S. – Comcast and Charter Spectrum – maintain a monopoly over 47+ million American households. It also sheds light on an additional 33 million homes only serviceable by one or two DSL providers. While these are just a few examples of the current market, you can easily see how large segments of the population lack the competitive supply needed to drive down costs and push for more development. What if there was a solution to address these pitfalls with the internet? What if Americans (or, really, anyone in the world) could circumvent some of the physical and political barriers stopping us from connecting from seemingly anywhere? These are questions Starlink is attempting to answer. Ways Starlink May Change the Internet First, what is Starlink and how is it different from other internet providers? It’s an Elon Musk satellite internet company bringing life to the telecom industry. In the last year, Starlink launched over 1,000 satellites into low orbit with the goal of offering a new type of broadband. If successful, this LEO service could not only supersede traditional satellite internet like HughesNet or Viasat but also rival the likes of fiber internet in rural and remote communities. Unlike GEO satellite providers who use a few hundred large satellites orbiting over 35,000 kilometers from Earth, Starlink plans to use up to 42,000 small satellites in low orbit no higher than 1,200 kilometers. Because of these key differences, Starlink is anticipated to offer reliable speeds up to 1 Gbps with lower latency of 20ms to 40ms worldwide. Essentially, it’d combine the performance of grounded internet with the geographical freedom of traditional satellite internet so people can live anywhere on Earth while staying connected. In general, LEO satellite service represents a real chance at solving connectivity issues for anyone outside city limits. Starlink may also pave the way for tangible changes to the industry as a whole, including lower prices, faster speeds, and better economic opportunities. Pricing of Internet As Starlink enters new markets, the added competition has the potential to drive down the cost of internet over time. In a study by the Analysis Group, they calculated that when just one new competitor joins a designated market area (DMA), the price of plans with speeds ranging from 50 Mbps to 1 Gbps sees a monthly decline of $1.50. That’s it? McDonald’s saves me more than that. Not so fast, though. Remember how we said Starlink isn’t the only company testing low orbit satellites? With other ventures like Blue Origin, OneWeb, and Telesat itching to launch their own LEO constellations, it won’t be long before new players enter the market. At which point, the Analysis Group guesstimates an 8% reduction in monthly broadband prices, or about $7.50. For low-income households, that may be the difference needed to break even on bills. And, even though Starlink itself is quite expensive, its presence in the market has the potential to still benefit consumers who could choose a (now) cheaper internet provider. Internet Speeds Similarly, the buzz around LEO internet speeds has industry heads raising their eyebrows as well. While Starlink is only testing speeds of 50 Mbps to 150 Mbps right now, in time it’s expected to offer speeds up to 1 Gbps with low latency. Normally these speeds are reserved for grounded connections like fiber or cable internet. So, if Starlink manages to deliver, we may no longer be limited by our geography. Even further, the Analysis Group reports that the availability of higher internet speeds in a DMA “increases the likelihood that other providers will introduce high-speed plans to match […] their competition.” In particular, they found that broadband providers are 4 to 17 percent more likely to increase their speeds on an annual basis because of competition. This goes to show that a little healthy rivalry in the marketplace first and foremost benefits the consumer. Economic Opportunity If Starlink is successful, we expect to see economic opportunity improve for billions with a B as well. With global availability, more people will have the means to compete for jobs in today’s digital age. To put things into perspective, consider the world population. Of the current 7.8 billion people, a little under half of them (40%) lack regular internet access. That’s nearly one out of every two people. If LEO satellite service can make it to where geography, price, and speeds aren’t roadblocks anymore, what happens? In general, more people with internet access equates to more job access. And, as jobs continue to transition online, it’s safe to assume that people won’t be as limited by obstacles such as disabilities, poor education, and wealth disparities when they compete for openings. In these ways, Starlink has the potential to help offset poverty where many governments have failed.

#### It's comparably faster than current competitors.

Lumanlan 21 August Dominic M Lumanlan 8-14-2021 "How Elon Musk’s Starlink will be the future of the Internet" <https://medium.com/@augustlumanlan2017/how-spacexs-starlink-will-be-the-future-of-the-internet-8f07adb4eb2> (Engineering Author)//Elmer

Internet speeds, satellite equipment, and user feedback Starlink has very high internet speeds, higher than the speed of internet we currently have in our homes. Speeds average around 100 mbps but it could go as far as 200 mbps, or even 300 mbps. It has a latency of 20 milliseconds. Latency just means the time it takes for the satellite to transmit the data packets (YouTube videos, Facebook messages, Google searches, etc.) from the ground station, to the nearest Starlink satellite, which then transmits it to other nearby satellites and whichever one is closest above the user will transmit it downward to the Starlink dish that receives the data packets, which can finally reach your home router and now you’re connected to the internet and received the data packets. The process can repeat vice versa. This means that the internet connection with Starlink is much faster than our current internet connection which has around 60 milliseconds of latency. A lot of beta testers have shared their experiences online and have been picked up by the media to know more about the Starlink internet program’s capabilities and the user’s feedback about them. What they say is true: They are so happy about it, they think it’s worth it. Because its so fast and reliable to many places around the world, you can easily connect to the internet and be able to do multiple things like watch YouTube or Google search, or even work conveniently anywhere you wish, as long as you have a ground Starlink dish with you.

#### Internet solves extinction

**Eagleman 10** [David Eagleman is a neuroscientist at Baylor College of Medicine, where he directs the Laboratory for Perception and Action and the Initiative on Neuroscience and Law and author of Sum (Canongate). Nov. 9, 2010, “ Six ways the internet will save civilization,”  
 http://www.wired.co.uk/magazine/archive/2010/12/start/apocalypse-no]

Many **great civilisations have fallen**, leaving nothing but cracked ruins and scattered genetics. Usually this results **from: natural disasters, resource depletion, economic meltdown, disease, poor information flow and corruption**. But we’re luckier than our predecessors because **we command a technology that no one else possessed: a rapid communication network that finds its highest expression in the internet**. I propose that there are six ways in which **the net has vastly reduced the threat of societal collapse. Epidemics can be deflected by telepresence** One of our more dire prospects for collapse is an infectious-disease epidemic**. Viral and bacterial epidemics precipitated the fall of** the Golden Age of Athens**,** the Roman Empire and most of the empires of the Native Americans. **The internet can be our key to survival because the ability to work telepresently can inhibit microbial transmission by reducing human-to-human contact**. In the face of an otherwise devastating epidemic, businesses can keep supply chains running with the maximum number of employees working from home. This can reduce host density below the tipping point required for an epidemic. **If we are well prepared when an epidemic arrives, we can fluidly shift into a self-quarantined society** in which microbes fail due to host scarcity. Whatever the social ills of isolation, they are worse for the microbes than for us. **The internet will predict natural disasters We are witnessing the downfall of slow central control in the media**: news stories are increasingly becoming user-generated nets of up-to-the-minute information. **During the recent California wildfires,** locals went to the TV stations to learn whether their neighbourhoods were in danger. But the news stations appeared most concerned with the fate of celebrity mansions, so Californians changed their tack: they uploaded geotagged mobile-phone pictures, updated Facebook statuses and tweeted. The balance tipped: **the internet carried news about the fire more quickly and accurately than any news station could.** In this grass-roots, decentralised scheme, there were embedded reporters on every block, and the news shockwave kept ahead of the fire. This head start could provide the extra hours that save us. If the Pompeiians had had the internet in 79AD, they could have easily marched 10km to safety, well ahead of the pyroclastic flow from Mount Vesuvius. **If the Indian Ocean had the Pacific’s networked tsunami-warning system, South-East Asia would look quite different today. Discoveries are retained and shared** Historically, **critical information has required constant rediscovery**. Collections of learning -- from the library at Alexandria to the entire Minoan civilisation -- have fallen to the bonfires of invaders or the wrecking ball of natural disaster. Knowledge is hard won but easily lost. And information that survives often does not spread. **Consider smallpox inoculation**: this was under way in India, China and Africa centuries before it made its way to Europe**. By the time the idea reached North America, native civilisations who needed it had already collapsed. The net solved the problem. New discoveries catch on immediately;** information spreads widely. In this way, societies can optimally ratchet up, using the latest bricks of knowledge in their fortification against risk. **Tyranny is mitigated Censorship of ideas** was a familiar spectre in the last century, with state-approved news outlets ruling the press, airwaves and copying machines **in the USSR**, Romania, Cuba, China, Iraq **and elsewhere**. In many cases, such as Lysenko’s agricultural despotism in the USSR, it **directly contributed to the collapse of the nation**. Historically**, a more successful strategy has been to confront free speech with free speech -- and the internet allows this in a natural way.** It democratises the flow of information by offering access to the newspapers of the world, the photographers of every nation, the bloggers of every political stripe. Some posts are full of doctoring and dishonesty whereas others strive for independence and impartiality -- but all are available to us to sift through. Given the attempts by some governments to build firewalls, it’s clear that this benefit of the net requires constant vigilance. **Human capital is vastly increased Crowdsourcing brings people together to solve problems.** Yet far fewer than one per cent of the world’s population is involved. We need expand human capital. Most of the world not have access to the education afforded a small minority. For every Albert Einstein, Yo-Yo Ma or Barack Obama who has educational opportunities, uncountable others do not. This squandering of talent translates into reduced economic output and a smaller pool of problem solvers. **The net opens the gates education to anyone with a computer**. A motivated teen anywhere on the planet can walk through the world’s knowledge -- from the webs of Wikipedia to the curriculum of MIT’s OpenCourseWare**. The new human capital will serve us well when we confront existential threats we’ve never imagined before. Energy expenditure is reduced** Societal collapse can often be understood in terms of an energy budget: **when energy spend outweighs energy return, collapse ensues**. This has taken the form of deforestation or soil erosion; **currently, the worry involves fossil-fuel depletion. The internet addresses the energy problem with a natural ease**. Consider the massive energy savings inherent in the shift from paper to electrons -- as seen in the transition from the post to email. **Ecommerce reduces the need to drive long distances to purchase products. Delivery trucks are more eco-friendly** than individuals driving around, not least because of tight packaging and optimisation algorithms for driving routes. Of course, there are energy costs to the banks of computers that underpin the internet -- but these costs are less than the wood, coal and oil that would be expended for the same quantity of information flow. **The tangle of events that triggers societal collapse can be complex,** and there are several threats the net does not address. **But vast, networked communication can be an antidote to several of the most deadly diseases threatening civilisation.** The next time your coworker laments internet addiction, the banality of tweeting or the decline of face-to-face conversation, you may want to suggest that the net may just be the technology that saves us.

### 1NC – Framing

#### Framework – the role of the ballot is to determine whether the plan is a good idea through evaluation of consequences.

#### 1] Don’t let them weigh the sum total of their impact—they only get to weigh the unique amount solved by the affirmative. Filter the debate through scope of solvency—there’s no impact to root cause if they don’t solve it

#### 2] No performative or methodological offense, only offense from the plan—reject it cuz it explodes predictable limits, spiking out of neg ground making any discussion qualitatively worse

#### 3] Our impacts matter

#### A] Existential threats outweigh – all life has infinite value and extinction eliminates the possibility for future generations – err negative, because of innate cognitive biases

GPP 17 (Global Priorities Project, Future of Humanity Institute at the University of Oxford, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, “Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance,” Global Priorities Project, 2017, <https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf>,

1.2. THE ETHICS OF EXISTENTIAL RISK In his book Reasons and Persons, Oxford philosopher Derek Parfit advanced an influential argument about the importance of avoiding extinction: I believe that if we destroy mankind, as we now can, this outcome will be much worse than most people think. Compare three outcomes: (1) Peace. (2) A nuclear war that kills 99% of the world’s existing population. (3) A nuclear war that kills 100%. (2) would be worse than (1), and (3) would be worse than (2). Which is the greater of these two differences? Most people believe that the greater difference is between (1) and (2). I believe that the difference between (2) and (3) is very much greater. ... The Earth will remain habitable for at least another billion years. Civilization began only a few thousand years ago. If we do not destroy mankind, these few thousand years may be only a tiny fraction of the whole of civilized human history. The difference between (2) and (3) may thus be the difference between this tiny fraction and all of the rest of this history. If we compare this possible history to a day, what has occurred so far is only a fraction of a second.65 In this argument, it seems that Parfit is assuming that the survivors of a nuclear war that kills 99% of the population would eventually be able to recover civilisation without long-term effect. As we have seen, this may not be a safe assumption – but for the purposes of this thought experiment, the point stands. What makes existential catastrophes especially bad is that they would “destroy the future,” as another Oxford philosopher, Nick Bostrom, puts it.66 This future could potentially be extremely long and full of flourishing, and would therefore have extremely large value. In standard risk analysis, when working out how to respond to risk, we work out the expected value of risk reduction, by weighing the probability that an action will prevent an adverse event against the severity of the event. Because the value of preventing existential catastrophe is so vast, even a tiny probability of prevention has huge expected value.67 Of course, there is persisting reasonable disagreement about ethics and there are a number of ways one might resist this conclusion.68 Therefore, it would be unjustified to be overconfident in Parfit and Bostrom’s argument. In some areas, government policy does give significant weight to future generations. For example, in assessing the risks of nuclear waste storage, governments have considered timeframes of thousands, hundreds of thousands, and even a million years.69 Justifications for this policy usually appeal to principles of intergenerational equity according to which future generations ought to get as much protection as current generations.70 Similarly, widely accepted norms of sustainable development require development that meets the needs of the current generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.71 However, when it comes to existential risk, it would seem that we fail to live up to principles of intergenerational equity. Existential catastrophe would not only give future generations less than the current generations; it would give them nothing. Indeed, reducing existential risk plausibly has a quite low cost for us in comparison with the huge expected value it has for future generations. In spite of this, relatively little is done to reduce existential risk. Unless we give up on norms of intergenerational equity, they give us a strong case for significantly increasing our efforts to reduce existential risks. 1.3. WHY EXISTENTIAL RISKS MAY BE SYSTEMATICALLY UNDERINVESTED IN, AND THE ROLE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY In spite of the importance of existential risk reduction, it probably receives less attention than is warranted. As a result, concerted international cooperation is required if we are to receive adequate protection from existential risks. 1.3.1. Why existential risks are likely to be underinvested in There are several reasons why existential risk reduction is likely to be underinvested in. Firstly, it is a global public good. Economic theory predicts that such goods tend to be underprovided. The benefits of existential risk reduction are widely and indivisibly dispersed around the globe from the countries responsible for taking action. Consequently, a country which reduces existential risk gains only a small portion of the benefits but bears the full brunt of the costs. Countries thus have strong incentives to free ride, receiving the benefits of risk reduction without contributing. As a result, too few do what is in the common interest. Secondly, as already suggested above, existential risk reduction is an intergenerational public good: most of the benefits are enjoyed by future generations who have no say in the political process. For these goods, the problem is temporal free riding: the current generation enjoys the benefits of inaction while future generations bear the costs. Thirdly, many existential risks, such as machine superintelligence, engineered pandemics, and solar geoengineering, pose an unprecedented and uncertain future threat. Consequently, it is hard to develop a satisfactory governance regime for them: there are few existing governance instruments which can be applied to these risks, and it is unclear what shape new instruments should take. In this way, our position with regard to these emerging risks is comparable to the one we faced when nuclear weapons first became available. Cognitive biases also lead people to underestimate existential risks. Since there have not been any catastrophes of this magnitude, these risks are not salient to politicians and the public.72 This is an example of the misapplication of the availability heuristic, a mental shortcut which assumes that something is important only if it can be readily recalled. Another cognitive bias affecting perceptions of existential risk is scope neglect. In a seminal 1992 study, three groups were asked how much they would be willing to pay to save 2,000, 20,000 or 200,000 birds from drowning in uncovered oil ponds. The groups answered $80, $78, and $88, respectively.73 In this case, the size of the benefits had little effect on the scale of the preferred response. People become numbed to the effect of saving lives when the numbers get too large. 74 Scope neglect is a particularly acute problem for existential risk because the numbers at stake are so large. Due to scope neglect, decision-makers are prone to treat existential risks in a similar way to problems which are less severe by many orders of magnitude. A wide range of other cognitive biases are likely to affect the evaluation of existential risks.75

#### B] We access their role of the ballot—extinction by any process would cause massive suffering and obviously affects minorities. Proves even if they win their framing, extinction is still a tiebreaker – we’re not abstraction/inconsistent w their framing if we win our scenario

#### C] Anything other than probability \* magnitude is arbitrary and ethically irresponsible because it would justify a 100% chance of resolving a small amount of current suffering outweighs a 99% chance of preventing extinction, which is ethically disastrous and proves magnitude has to matter

#### We’ll impact turn Wynter and Mckittick – liberal values are good.

#### Their Ks of liberalism lack scholarly rigor and have it backwards—liberalism’s failings come from it not being vigorously defended enough and historical anti-colonial resistance explicitly reflected liberal values—their K independently dooms positive reform in the Global South

Claudio, 17—Associate Professor at De La Salle University Manila's College of Liberal Arts (Lisandro, “Defending Liberalism in the Global South: Notes from Duterte's Philippines,” The Global South, Volume 11, Number 2, Fall 2017, pp. 92-107, dml)

First is the claim that liberalism is a universalizing Enlightenment idea that has imposed itself on colonial societies. In displacing other forms of non-Western thinking, critics say it creates a hierarchy between a civilized/liberal subject and an uncivilized/illiberal one, thus allowing for the violence of colonialism. The most prominent writer in this vein is Uday Singh Mehta (1999), who argues that imperialism was not a contradiction within liberal thought but inherent in it.2 Through colonialism, he contends, liberalism “found a project, with all the grandeur of scale, implicit permanence, purposefulness, and the absence of a need to negotiate with what is extant” (12). Mehta based his account largely on a critique of British liberalism and its effects on colonial India. But others have applied his arguments to other liberal empires. By examining the United States’ colonial expansion in the late nineteenth century, Julian Go challenges the narrative of an inclusive liberal nationalism in the US. He contends that one must think of “civic-liberal nations as liberal empire-states” (emphasis in original, 2017, 74). Drawing from the influential anti-liberalism of Losurdo (2014), Go claims that both “are predicated upon a core hierarchized binary of citizen and Other—that is, between those who are members of the community because they are rational, mature, and civilized, and those who are not” (74). It is in this manner, he concludes, that US liberalism has excluded various subaltern groups, from African-American slaves to colonial-era Filipinos. ∂ To the critique exemplified by Mehta and Go, I offer two replies. First, liberalism’s universalism does not necessarily lead to colonialism. In fact, is it reasonable for a liberal who believes in rational deliberation to violently impose a set of beliefs on entire peoples? Scholars like Mehta are wont to emphasize the universalizing desires of liberalism (its first face), but they have neglected its other face, what Gray calls liberalism as modus vivendi—a liberalism that allows for “common institutions in which many forms of life can coexist” (2000, 6). A modus vivendi cannot be colonialism. And neither is colonialism a way of ordering liberty through institutions that enhance individual and collective freedoms. I must concede that at various points in liberalism’s history, the pendulum has swung towards its more universalizing tendencies. Yet to contend, as anti-liberal postcolonial theorists do, that liberalism is a universalizing project that imposes itself on divergent belief systems relies on an incomplete vision of the liberal project. ∂ A second reply relates to simple logic. It is, of course, true that liberalism creates “others.” But what political movement is bereft of an inside and outside? Marxism constructs the proletariat in relation to the bourgeoisie, nationalism has foreigners, various forms of identity politics insist on the primacy of specific subject positions over others, and religions have non-believers. In the sense that it sees the world through a political subject, liberalism is no different from other philosophies that create bonds of community. And while philosophers have theorized more fluid conceptions of political belonging— Deleuze and Guattari’s “rhizomatic” subjectivity (1988), which inspired Hardt and Negri’s conception of the amorphous “multitude” (2005)—it is not clear that these ideas have produced long-term movements or concrete agendas, especially in the Global South. ∂ The second claim is that liberalism is a modernist credo external to the experiences of the Global South and postcolonies and thus out of sync with the necessities of today. We have already noted how de Sousa Santos views the “indifference” of liberalism as anathema to the radical needs of the South. And we have also examined how the Comaroffs view liberalism as a “parochial” remnant of Euro-American modernity inapplicable to the Global South, both because it comes from Europe and America, and because it is anchored on outdated beliefs about the rule of law. Elsewhere, the Comaroffs contend that the liberal belief in “the capacity for constitutionalism and contract, rights and legal remedies to accomplish order, civility, justice, empowerment” is a form of legal “fetishism” that is ultimately “chimerical,” especially in postcolonial contexts. This kind of politics, then, becomes nothing but a pyramid scheme: “The more it is indulged, the more it is required” (2001, 38). ∂ Again I offer two replies. First, a history of liberalism shows that its potency as a political credo is not limited to the West. Of course, we cannot deny that much of liberalism’s early history lies in Europe and that the US became a major hub of liberal experimentation; liberalism’s place in what the Comaroffs label the “Euro-American” past is not up for debate. But because liberalism may encompass shifting subjectivities, political actors have been able to redefine liberalism within colonial contexts. Mehta is correct that imperialists deployed liberal rhetoric to justify expansionist policy. Nevertheless, the earliest anti-colonial movements were likewise liberal in nature, and, I would argue, more in line with the tenets of classical liberalism. Anti-colonial radicals in Spanish America, as Richard J. Evans notes, corresponded and collaborated with European liberals, forming a liberal and radical “international whose connections spanned the Atlantic” (2016, 17). ∂ Spain was a crucial node in this liberal internationalism; its various patriotic societies, which emerged after the Napoleonic wars, inspired similar organizations throughout the continent (Evans 2016, 39). It is thus unsurprising that European liberalism spread to Asia through the Spanish colony of the Philippines. Historians John Schumacher (1991, 31) and Nick Joaquin (2005, 24–35) have posited that the propaganda movement that paved the way for the Philippine revolution of 1896 (the first anti-colonial revolution in Asia) was birthed within a local liberal tradition that mixed with nationalist anti-colonialism. Recent evidence has shown, moreover, that, like the French revolution, the Philippine revolution was also liberal in character.3 ∂ Critics view liberalism through the eyes of “liberal” imperialists, but they are silent about how colonized actors themselves articulated concepts of liberty and human rights from their subaltern positions. Philippine national hero, the polymath novelist and polemicist Jose Rizal, saw in the liberal tenets of the French declaration of rights a blueprint for a society after colonialism, translating the declaration for his countrymen during a sojourn in Hong Kong (Schumacher 1997, 270). He was a liberal who criticized colonialism on liberal grounds and believed that liberals who abetted colonial rule were untrue to their principles. Writing in 1890, Rizal claimed that if Spanish liberals in the Philippines had “more faith in their ideals,” they would resist the colonial rule of Catholic friars and that “modern ideas” would not “be asphyxiated upon touching the shores of Manila” (1964, 289). ∂ If it is true that the one consistent feature of liberalism’s history has been the “constant opposition to assorted tyrannies,” then the more authentic liberals were those in colonial contexts, who argued that colonialism was tyranny writ large (Ryan 2012, 28). For the Filipino propagandists, there was a sense that liberalism could be purified in colonial contexts.4 “Liberals” in positions of power more easily succumb to tyranny, thereby turning their backs on their very own principles. A correction of liberalism could thus occur in places of disempowerment. What prevents Global South thinkers from appropriating this liberal anti-colonialism today? This appropriation would not be a wholesale adoption of modernity and Enlightenment. Rather, as in the case of Filipino propagandists, it would begin by grappling with rights and liberties in the postcolony, seeing how these can be enhanced and purified in these new contexts. ∂ My second reply to the argument about liberalism’s inapplicability to the postcolonial politics of the present rests on pragmatism. Modernist politics based on principles like constitutionalism may be wanting, but what are our alternatives? This is a trite response, but it bears repeating, especially in the context of the Global South, where people starve and immediate, even palliative, change is urgent. Reformism is not anathema to postcolonial societies. A fairer legal system that allows the poor to be treated equal under the law— one that affords them worthy defenses in criminal trials, one that prevents them from being kicked off their land and denied their property—is a sustainable goal that we must aspire for. And the Global South would do well to aspire for social services like state-sponsored healthcare (more dysfunctional in the Philippines than even the United States) that curb the worst violences of the “neoliberalism” that anti-liberals decry. ∂ Presumably, the advocates of non-modernist anti-liberalism from the Global South anchor their vision of change on a renewed revolutionary politics that challenges the core structures of contemporary capitalist societies. For them, another world is possible. But what are political actors in the Global South left to do while the theoreticians figure out how and when the revolutionary break will occur? Liberalism promotes a baseline of slow yet functional politics that tempers the nihilism of much radical thinking. But, a stable base of political rights may open new possibilities that may also tickle our collective imaginations. Slow does not mean uninspiring.

### 1NC – Case

#### Vote neg on presumption —

#### a) Alt causes — even if space appropriation is an instance of settler colonialism, ending it doesn’t end violence on earth — additionally, they don’t end non-appropriative forms of space exploration like rocket launches — this is offense because claims to undo the settler order while leaving it in tact moralize violence and create a palliative effect

#### b) Double turn — Belcourt and Winter and McKittrick say that settler colonialism is embedded into the code of settler society and reform will only replicate it — the aff is definitionally an attempt to tinker with the system they say is broken — voting neg is more consistent with their thesis because it recognizes the irredeemability of settler society instead of trying to improve it

#### c) Colonial equivocation — that idea that humans expanding into space and killing at worst maybe some bacteria is equivalent to the literal genocide of indigenous peoples is repugnant and a turn under their ROB — equating colonizing the moon and colonizing native land trivializes violence and erases native existence

#### d) Nothing they talk about are specific to space appropriation just about the way we talk about space colonization—they haven’t won that the specific projects of exploration or colonization are colonial which

#### Space colonization solves extinction

Filling Space 19, 4-19, "Deflecting Existential Risk with Space Colonization," Filling Space, https://filling-space.com/2019/04/19/deflecting-existential-risk-with-space-colonization/

The first living organism on Earth emerged approximately three and a half billion years ago. Since then, life has evolved into countless forms and colonized the planet. But the story of life is not a rosy one. At least five mass extinctions have occurred, and nearly all species that have ever existed on our planet are now dead. One of the most well-understood mass extinctions occurred when the Alvarez asteroid impacted Earth and, likely combined with other factors, killed many dinosaurs and other species. Life then had no tools to detect the coming asteroid or to be able to plan proactively to ensure its survival.

In order to avoid sharing the same fate as the dinosaurs, scholars argue that humans should become a multi-planetary species. We spoke with Professor Gonzalo Munevar, Emeritus Professor at Lawrence Technical University, to hear his thoughts on the existential risks we face and how colonization of the cosmos can help us address them. He has written extensively about the philosophy of space exploration and human consciousness.

Why do you argue that “failure to move into the cosmos would condemn us to oblivion”?

By having a significant presence in the solar system in the next few thousands of years and beyond, we will be in a better position to deflect asteroids and comets that might bring the end of humanity, and much other Earth life, in a horrible collision. And if perchance one such catastrophe proves inevitable (e.g. a rogue planet passing through the solar system), humanity would still survive by having colonized Mars and other bodies, as well as by having built artificial space colonies of the type advocated by Gerard O’Neill.

Once the sun begins to turn into a red giant in a few billion years, we must have long moved into the outer solar system. In the very long run, we have to move into other solar systems. Relativistic-speed starships would be nice, but they are not necessary for the task of moving humanity to the stars. We can reach them, slowly but surely, by propelling some of our space colonies away from the sun, carrying perhaps millions of human beings. They would take advantage of the many resources to be found in the Oort Cloud, and then of equivalent clouds in other solar systems. Even interstellar space has resources to offer. Nuclear energy, probably fusion, would likely be required. It may take us tens of thousands of years, but in the cosmic time scale, that is but a blink in the eye.

What are these catastrophic threats? Are there any records of catastrophic events happening before humans appeared on Earth?

I have already mentioned collisions with asteroids and comets. Although the active geology of our planet tends to erase the record of many collisions, we can find a well-preserved record on the Moon and Venus, the two closest bodies to Earth. On the 600-million-years-old Venusian surface, the spacecraft Magellan discovered about one thousand impact craters at least twice the diameter of meteor craters on Earth. This impact record makes it reasonable to estimate a catastrophic impact on Earth every half a million years or so. Collisions with bodies of 5 km across would happen, on the average, every 20 million years. Apart from the Alvarez asteroid (crater near Yucatan) that led to the extinction of the dinosaurs and the majority of species on Earth 65 million years ago, there have been at least two more impacts by asteroids 10 km or larger in the last 300 million years.

How could human colonization of outer space save other terrestrial life?

On both O’Neill types of colonies as well as on colonies on other planets, and particularly on terraformed planets, we would need all sorts of organisms like bacteria and plants for food, medicine, and ornamentation, as well as many animals for food and other purposes. We cannot have a proper colony without an Earthly environment to surround and nourish us. So, we have to take much other terrestrial life with us in order to survive and flourish. And given the value of biodiversity we would make it a point to take a great variety of organisms that contribute to our biosphere. Of course, we should heed Mark Twain and be sure not to include mosquitoes in our future space arks. I myself would keep out tarantulas and some other obnoxious viruses, bacteria, plants, and animals.

#### Space colonization solves climate change

Youn and Theodorou 19, 5/9, "Blue Origin, Jeff Bezos unveils plans for space colonization," ABC News, https://abcnews.go.com/Business/blue-origin-jeff-bezos-unveils-lunar-lander-mission/story?id=62941981 TDI  
His inspiration? American physicist Gerard O'Neill, who became interested in the idea of space colonization in 1969.

Bezos extolled his belief in the idea that humans could live in environments that were ideal and create colonies where heavy industry can be carried out without subjecting the earth to atmospheric pollution. He also did refer to coming back to Earth.

“Earth is the best planet. It is not even close. Don’t even get me started on Venus," Bezos said.

The Amazon founder identified two initial goals that Blue Origin would focus on: a radical reduction in launch costs and establishing resources for space. Like Elon Musk's SpaceX, Blue Origin has focused on reusable rockets.

Blue Origin would begin by sending human's into space in 2019 on New Shepard -- a suborbital vehicle designed for space tourism -- which uses liquid hydrogen, an incredibly efficient fuel source.

#### Space colonization encourages healthcare innovations- solves diseases

Donoviel 19 (Dorit Donoviel, 7-19-2019, "Space exploration is reinventing healthcare," [20+ years leadership experience as executive director of R&D overseeing diverse areas of biomedical research from basic to applied science, drug discovery, and technology development. Executing a multi-million dollar national research portfolio of grants addressing the plethora of physiological and behavioral challenges of humans in space. Executive Director, Translational Research Institute for Space Health at Baylor College of Medicine] The Hill, <https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/453853-space-exploration-is-reinventing-healthcare>) TDI

Though many do not realize it, humans have been living and working in space continuously for the past two decades. The conditions of spaceflight have accelerated our ability to study progressive degenerative diseases. This novel paradigm of understanding human physiology under the stresses of living in space holds great promise for new sources of medical breakthroughs for Earth.

Although astronauts are carefully selected to be exceptionally healthy and exhibit peak physical and mental performance, after only four to six months in space, they can develop numerous medical [conditions](https://humanresearchroadmap.nasa.gov/Risks/). Without appropriate exercise, they lose bone and muscle mass. They become prone to developing kidney stones. Their hearts become deconditioned. Their blood vessels stiffen. A subset of astronauts develop a swelling of the optic nerve and possibly an increase in pressure on the brain. Even dormant viruses become activated, alongside changes to the immune system. There is a sense of urgency to solve these problems if we are to send humans to Mars and return them safely in the next decade or two.

This is why NASA is investing in cutting-edge research for human health and performance including high-risk high-reward approaches funded through the [Translational Research institute for Space Health](https://www.bcm.edu/centers/space-medicine/translational-research-institute) (TRISH). Supporting potentially ground-breaking innovations requires a leap of faith in the right direction.

Keeping astronauts healthy during deep space exploration missions — where there are no hospitals and no medical specialists — requires a different paradigm for healthcare. Astronauts are typically engineers and scientists, and only occasionally physicians. On the way to Mars, when communications with Earth will be limited, they could be forced to act as both patients and healthcare providers. If a medical condition is allowed to progress when they are millions of miles away from Earth, the situation could become catastrophic.

Therefore, astronauts will need to detect even the most subtle changes in their own health status early enough to prevent disease. This requires a healthcare paradigm of predicting, preventing and mitigating ailments by intervening early.

This means enabling monitoring, diagnostic and therapeutic medical capabilities that are simple to use, safe, robust and miniaturized. Additionally, what will work in a small spacecraft in the hands of an engineer is also likely to work in a community clinic with limited resources. Or even in our homes. This different approach to healthcare can help save lives and reduce costs — at a global level.

Space demands the best in healthcare innovations, focusing on prevention and early intervention using smart, creative solutions. On a mission to Mars, blood tests will be done in a matter of minutes, by the patient, on a single [drop of blood](https://www.1dropdx.com/). A trained and adaptive computer [algorithm](https://www.visualdx.com/) will track health status based on a variety of physiological parameters and alert astronauts when important deviations from normal become evident.

[Automated eye exams](https://www.healio.com/ophthalmology/retina-vitreous/news/online/%7Bb1a85e81-9e54-4976-9717-3218fd7fa175%7D/web-vision-technologies-awarded-grants-to-develop-devices-for-nasa) will be performed by the astronauts on themselves and images will be analyzed by a computer for changes. Customized [medications](http://news.mit.edu/2016/portable-pharmacy-on-demand-0331) will be tailor-made for the patient on the spot. If a minor medical procedure is required, the caregiver will learn and practice beforehand using augmented reality tools and software [simulations](https://www.level-ex.com/) adjusted for zero-gravity.

Kidney stones will be found early and treated quickly and painlessly using [ultrasound](http://www.sonomotion.com/) to “push” them out of the kidney so they can be cleared naturally with urination. Sleep and mood will be improved using [sound stimulation](https://www.usa.philips.com/a-w/about/news/archive/standard/news/press/2019/20190617-philips-smartsleep-deep-sleep-headband-selected-by-nasa-funded-institute-for-studies-to-improve-sleep-and-behavioral-health.html) and health will be improved by individualized diets which will be enriched with high-nutrient [plants](https://news.ucr.edu/articles/2019/04/25/astronauts-might-soon-grow-space-tomatoes) grown efficiently within a small footprint. Most importantly, all these advances have clear and important applications on Earth.

Space exploration has already yielded hundreds of inventions that filled our [arsenal](https://spinoff.nasa.gov/) for fighting diseases. To land women and men on Mars and return them healthy, we must reinvent healthcare. The positive consequences of this work will impact all of humanity. The spirit of Apollo is alive and well in space health research today. And for science, medicine and technology pioneers, our most important work is still ahead.

#### Humans can survive on asteroids within 15 years
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Humans could live on giant orbs floating in the asteroid belt between Mars and Jupiter within the next 15 years.

That’s the bonkers claim made by top scientist Dr. Pekka Janhunen, who says millions of people could inhabit a megacity in space by 2026.

Janhunen, an astrophysicist at the Finnish Meteorological Institute in Helsinki, described his vision in a research paper published this month.

He laid out the blueprint for floating “mega-satellites” around the dwarf planet Ceres, which lies roughly 325 million miles from Earth.

“The motivation is to have a settlement with artificial gravity that allows growth beyond Earth’s living area,” Janhunen wrote.

The vast majority of plots to settle distant worlds revolve around the moon or Mars. This is largely due to their proximity to Earth.

Janhunen’s proposal, on the other hand, looks a little farther afield.

His disk-shaped habitat would boast thousands of cylindrical structures, each home to more than 50,000 people.

Those pods would be linked by powerful magnets and generate artificial gravity by slowly rotating.

Residents would mine resources from Ceres 600 miles below the settlement and haul them back up using “space elevators,” Janhunen said.

“Lifting the materials from Ceres is energetically cheap compared to processing them into habitats, if a space elevator is used,” he wrote.

“Because Ceres has low gravity and rotates relatively fast, the space elevator is feasible.”

Ceres — the largest object in the asteroid belt — is the best destination for off-world settlements due to its nitrogen-rich atmosphere, Janhunen added.

This would allow settlers to more easily create Earth-like conditions than those colonizing the harsher, carbon dioxide-rich environment of Mars.

That doesn’t solve the threats of rogue asteroids or space radiation, though Janhunen, who worked with a number of Finnish researchers on the paper, has thought of that, too.

He proposed that giant, cylindrical mirrors placed around the mega-satellite could protect it from bombardment of all kinds.

Those mirrors would also focus sunlight onto the habitat for the growth of crops and other plant life.

#### Space colonization possible
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The good news: Critical technologies such as propulsion and power generation systems will improve over time. Transit durations between celestial destinations will shorten (in the same way sailing vessels gave way to steam ships and then to airliners and perhaps, one day, to point-to-point ballistic reusable rockets). Methods for obtaining critical resources on other planets will be refined and enhanced. Genetic engineering may be used to better adapt humans, their crops and other biota to life in space or on other planetary surfaces – to withstand the effects of low or micro-gravity, radiation, and the psychological effects of long-duration spaceflight.

As nation after nation lands their inaugural exploratory vessels on our Earth’s moon, and as billionaire space enthusiasts race to launch passengers, satellites and other cargo into orbit, it’s clearly time for us to sit down as a species and debate whether our future will be one highlighted primarily by growth and discovery, opening the solar system to settlement and economic development, or one that eschews outward expansion for conservation and preservation. Doing so would allow us to focus our attentions on this planet, leaving the solar system in its natural state, a celestial Antarctica stretching beyond Neptune.