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#### Counterplan: Private entities in Asia ought to invest in Large Satellite Constellations in Lower Earth Orbit for the purposes of emergency communications in the event of disaster relief or external shocks.

#### All other private entities except for those in Asia for that purpose ought not appropriate outer space.

#### Private LEO constellations are economically viable in the long term, but require upfront investment – those uniquely solve disaster response because of satellite internet’s connectivity options for island countries

Garrity and Husar 21 Garrity, John, and Arndt Husar. John Garrity is an economist, policy advisor, and project manager focusing on digital inclusion, universal internet access policy, and last-mile connectivity. He has coauthored numerous reports on technology and development and has presented around the world on efforts to close the digital divide. Arndt Husar facilitates the effective use of digital technology, advising ADB clients, regional departments, as well as sector and thematic groups on digital transformation. " Digital Connectivity and Low Earth Orbit Satellite Constellations: Opportunities for Asia and the Pacific." (2021).

Satellite communication plays a necessary role in the global connectivity ecosystem, connecting rural and remote populations, providing backhaul connectivity to mobile cellular networks, and rapidly establishing communication in emergency and disaster response scenarios. This Asian Development Bank (ADB) Sustainable Development Working Paper, the first in a series reviewing emerging innovations in connectivity technologies, focuses on low Earth orbit (LEO) satellites, which have been in deployment for decades and are again a subject of intensive investment as new large constellations are in early stages of deployment. These new LEO constellations, such as those being deployed by Starlink by SpaceX, Project Kuiper by Amazon, OneWeb, Lightspeed by Telesat, among others, may prove to be transformational to the connectivity landscape based on their global coverage and their suitability for areas not served by fiber optic cable networks. ADB’s developing member countries are well placed to leverage and benefit from this expansion of internet connectivity, particularly for underserved geographies and countries with limited international internet bandwidth, such as landlocked developing countries and small island developing states. With their global reach and coverage, LEO constellations are expected to dramatically expand the availability of high-speed broadband internet access with levels of service that rival fiber optic cables in terms of speed and latency, and at significantly reduced price levels compared to traditional geostationary satellites. A proactive engagement with LEO solutions is likely to yield benefits as the relevant business models are still evolving. Well-informed early action by regulators and investors can ensure that developing member countries prepare for opportunities presented by the anticipated expansion of connectivity bandwidth. I. IntRoDUCtIon This Emerging Connectivity Innovations Case Study on SpaceX Starlink and low Earth orbit (LEO) satellite constellations is intended to provide readers, particularly in developing countries in Asia and the Pacific, with a background understanding of the role of satellite communications in global internet connectivity and an exploration of the potential impact of the next generation of LEO constellation systems. While the adoption of internet connectivity across the world has generally increased incrementally, some innovations have been transformational, dramatically expanding the geographic reach of connectivity and bandwidth capacity. For example, the introduction of basic mobile phones in the late 1990s and early 2000s led to rapid adoption of mobile telephony across low- and middle-income countries (a phenomenon known as the “mobile miracle”). Similarly, public and private investment in undersea fiber optic cables circling sub-Saharan Africa in the 2000s significantly reduced the cost of bandwidth in many countries in the region. Satellites have used low Earth orbits since the beginning of space exploration; however, private investment in LEO constellations, consisting of hundreds or thousands of satellites, has been limited because significant up-front capital expenditure is required. While it remains to be seen how the next generation of LEO satellite constellations will evolve, LEOs are forecasted to significantly increase the available internet bandwidth in remote and rural geographies not currently served by fiber optic cables. This increased bandwidth could be leveraged to increase economic and social development opportunities for individuals, organizations, businesses, and government facilities (including public schools) located in these areas, provided that the private sector satellite companies investing in LEO constellations see market opportunities to extend service to these areas. This case study is intended to introduce to Asian Development Bank developing member countries how to start preparing for the expansion of LEO satellite communication services. II. BACKGRoUnD: sAteLLIte ConneCtIVItY As A MeAns FoR BRoADBAnD InteRnet Internet connectivity has become a necessary component of every country’s critical infrastructure given the reliance of all aspects of economic activity, governance, and social development on internet communications. The coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic dramatically increased the importance of internet communications infrastructure. Trade, employment, learning, leisure, and communications quickly shifted into the digital sphere and countries with robust internet infrastructure and high adoption rates of internet-enabled devices were better able to adjust and adapt to the shift to digital activity. The United Nations estimates that 1.6 billion learners were affected by school closures in 2020, affecting 94% of the world’s student population and up to 99% in low and lower middle-income countries.1 1 United Nations. 2020. Policy Brief: Education during COVID-10 and beyond. 2 ADB Sustainable Development Working Paper Series No. 76 Access to distance learning opportunities varies greatly by country and income groups, with estimates of less than half of students in low-income countries able to access distance learning.2 Internet access and adoption in the developing member countries (DMCs) of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) continues to grow, particularly as a result of public and private investment in telecommunications infrastructure, increased competition, and allocation of shared resources, such as spectrum auctions and assignment. Despite these efforts, large access gaps remain in Asia, where the most remote, difficult to reach, or sparsely populated districts remain disconnected, leaving more than half of the population without access to the internet. This lack of digital infrastructure represents a missed opportunity to accelerate economic and social development. Despite the rapid expansion of internet connectivity infrastructure across the world, significant gaps in internet adoption and infrastructure access remain. This highlights the importance of satellite communications that can bridge gaps, swiftly expand network coverage, and enhance existing infrastructure. The latest estimates from the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) show that 3.7 billion people are still not participating online (49% of the global population), and 63% of rural households are without internet access (Figure 1).3 Also, 1.5 billion people reside in areas without high-speed mobile data coverage (fourth generation long-term evolution or 4G LTE), while 607 million people reside in areas with no mobile data coverage at all (at least 4G or third generation [3G] coverage). Furthermore, 313 million people reside in areas with only basic voice and short messaging service (SMS) coverage (second generation [2G]), and 220 million people reside in areas with no cellular coverage. The ITU estimates that nearly $428 billion is required to achieve universal access to broadband globally, $251 billion of which is required for Asia, with approximately 75% coming from the private sector and the remainder with support from the public sector.4 The majority of the world’s population, over 5 billion people, live more than 10 kilometers (km) away from any fiber optic cable infrastructure (3.6 billion reside more than 25 km away).5 Other issues, such as affordability, digital literacy, and the lack of relevant or local language content, have resulted in 2.4 billion people who live within 4G coverage not subscribing to 4G data services. [FIGURE 1 OMITTED] Satellite connectivity is predominantly used for backhaul connectivity for remote cellular base stations and as a last-mile connection for individual subscribers and enterprises. Figure 2 provides an overview of the internet infrastructure network components, from international connectivity to the last mile. Because of the higher relative cost of bandwidth transmitted via satellite versus terrestrial technologies, satellite is currently primarily used in situations where fiber optic cables and other high-capacity technologies are not financially viable due to low population densities and large distances between high-capacity networks and last-mile networks.6 However, in a few cases, satellite connectivity is relied upon for international internet gateway traffic or as part of a country’s core network. For landlocked developing countries that are dependent on terrestrial fiber connectivity, in some cases, satellite connectivity serves as a substitute to complex bilateral and multilateral negotiations to extend costly fiber connectivity to their country. [FIGURE 2 OMITTED] Satellite connectivity is predominantly used for backhaul connectivity for remote cellular base stations and as a last-mile connection for individual subscribers and enterprises. Figure 2 provides an overview of the internet infrastructure network components, from international connectivity to the last mile. Because of the higher relative cost of bandwidth transmitted via satellite versus terrestrial technologies, satellite is currently primarily used in situations where fiber optic cables and other high-capacity technologies are not financially viable due to low population densities and large distances between high-capacity networks and last-mile networks.6 However, in a few cases, satellite connectivity is relied upon for international internet gateway traffic or as part of a country’s core network. For landlocked developing countries that are dependent on terrestrial fiber connectivity, in some cases, satellite connectivity serves as a substitute to complex bilateral and multilateral negotiations to extend costly fiber connectivity to their country. Particularly in situations where a high degree of data throughput is required per site, such as satellite backhaul for broadband cellular networks, the data volumes as well as the distance to the nearest backbone node play a significant role in cost comparisons between satellite connectivity versus terrestrial network deployments (microwave backhaul, in particular). Figure 4 illustrates how higher data bandwidth requirements are more cost-effectively supplied by terrestrial ground networks; however, a crossover point occurs where satellite capacity may end up being more cost-competitive, depending on different price points of satellite bandwidth and total traffic demand per month.12 Satellite connectivity is also well- suited to deploy in emergency situations, such as in response to natural disasters or other external shocks, that require expeditious deployment of network connectivity where terrestrial infrastructure is either nonexistent or destroyed. For many rural and remote communities, satellites are the only connectivity option. For geographies without direct access to fiber optic cable infrastructure or at great distances from high- capacity bandwidth capacity, satellite connectivity is the only option available. Even where terrestrial network infrastructure that could be used for backhaul connectivity is available, satellite deployments may still be preferred because satellite terminals require only electrical power and a clear line of sight to the sky. However, an expansion of terrestrial infrastructure usually requires extensive civil works (underground fiber ducts, pole attachments, or tower construction for cellular base stations), which comes with challenges such as securing the rights-of-way, permits, and having to pay the related fees. Satellite broadband is poised to become an even more important technology for addressing the growing digital divide. As information and communication technologies play an increasingly important role in commerce, government services, health care, education, and other sectors, satellite connectivity allows communities to get connected swiftly, bypassing the infrastructure deployment challenges that come with terrestrial infrastructure deployments. The role of satellite connectivity in emergency telecommunications has also been vital where the communications satellites are heavily relied upon in disaster recovery efforts.13 Satellite technology may also be complementary with traditional wired and mobile broadband, which are better suited for densely populated areas. Satellite service could become a default solution for remote areas, allowing terrestrial services to focus on improving access in their current coverage areas. Satellite connectivity is already being used for network redundancy at national levels for international internet capacity, as well as for backup in core and backhaul networks.14 The recent $50 million loan to Kacific by ADB for the deployment of a broadband satellite, which covers large parts of Southeast Asia and the Pacific, demonstrates the relevance of satellite connectivity for unserved and underserved regions.15 By deploying new satellite technology (in the Ka-band16), Kacific’s service offering is commercially viable despite the existing presence of other major competitors in Asia and the Pacific, including global entities such as Intelsat, SES, and Eutelsat, as well as more regional players such as AsiaSat, Thaicom, MEASAT, and SKY Perfect JSAT.

#### The Asia-Pacific is the most disaster-prone region in the world – the next catastrophe is a question of when, not if

Thomas Bickford et al 15, Ph.D., senior research scientist in CNA Corporation’s China Studies division, “The Role of the U.S. Army in Asia,” May, https://www.cna.org/CNA\_files/PDF/CRM-2015-U-010431-Final.pdf

Natural disasters As Typhoon Haiyan amply demonstrated when it hit the Philippines in November 2013, natural disasters can represent a significant threat to human security. In 2012, the Asia-Pacific region experienced 93 natural disasters, which affected some 75 million people.206 It is one of the most disaster-prone regions in the world:207 it is prone to typhoons and cyclones; it contains some of the world’s most active faults and volcanos; and many areas experience massive flooding. As former USARPAC commander Lieutenant General Wiercinski has noted, the only questions are when and where the next big disaster will occur. Admiral Locklear, Commander, USPACOM has noted that climate change is one of the region’s most pressing security challenges.209 While the ability to respond to natural disasters varies widely among countries in the region, even advanced countries can require international assistance, as Japan did after the March 2011 earthquake and tsunami.

#### Disasters are an existential threat---it’s try or die for response and coordination.

Frederick Tipson 13, adviser to the USIP Center of Innovation on Science, Technology, and Peacebuilding whose career has included positions in the UN Development Programme, Microsoft, Hongkong Telecom, AT&T, the Markle Foundation, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the University of Virginia Law School, BA in History from Stanford, MA in IR from Yale, PhD and JD from UVA, “Natural Disasters as Threats to Peace”, 2013, United States Institute of Peace, <https://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/resources/Natural%20Disasters%20as%20Threats%20to%20Peace%20SR324.pdf> //hhb

As the three spheres of our habitat evolve and erupt, human beings frequently get in the way. Natural hazards become humanitarian disasters when they expose and exacerbate human vulnerabilities—those characteristics of societies that limit their ability to avoid major damage and recover quickly.3 Such vulnerabilities range from very concrete weaknesses in infrastructure or the exposed locations of large populated areas to more intangible dimensions of economic fragility, social cohesion, and political capacity, which affect both preparedness and recovery. Although the recent historical pattern of major storms, droughts, and earthquakes can be traced (see map 1 at the end of this report), the extent of human vulnerabilities is a complex and subjective matter, often evident only after the fact. Mortality figures are typically used as indicators of the severity of disasters. By that measure, the three worst disasters in the world since 1950 were the earthquake in Tangshan, China, in 1976 (250,000 dead), the earthquake and tsunami in the Indian Ocean in 2004 (240,000 dead), and the earthquake in Haiti in 2010 (316,000 dead).4 These three earthquakes were by no means the largest in that sixty-year time frame, but they occurred where large numbers of people were exposed and unable to protect themselves. Severity also can be measured by other direct effects: destruction, dislocation, and disease. The 2010 earthquake in Haiti not only killed more than 300,000 people but injured an additional 300,000, affected 3.7 million (30 percent of the total population), caused $8 billion in damage, and was followed by 470,000 cases of cholera with 6,631 attributable deaths. The death rate from an earthquake, hurricane, or epidemic is generally much higher in poorer societies than in richer ones, where economic damage is usually the more numerically impressive consequence. Because their constituents have come to recognize how much the damage from “acts of God” can be affected by the actions, or inactions, of human beings, political leaders are increasingly being held accountable for minimizing the foreseeable risks of extreme events. “Natural Hazards, UnNatural Disasters: The Economics of Effective Prevention” is the indicative title of one important report by the United Nations and the World Bank. Reducing the risks begins with the recognition of how vulnerable many people have become. Throughout the world, in both wealthy and poor countries, ever-larger concentrations of people live in exposed locations under fragile or unprotected conditions. Infrastructure is often inadequate or deteriorating, and there is little or no awareness or preparation even for likely natural events. Those most exposed include millions in low-lying shorelines or coastal wetlands, marginal urban slums, and huge “temporary” settlements of internally displaced persons or refugees. Many of these populations depend on international humanitarian agencies to provide food and medicine and to assist local authorities in assuring adequate water, sanitation, health services, and shelter. As urban populations grow and conditions deteriorate further, reliable access to these necessities is becoming increasingly problematic for more and more people. Demographic trends best convey the scale of the challenges. In less than twenty years, the global population will rise from 7.1 billion to more than 8 billion. Key countries will grow even more rapidly. Between 2010 and 2025, Egypt is projected to grow from 81 million people to 106 million, Pakistan from 174 million to 234 million, and Nigeria from 159 million to 258 million.5 Many more people around the world will attain middle-class incomes, but a large percentage in many countries will be young and unemployed. Half the world’s population is already twenty-five years old or younger. Projections suggest that, by 2030, the world will need to provide fifty percent more food and additional fresh water equivalent to twenty new Nile Rivers.6 In that time frame, the needs of many countries, including India and China, will begin to exceed foreseeable water supplies for consumption and irrigation. The growth of earthquake-prone megacities is perhaps most telling of all. In just over a decade, metropolitan Jakarta will go from 9.6 million to 12.8 million people, Mexico City from 20 million to 24.6 million, Delhi from 22 million to 32.9 million, and Tokyo from 37 million to nearly 40 million—and these are just four of the thirty-seven cities that will then have populations greater than 10 million.7 There were only twenty-three in 2011. One of every seven or eight people in the world will be living in one of these massive metropolises, many in huge urban slums that have few, if any, services or infrastructure. Such concentrated population centers are extremely vulnerable to even normal patterns of earthquakes, storms, drought, and disease (see map 2). Epidemics that spread within such populations are especially difficult to contain. Climate volatility adds a further dimension of growing risk. Current changes in the climate of key regions portend severe near-term effects, whether or not the consequences of global warming match the worst predictions for the longer term. Since the 1980s the number of recorded natural disasters related to weather and climate has roughly doubled. According to the above-mentioned United Nations-World Bank report, “If there is no conscious change in adaptation policies to extreme events, baseline damages [even] without climate change are expected to triple to $185 billion a year from economic and population growth alone”8 (emphasis added). Nor are these risks confined to poor or middle-income countries. The world’s largest reinsurance companies, Munich Re and Swiss Re, warn of major increases in weather-related damage in both North America and Europe over the next decade.9 Contrary to critiques from global warming skeptics, the scientific and intelligence communities actually have been cautious in predicting the human effects of climate change. The April 2012 report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is relatively conservative in forecasting future climate-induced disasters.10 Likewise, the National Intelligence Council handles climate change and natural disasters in a largely conventional and understated manner.11 However, an increasing number of authoritative reports have begun to highlight the dire risks of current climate trends and the need to begin assessing the potential for plausible adverse scenarios. Both the World Bank and the UN Environment Programme warned recently that the likely rise in global mean temperatures will exceed key thresholds sooner than previously expected, with implications for both severe weather and ocean surges.12 Security specialists are beginning to take these trends to heart. The Defense Science Board warned in its 2011 report that climate changes in key regions will interact with other vulnerabilities to become serious “threat multipliers.”13 The World Economic Forum highlights the interactive implications of climate changes with governance, fiscal, population, and technology vulnerabilities.14 A recent report of the National Research Council called on foreign policy experts to consider more systematically the political and security implications of foreseeable climate changes, suggesting that “it is prudent for security analysts to expect climate surprises in the coming decade, including unexpected and potentially disruptive single events as well as conjunctions of events occurring simultaneously or in sequence, and for them to become progressively more serious and more frequent thereafter, most likely at an accelerating rate.”15 Despite the pervasive dysfunction of most governments in addressing “climate surprises” and other disaster vulnerabilities, we will no doubt see environmental risks beginning to shape the political expectations of senior officials and thought leaders. As in the Cold War or the current ”war on terror,” responsible policymakers must look not only to the familiar and most imminent threats but also to less likely but higher-impact scenarios that could be truly catastrophic for national security, particularly if sudden and unanticipated.16 Not unlike other threats to peace and security, the inability to predict with certainty the location and timing of future natural disasters should not obscure a nation’s vital interest in assessing their likelihood and potential aftereffects.

Local Catastrophes and Global Repercussions

The challenge is to envision plausible threats and sequential patterns of potential danger—not to scare people but to anticipate potential consequences and devise strategies to prevent or reduce economic, political, and social damage. The National Research Council suggests using analytical “stress” tests of particular countries or regions to envision the effects of major disasters, or clusters of disasters, even if some of them should be considered unlikely. History offers examples of catastrophes that illustrate the possible ripple effects from otherwise local disasters. The Lisbon earthquake, tsunami, and fire of 1755 destroyed that city and decisively degraded Portugal’s role as an imperial power.17 The Spanish flu epidemic of 1918–20 killed an estimated fifty million to one hundred million people worldwide and was particularly lethal among young adults, compounding the immense losses to that generation from World War I. More recently, the destruction from Hurricane Katrina on the U.S. Gulf Coast in 2005; the earthquake, tsunami, and nuclear shutdown in Fukushima, Japan in 2011; and Tropical Storm Sandy on the U.S East Coast in 2012 exposed the interconnected vulnerabilities of coastal settlements, energy infrastructures, health-care facilities, and large-scale relief and recovery operations—a complex combination for which neither the United States nor Japan was adequately prepared. Major localized disasters do not always result in irreversible setbacks. The Chicago Fire of 1871, the Boston Fire of 1872, and the San Francisco Earthquake of 1906 resulted in the major reconstruction of all three cities, making each of them more economically vibrant and resilient.18 New York will undoubtedly be better prepared after Sandy, as New Orleans was after Katrina when it faced Hurricane Isaac in August 2012. Yet both disaster specialists and mainstream media too often treat natural disasters as limited and local matters. Media focus has typically been more on immediate suffering than larger implications, direct effects than long-term consequences, and infrastructure repair than major institutional reforms. Nevertheless, as the number and scale of natural disasters increases, we are likely to witness growing public awareness and anxiety about the vulnerability of certain areas, which will become a strong political factor adding to the wider and longer-term consequences of disasters. Internet technologies will facilitate not only the rapid dissemination of distressing information about natural disasters and severe environmental conditions but also the potential for exaggerated predictions, political incitement, conspiracy theories, or even popular panic. Worst-case scenarios may then become urgent political focal points, especially those that illustrate the fragility of economic necessities, social cohesion, or public safety.19 Economic Cascades The most troubling scenarios of natural disasters involve those with simultaneous effects on major essentials: food, water, land, medicine, energy, or subsistence income. An overlapping series of earthquakes, floods, and food shortages affecting a megacity could overwhelm the capacity of national and international agencies to respond adequately. Other consequences could follow: The Fukushima nuclear meltdown, for example, led both the Japanese and German governments to announce the phasing out of their nuclear power industries—a major blow to any prospect of curbing global carbon emissions.20 Disruptive disasters in major food-producing regions could have dire global consequences. Corn, wheat, and rice crop failures would lead to price hikes and shortages in far-flung locations. The worldwide collapse of one of these major staples—for example, from a new fungal infestation in one region and a drought in another—could lead to famines, export cutoffs, stockpiling and hoarding, or cartelized supply arrangements. Such developments could create new zones of instability, hostility, and populist pretexts for aggressive steps to secure new supplies or assure future access. The drive to guarantee food sources has already prompted the governments of China, Korea, Saudi Arabia, and others to buy land in Africa and Latin America for growing food that could be diverted from global markets during shortages. Water shortages could be another cause of future conflicts. Recent intelligence analyses suggest that countries are unlikely to go to war over water,21 but the larger patterns of depletion and diversion—glacial melts in South Asia and the Andes; upstream dams in the Middle East, East Africa, and Southeast Asia; widening drought in sub-Saharan Africa—suggest that peacefully resolving some disputes over severe water shortages could be very difficult. The genocides in Rwanda and Darfur owed much to the pressures of land, food, and water competition in fomenting ethnic conflicts.22 Medicine can be another life-and-death necessity in times of emergency. It is not difficult to imagine that the government of a state facing the prospect of a deadly epidemic would take steps to seize or intercept supplies of essential medicines. After European and U.S. laboratories cloned the lethal H5N1 virus, Indonesia demanded access to the vaccine formulas to assure adequate supplies for its huge population at reasonable cost. A global pandemic from that virus or a similar microorganism could lead to travel restrictions, news blackouts, and other isolationist reactions, but also to more aggressive measures to obtain lifesaving medicine. Massive casualties could undermine the standard protocols of global cooperation among international and national agencies, reducing global effectiveness in containing disease.23 Natural disasters can also sever transportation and communication links and global supply chains—life lines for necessities—compounding the catastrophe where the disaster occurs and affecting employment even in distant locations. In 2011 both the Thai floods and the Japanese earthquake and tsunami disasters affected hard-disk and auto suppliers, causing factory shutdowns and end-product shortages on other continents. The volcanic dust cloud from Iceland in 2010 halted European air traffic for only a week or so but even then had significant effects on both business and tourism. Compare this with the massive 1883 eruption of Krakatoa and the 1815 eruption of Mount Tambora, both in Indonesia, which created longer-lasting effects around the world. The Tambora event led to what was then called “The Year Without a Summer,” because of the adverse effects on U.S. and European weather patterns.24 Social Collapse Major disasters can have social consequences when the intense stress of damage and recovery causes breaks along ethnic, religious, class, or geographic fault lines. A major earthquake in a megacity could produce violent confrontations among groups competing for scarce relief supplies and recovery assistance. Or the disaster might create reverse-urbanization pressures for millions of homeless and jobless people in suddenly uninhabitable slums. Once again, the purpose of discussing such scenarios is not to suggest that social chaos following a disaster is a given but rather to consider ways to prevent, or at least reduce, that possibility. The major quake that struck Mexico City in 1985 produced not widespread strife but inspiring solidarity in local relief and recovery operations, even among the poorest citizens.25 That city is now a prime candidate for even bigger quakes, affecting an even larger population. Joint planning for such a crisis by the United States and Mexico could reduce the possibility of greater casualties and infrastructure losses that might impel hundreds of thousands to seek entry into the United States. Sudden large-scale migrations are an increasing prospect among the effects of climate change. Low-lying islands, flood-prone coastal areas, large refugee camps, and regions of prolonged drought could provoke major population movements. The possibility of Bangladeshis pouring into India to escape delta flooding has already led the Indian government to construct a 4,000-kilometer fence to forestall such influxes. Mass migration from Africa to Europe could also result from the droughts and floods affecting an increasing number of areas. Within the continent, such forced movement could compound urbanization trends. Such cataclysms are unlikely to occur without violence.

Political Catalysts

Natural disasters can dramatically expose deep social inequities and government indifference or incompetence, fomenting opposition movements. In 1970, the government in western Pakistan responded so poorly to the cyclone that struck eastern Pakistan that it strongly contributed to the secession of what became Bangladesh. The Nicaraguan earthquake in 1972 fatally discredited the Somoza regime. The Myanmar government’s heartless response to Cyclone Nargis in 2008 was likely a further factor in the military regime’s political vulnerability and may have accelerated the recent transition there. An unprecedented drought in Syria from 2006 to 2010 disrupted agriculture in regions that then became strong supporters of the armed resistance.26 The rise in global food prices that began with a severe drought in Russia in the summer of 2010 was a key factor in provoking popular uprisings in various Arab states the following year.27 An earthquake and tsunami near Jakarta—40 percent of which is below sea level and frequently inundated by heavy rains—could render much of that city uninhabitable and set back Indonesia’s economic growth and democratic development for years. It could also reduce the country’s ability to cooperate on global issues, such as deforestation or pandemic prevention, on which its involvement has been crucial.28 An earthquake in Karachi or Delhi or a major flood in Mumbai or Lagos could cripple the economies of their respective countries and further degrade the effectiveness of government authorities to avoid serious ethnic, sectarian, or even international conflicts. Major deterioration of any one of these cities could undermine the stability of their respective regions, with direct economic and possibly military consequences for the United States. Weak governments or failed states lack the capacity to prevent even moderate disasters from becoming severe crises. For any of the above scenarios, it is insufficient for only government agencies to be aware or prepared. As the extent of global fragility in the face of natural disasters becomes more widely felt, the public may sense the start of a regional or even global slide toward scarcities of various kinds, leading to political pressures for more secure sources of necessities. Such pressures increase the risk of international confrontation and present opportunities for exploitation by terrorists, criminals, or fanatics who see increased mayhem as in their interest.29

Defensive Measures and Strategic Adjustments

Efforts to reduce the severity of natural disasters and contain their larger consequences will require three kinds of initiatives: stoic, heroic, and “ecozoic.”

Stoic Resilience

Humans continue to cope with natural disasters largely as they always have, by “weathering” them: riding out storms, putting out fires, waiting out droughts, and helping out their neighbors. The capacity of societies to withstand catastrophes is generally referred to as resilience. Such resilience depends on physical, economic, cultural, and political factors that determine a society’s ability to plan for and recover from disasters without creating major social and economic fallout. These capabilities are almost entirely the “stoic” achievements of local people—namely, doing what is necessary to survive and prosper in the places they inhabit. As with all preventive efforts, the benefits of investing in resilient infrastructure and sensible preparedness far outweigh the costs of coping with the consequences after disasters strike. Strong and enforced building codes; zoning restrictions in coastal areas; prepositioned shelters and supplies; accessible hospitals, clinics, and health workers; wellpublicized evacuation routes; and other aspects of public awareness all make a substantial difference in reducing casualties and damage. Media coverage can sometimes give the impression that those most affected by disasters depend mainly on responses from outsiders, but the reality in most cases is otherwise. People in the path of a natural event are almost always most effective in helping each other, comprising the overwhelming proportion of first and subsequent responders.30 However, the United States is neglecting a range of major domestic vulnerabilities to natural hazards that could have catastrophic consequences.31 Stephen Flynn has most ably summarized these and other ominous features of what he calls our “brittle nation.”32 The vulnerability of coastal developments along the Eastern seaboard, so tragically demonstrated during Tropical Storm Sandy, is one continuing danger. On the opposite side of the country, earthquakes present the more ominous threat. As Flynn recounts, the deteriorating earthen levees that currently protect the massive farmlands of California’s Central Valley are vulnerable to seismic effects. If seawater were to breach the levees after a major earthquake, it would contaminate one of the country’s most important food and employment sources for years to come. Prolonged heat waves and drought in the Midwest, even worse than those in 2012, could permanently devastate croplands and damage the country’s strained and outdated electrical grid. As the U.S. public health infrastructure continues to degrade, deadly epidemics could severely reduce national economic performance and shake citizens’ confidence in the competence and reliability of government at all levels. The current economic stress and political paralysis in the United States complicate the country’s physical vulnerabilities. Debt levels and ongoing deficits substantially reduce the capacity of government agencies at all levels to address infrastructure and preparedness investments that reduce disaster risks. In 2012, even normally routine federal appropriations for disaster relief after Sandy became a political football.33 While most investments in community resilience, as well as in industrial and agricultural facilities, are state and local matters, congressional gridlock on many major issues indicates the difficulty that new assertions of federal authority or leadership would face in directing infrastructure changes or restricting flood zone settlements. The domestic vulnerabilities of the United States are further compounded by the global risks to vital U.S. interests resulting from the vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure and large populations around the world. While national development strategies increasingly emphasize “disaster risk reduction” and “sustainable economies”34 and certain countries, such as Bangladesh, Vietnam, and Mozambique, have successfully lowered their casualty rates from recurrent flooding through better preparedness and infrastructure changes, their examples are not widely imitated. Even their successes may be overwhelmed eventually by the expected scale of storms and ocean surges. Ethiopia and Rwanda have implemented food security policies that have increased their ability to cope with drought and other environmental challenges. But despite initiatives such as the U.S. Agency for International Development’s (USAID) Feed the Future program, the global prospects for substantial increases in food production are uncertain at best. Worldwide expenditures on health care, including infrastructure and training, experienced an exceptional increase over the last decade, especially from the U.S. government. However, both health and agricultural improvements depend on continued donor assistance, which has already fallen significantly since the global recession.35 Most fundamental to stoic readiness is the political capacity of societies to mobilize in the face of crises. Such capacity includes the ability to make decisions quickly and cohesively, to redirect funding rapidly without corruption, and to deliver supplies and support efficiently. Even effective democratic governments, such as those of Turkey or Indonesia, might find regional, ethnic, or religious diversity becoming a source of conflict in the wake of a massive natural disaster. More troubled federal polities, such as Pakistan or Nigeria, could unravel, although Pakistan has handled three successive seasons of massive flooding with remarkable resilience. In failed or failing states, government capabilities are especially lacking, and such political capacity is the most difficult set of skills and institutions to improve, even with major development assistance from outsiders.36 International organizations and financial institutions increasingly promote disaster risk reduction. Both the World Bank and the agencies of the UN system, led by the United Nations Development Programme, advocate investments that increase resilience to environmental challenges. But the resources to back up these recommendations are not commensurate. For example, under the impetus of the 1997 Kyoto Protocol on climate change, an adaptation fund to assist with risk reductions was initiated in 2001. But that fund was not actually launched until 2007, and despite the creation of a similar green climate fund at the Copenhagen climate change summit in 2009, both initiatives remain woefully underfunded—as highlighted in the latest global gathering on climate change in Doha.37 With a huge imbalance between growing global risks to large populations and declining investments in resilience, U.S. leaders will be forced to make difficult choices. U.S. policies on development assistance will likely have to adopt a form of preventive triage, placing scarce assistance dollars where they will have the most enduring effects on resilience and adjustment, rather than where the needs of poverty reduction and other objectives of the UN’s Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) might otherwise seem greatest. Already the efforts to set a new agenda for development after the deadline for the MDGs in 2015 include some recognition of the need for a more pragmatic view of sustainability. But as with the MDGs, the political dimensions of resilience continue to receive little emphasis in current drafts of these global manifestos.

Heroic Relief

Increased resilience must be matched with enhanced capabilities for effective relief. Improving the scale and effectiveness of assistance to the victims of disasters is an essential priority not only for limiting immediate effects but also for containing political fallout. In the United States, specialized national agencies, such as the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the American Red Cross, are the principal organizers of emergency support, supplemented by state-level agencies, the National Guard, and countless local and national non-governmental organizations (NGOs).38 Since Hurricane Katrina in 2005, all these actors have demonstrated improved capacities to deal with storms, even as available resources for future crises are in decline. Most other developed countries have similar, though mainly national, agencies to lead relief operations. In poorer countries, capacities are more variable, often either completely localized or highly dependent on national military agencies, as evidenced during the 2004 tsunami in the Indian Ocean. The National Disaster Management Authority of Pakistan, in its response to the massive floods of 2010 and 2011, has been one of the notable civilian exceptions. Assistance to the most at-risk countries to increase their own capacity for humanitarian relief should be a donor priority. Resources for humanitarian assistance from national donor agencies have seen major growth in the past twenty years. In the United States, funding for foreign disaster assistance has had strong bipartisan support in Congress for many years, and humanitarian relief resonates strongly with large portions of the U.S. electorate. The Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) within USAID has had a record of operational excellence and effectiveness. Other governments also have made international humanitarian assistance a high priority. Scandinavian ministries, the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development (DFID), and the European Commission’s Solidarity Fund have been especially generous contributors to relief operations in recent times, both directly and through UN agencies. The role of major international NGOs, corporate philanthropy, and foundations has also grown, with resources that sometimes exceed those from official sources. With the expansion of heroic generosity, the delivery of disaster assistance has become a major international industry. Large companies and suppliers sell their goods and services in the wake of each major event. NGOs similarly follow devastation and suffering from place to place. Many take advantage of public attention and sympathy for disaster victims to raise large amounts of money for relief. However, the effectiveness of relief operations, and especially the transition from relief to recovery, often has been less than optimal. Repeated proposals have been made to create a more centrally coordinated system, and UN agency leaders have made major advances over the past two decades in coordinating and funding major international relief operations. In 1991, the General Assembly created an Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) of UN agencies, a Central Emergency Revolving Fund (CERF), and an Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) within the UN secretariat. The latter evolved by the end of the 1990s into the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), headed by the ERC with the rank of under-secretary-general. In 2005, following the Indian Ocean tsunami, IASC members agreed on an intensified approach to collaboration, dubbed the “cluster system,” which divided relief operations into major functional components and designated lead agencies in each sector to coordinate the work of both international organizations and NGOs. The current ERC, Valerie Amos from the United Kingdom, has undertaken further efforts to improve the performance of the relief community, in the process raising billions of dollars through consolidated appeals, including urgent “flash appeals” to donors. The January 2010 earthquake in Haiti, which received huge publicity and donations, highlighted both the best and worst features of the international cluster system—and of heroic relief efforts in general.39 Assistance followed a familiar pattern of initial energy and compassion that dissipated once the atmosphere of emergency and improvisation shifted to the long-term demands for major reconstruction and local government control. The influx of supplies and aid workers during the first year of relief was overwhelming. One year later, agencies reluctantly faced the need to shift their promises from “building back better” (as former President Clinton likes to put it)40 to the harsher choices involved in satisfying donors that their resources were accomplishing more immediate concrete effects. Addressing short-term basic human needs for water, food, and shelter—often to people living in large tent cities—is a different task from that of rebuilding basic infrastructure, restarting large and small businesses, and forging political institutions that endure after agencies depart. As all too often happens, the initial humanitarian response to Haiti was overly romantic, inconsistent, and insufficiently attuned to the unique features of the local culture, economy, and political system.41 With intense economic pressures on virtually all major donors, disillusionment with relief operations may result in political pressures to reduce assistance. Popular support for even the most sympathetic causes may begin to wither, including among generous Americans, especially if foreign crises multiply, or if the U.S. homeland itself is struck by major natural disasters that divert attention and resources to domestic priorities. The multilateral institutional cushions needed to mitigate the social, economic, and political fallout from extreme events remain ad hoc and undeveloped. G-8 and G-20 summit agendas pay some attention to these issues but with little evident follow-through from national governments.42 The UN Security Council, despite one famous session to address the security implications of HIV/AIDs in early 2000, has been erratic and unfocused in dealing with the broader security challenges of disease and disasters. As the council is the principal global institution responsible for addressing international “threats to the peace,” such neglect will need to be remedied. International financial institutions have standard approaches for assisting with disaster recovery, such as the emergency response programs of regional development banks, as well as the World Bank’s Emergency Recovery Loan program, Hazard Management Unit, and Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR). The International Monetary Fund has an emergency assistance facility designed to ease the fiscal effects of major disasters.43 But these economic mechanisms are not scaled for the size of the challenges ahead, and the international diplomatic and intelligence channels needed to address urgent political and security risks are relatively undeveloped. Even the example of the successful global efforts led by the World Health Organization in responding to pandemic threats from the SARS and avian flu viruses may not prevent national budget cuts in preventive and public health capacity.44 The same budgetary fate could befall otherwise promising initiatives to reduce food insecurities, such as those which the G-20 governments have endorsed. The international community deserves great credit for its recent heroic efforts to aid societies affected by natural disasters. But it is highly unlikely that multilateral relief operations are prepared to work at the necessary scale when disaster incidents multiply. As with future investments in resilience, some form of priority setting or triage may become the imposed standard for major international relief as well. Ecozoic Relocation Even the most effective combination of stoic and heroic efforts will not sustain vulnerable populations indefinitely. As sea levels and storm surges continue to rise, as key fisheries are contaminated or extinguished, as certain regions become inhospitable to agriculture, or as earthquakes or epidemics degrade the capacity of megacities to provide for their citizens, some currently inhabited parts of the planet will have to be scaled back, or even abandoned, for large-scale settlement. Particularly if global warming trends fulfill some scientific projections, the planet may impose wholesale and dramatic adjustments to the locations, dimensions, and lifestyles of human settlements on a scale akin to the major migrations imposed by ancient ice ages. Anticipating future adaptations of this magnitude, some scientists and philosophers have begun to refer to a coming “ecozoic” age of human adaptation.45 In the United States, such speculation will likely surface initially as more intense versions of familiar controversies over development or rebuilding in coastal areas or floodplains. These issues involve decisions about zoning, taxes, subsidized flood insurance,46 and the various publicly funded programs that promote or sustain coastal growth, such as beach reclamation or the building of wave barriers and dikes.47 Developers and local politicians often downplay disaster risks and the pressures from local citizens are almost always to rebuild rather than to abandon or relocate. Yet even the most stoic impulses must confront difficult choices. New Orleans is a prominent case in point regarding resettlement and reconstruction in areas prone to further flooding, such as the lower Ninth Ward. Hurricane Isaac demonstrated that the huge post-Katrina investments in floodwalls and levies involved decisions to protect certain areas at the expense of others. Such choices now confront officials and citizens on the Jersey Shore, Staten Island, and Long Island in the wake of Tropical Storm Sandy. The same issues will be replicated around the world. Government subsidies for hazard insurance or expensive engineering for stopgap measures, such as dikes, imported water supplies, or beach reclamation, will at some point no longer protect exposed populations enough to justify the resources needed to maintain them. As media coverage and public discussion increasingly focus on the most exposed areas, many people will begin to vote with their feet and look to resettle their families and businesses in areas less exposed to the hazards they witness across the globe. Real estate prices and infrastructure investments will increasingly reflect the realities of that new marketplace. Obvious areas of special exposure already justify “exit strategies” or migratory transitions. The former president of the Maldives, Mohamed Nasheed, has become a prominent spokesman for the fundamental threats of sea level increases to small island states.48 In other exposed areas—such as low-lying estuaries of Bangladesh, Burma, and Vietnam, as well as large areas of Africa—desertification, erosion, or salinization could render agriculture or adequate supplies of potable water infeasible. Water shortages may make areas of Central Asia and the Middle East impractical for continued settlement. On an even larger scale, some experts suggest that the expected growth of certain megacities will reach practical ceilings because of the physical and economic limitations of distributing food and water.49 Major epidemics could accelerate these pressures to limit or reduce some urban populations. The political and social dimensions of massive shifts in environment and population are difficult to predict, but the likelihood is that over time large groups of people will become ecologically displaced persons or “environmental refugees,” forced from their historic homelands and needing relocation to more hospitable places within or beyond national boundaries.50 Such transitions will present large political and economic challenges, both for long-term humanitarian support and for immigration laws and enforcement. If these movements involve millions of desperate people, geographic and political boundaries will become increasingly problematic. Recommendations: National Security and Global Solidarity The incidence of military conflicts between states is at a historic low; even the number of conflicts within states has declined steeply since the twentieth century.51 However, both trends could be slowed or reversed by increased vulnerabilities to natural disasters and the limits of political and economic capacity to deal with them. How should the challenges ahead be framed in terms of U.S. national security and the larger “threats to the peace”?

Citizen Safety Most governments place their highest priority on national security, which begins with ensuring the physical safety of their citizens, or as John Jay famously put it in The Federalist: “Among the many objects to which a wise and free people find it necessary to direct their attention, that of providing for their safety seems to be the first.”52 While they are used to thinking of such safety in terms of protection from attacks by military or terrorist adversaries, Americans also regard their fundamental security as dependent on access to reliable supplies of air, water, food, medicine, and shelter.53 All would likely place these subsistence needs above any threat currently on the horizon, foreign or domestic. However, it is leaders—thought leaders as well as political leaders—who define the priorities for government policy and expenditures in dealing with what they perceive as the greatest threats to the country and its citizens. Such definitions of national security generally arise as narratives developed in the course or aftermath of major international attacks or threats of attack. Historical turning points in these narratives over the last hundred years include, for example, the German attacks on U.S. shipping that provoked the country into World War I; the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor that plunged the United States into World War II; the Berlin crisis, Korean War, and Soviet nuclear tests that intensified the Cold War; and the September 11, 2001, attacks that provoked the U.S. War on Terror. Whether or not all Americans agreed with the security rationales their leaders offered at those times, they provided bold assessments of the threats confronting the country, which gained wide acceptance. Each narrative was a necessary, and apparently sufficient, political basis to enlist political support for executive orders, policies, legislation, appropriations, treaties, and other international commitments that were consistent with the leaders’ justifications. At present there is no reasonable prospect that U.S. leaders would create a national security narrative focused on the cumulative threats from an overstressed planet.54 To mobilize popular support for the major initiatives necessary to reduce foreseeable risks, U.S. leaders would eventually have to shift their characterizations of such threats from environmental to existential and from futuristic (after 2050) to imminent (before 2020). That shift is unlikely until Americans experience a pattern of severe crises that would shift popular perceptions and political attitudes in decisively different directions. No one wants to contemplate the horrific disasters that might drive such a shift in attitudes, especially when the destruction from Katrina and Sandy seem not to have had such an effect on most political leaders. Political resistance to the recognition of these likely threats is reinforced by a suspicion that those who highlight them are also seeking to justify major government interventions and expenditures, involving severe changes in lifestyles. References to global warming, or even to obvious climate changes, sound to some audiences as code words to justify carbon caps and oil taxes. Therefore this report assumes that such mitigation programs are not foreseeable in time to avoid the climatic, economic, and demographic consequences of current trends. Indeed, it is because these trends will not be changed in time that steps must be taken to adapt to their likely effects. U.S. political and thought leaders need to fulfill their highest responsibility—for the safety of citizens—by beginning to consider a range of risk reduction policies, infrastructure investments, and preparedness strategies, including the necessary legislative and budgetary changes, that might constitute an approach to national security aimed at reducing the direct and secondary consequences of natural disasters. Whether or not the necessary stoic and heroic steps are all politically palatable, the larger arguments for them should at least be actively under current debate. As Stephen Flynn has emphasized, most of these steps would not only reduce U.S. vulnerability to extreme natural events but would also reduce the opportunities for terrorists to exploit the same vulnerabilities.55 How these competing political pressures will play out depends not only on the timing and locations of disasters but also on how soon the growing public perception of our vulnerabilities becomes a political reality. The combination in 2012 of major tornados, midwestern drought, Texas floods, Hurricane Isaac, western wildfires, Arctic ice depletion, and Tropical Storm Sandy could mark the beginning of a sea change in the electorate’s expectations of present and future exposure to natural disasters. In that event, the hardest challenge for U.S. leaders may well be to prevent the country from turning inward to focus on domestic priorities and resisting involvement in the crises of other countries or regions. Such isolationism could be expressed through intensified calls for energy independence, food selfsufficiency, foreign assistance cutoffs, and even military retrenchment. Reversing decades of generosity and pragmatism, donor fatigue and domestic needs could generate a new version of an “America First” constituency that opposes all such international engagement and punishes at the polls any politician who supports it. Collective Containment U.S. leaders also cannot ignore the national security implications of the most serious risks of disaster beyond our borders. The safety of U.S. citizens is inextricably bound through the global economy with the course of environmental events in other parts of the world. Disasters or extreme conditions that degrade major agricultural areas (Russian, Australian, or Argentinean wheat fields, Japanese, Burmese, Philippine rice), disrupt for prolonged periods key manufacturing, transportation, or communications infrastructure (greater Bangkok, Bosporus, European airspace), or create immense casualties among large stressed populations (pandemics in Pakistan, Brazil, Nigeria) could affect the stability of entire regions. The severe degradation of a megacity could snowball into wider instability and conflict if not managed collaboratively. The sooner and more deliberately U.S. leaders can articulate geographic, cultural, or economic justifications for targeting scarce assistance, the sooner they are to be persuasive to U.S. citizens. Political preparation is equally required of other governments and populations. If disasters multiply, U.S. influence with these countries will likely depend on the level of U.S. engagement, generosity, and leadership in promoting a sense of global solidarity through an agenda for collaboration on resilience, relief, and relocation options. For this purpose, the U.S. government will need to complement its domestic security rationale with a compelling diplomatic narrative that advocates the needs and priorities for dealing with events that might otherwise spark major confrontations. The alternative could well be aggressive measures by governments, desperate for necessities, to bypass market allocations or seize supplies by intercepting transports, deploying covert operations, or even initiating outright invasions. A series of functionally focused collaborations to identify and manage key risks could be indispensable to contain the political consequences of future extreme events. Whether the Security Council, the G-20, the World Health Organization, or some new or combined political coalition would be the locus for such negotiated understandings is unclear. But the likelihood is that all international institutions will have to elevate their focus and resources to address disaster scenarios and environmental vulnerabilities. The security agendas of politicians, policymakers, and intelligence personnel will likely be distracted, for the time being, by perceived dangers from rogue states armed with nuclear weapons, failed states and ungoverned areas as safe havens for terrorists, and economic criminals, such as cyberburglars, unfair traders, and intellectual property thieves. Meanwhile, the safety and prosperity of the United States, as well as peace throughout the world, increasingly will be endangered by unaddressed vulnerabilities to natural disasters and extreme environmental crises. Contention and conflict could also result from the sudden realization—or opportunistic exaggeration—among large groups of alarmed citizens that such vulnerabilities are both existential and irreversible. Given demographic and environmental trends, and the increasing vulnerabilities and probable shortages to be expected within this decade—and certainly before 2030—the threats to the peace from Mother Nature may soon come to dwarf any of the threats posed by mere mortals.

#### It competes.

Takaya et al 18 “The Principle of Non-Appropriation and the Exclusive Uses of LEO by Large Satellite Constellations” Yuri Takaya-Umehara [Visiting researcher at the University of Tokyo since April 2017. She was affiliated to the Kobe University to provide a course on space law to post-graduate students (2011-2017). She chairs a working group on the formulation of global norms in space law organized by the Keio University since 2018. She obtained her Ph.D. degree at the IDEST of Paris XI University in France, LL.M. at the Leiden University in the Netherlands.] Quentin Verspieren [Ph.D. in public policy @ The University of Tokyo, Assistant Professor of Space Policy @UTokyo, General Manager, Global Strategy @ArkEdge Space Inc., Associate Research Fellow @ESPI] Goutham Karthikeyan [The University of Tokyo & Institute of Space and Astronautical Science, Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency (ISAS-JAXA)] 2018 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328094878\_The\_Principle\_of\_Non-Appropriation\_and\_the\_Exclusive\_Use\_of\_LEO\_by\_Large\_Satellite\_Constellations SM

* LSC = large satellite constellations

LSC raise concerns in the international community such as the IADC and the International Academy of Astronautics (IAA) whether or not it would result in the almost-exclusive use of selected orbits, the so-called “curtains of satellites”.22 The non-appropriation principle defined in Article II of the OST states that, Outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, “is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means”. The principle, that serves to regulate the exploration and use of outer space, is a fundamental rule and recognized as customary international law. The principle applies to LEO as the scope of its application and includes any orbits around the Earth and other celestial bodies, inter-planetary transfer orbits and Lagrangian point(s). In short, the use of LEO by LSC falls into the scope of the principle.

The principle prohibits any states from claiming sovereignty in outer space (including celestial bodies) which makes a difference between the legal status of air space and outer space. According to the Chicago Convention of 194423, every state has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace above its territory, while the legal status of outer space is res communis omnium where it is free for exploration and use but “no portion of outer space may be appropriated to the sovereignty of individual states”24. By prohibiting states to claim any sovereignty in outer space, Article II transformed the legal status of outer space from res nullius to res communis omnium and the ultimate goal of the principle is to prohibit any taking of land by claims of sovereignty25 to prevent space colonization and an extension of the arms race in outer space. Thus, the principle is known for denying any claim of state sovereignty in outer space; however, an emphasis needs to be put on the provision that it also prohibits national appropriation, as well as private appropriation,26 by means of “use, or occupation, or by any other means”.

4.2 Exclusive Use of LEO by LSC

As noted above, no state could subject (any part of) outer space to its sovereign control, or regard it as part of its territory27. By prohibiting the claim of sovereignty, the principle prevented outer space from being colonized by states.28 The principle also prohibits national appropriation of outer space “by means of use or occupation”. This paper claims that the exclusive use of LEO by LSC contravenes both the latter means of national appropriation.

### 1NC—CP

#### Text – Private entities ought not appropriate outer space except to invest in, develop, and construct space elevators.

#### Space Elevators constitute Appropriation – they impede orbits.

Matignon 19 Louis de Gouyon Matignon 3-3-2019 "LEGAL ASPECTS OF THE SPACE ELEVATOR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM" <https://www.spacelegalissues.com/space-law-legal-aspects-of-the-space-elevator-transportation-system/> [PhD in space law (co-supervised by both Philippe Delebecque, from Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne, France, and Christopher D. Johnson, from Georgetown University || regularly write articles on the website Space Legal Issues so as to popularise space law and public international law]//Elmer

An Earth-based space elevator would consist of a cable with one end attached to the surface near the equator and the other end in space beyond geostationary orbit. An orbit is the curved path through which objects in space move around a planet or a star. The 1967 Treaty’s regime and customary law enshrine the principle of non-appropriation and freedom of access to orbital positions. Space Law and International Telecommunication Laws combined to protect this use against any interference. The majority of space-launched objects are satellites that are launched in Earth’s orbit (a very small part of space objects – scientific objects for space exploration – are launched into outer space beyond terrestrial orbits). It is important to precise that an orbit does not exist: satellites describe orbits by obeying the general laws of universal attraction. Depending on the launching techniques and parameters, the orbital trajectory of a satellite may vary. Sun-synchronous satellites fly over a given location constantly at the same time in local civil time: they are used for remote sensing, meteorology or the study of the atmosphere. Geostationary satellites are placed in a very high orbit; they give an impression of immobility because they remain permanently at the same vertical point of a terrestrial point (they are mainly used for telecommunications and television broadcasting). A geocentric orbit or Earth orbit involves any object orbiting Planet Earth, such as the Moon or artificial satellites. Geocentric (having the Earth as its centre) orbits are organised as follow: 1) Low Earth orbit (LEO): geocentric orbits with altitudes (the height of an object above the average surface of the Earth’s oceans) from 100 to 2 000 kilometres. Satellites in LEO have a small momentary field of view, only able to observe and communicate with a fraction of the Earth at a time, meaning a network or constellation of satellites is required in order to provide continuous coverage. Satellites in lower regions of LEO also suffer from fast orbital decay (in orbital mechanics, decay is a gradual decrease of the distance between two orbiting bodies at their closest approach, the periapsis, over many orbital periods), requiring either periodic reboosting to maintain a stable orbit, or launching replacement satellites when old ones re-enter. 2) Medium Earth orbit (MEO), also known as an intermediate circular orbit: geocentric orbits ranging in altitude from 2 000 kilometres to just below geosynchronous orbit at 35 786 kilometres. The most common use for satellites in this region is for navigation, communication, and geodetic/space environment science. The most common altitude is approximately 20 000 kilometres which yields an orbital period of twelve hours. 3) Geosynchronous orbit (GSO) and geostationary orbit (GEO) are orbits around Earth at an altitude of 35 786 kilometres matching Earth’s sidereal rotation period. All geosynchronous and geostationary orbits have a semi-major axis of 42 164 kilometres. A geostationary orbit stays exactly above the equator, whereas a geosynchronous orbit may swing north and south to cover more of the Earth’s surface. Communications satellites and weather satellites are often placed in geostationary orbits, so that the satellite antennae (located on Earth) that communicate with them do not have to rotate to track them, but can be pointed permanently at the position in the sky where the satellites are located. 4) High Earth orbit: geocentric orbits above the altitude of 35 786 kilometres. The competing forces of gravity, which is stronger at the lower end, and the outward/upward centrifugal force, which is stronger at the upper end, would result in the cable being held up, under tension, and stationary over a single position on Earth. With the tether deployed, climbers could repeatedly climb the tether to space by mechanical means, releasing their cargo to orbit. Climbers could also descend the tether to return cargo to the surface from orbit.

#### Private Companies are pursuing Space Elevators.

Alfano 15 Andrea Alfano 8-18-2015 “All Of These Companies Are Working On A Space Elevator” <https://www.techtimes.com/articles/77612/20150818/companies-working-space-elevator.htm> (Writer at the Tech Times)//Elmer

Space elevators are solid proof that any mundane object sounds way cooler if you stick the word "space" in front of it. But there's much more than coolness at stake when building a space elevator – this technology has the potential to revolutionize space transportation, and the Canadian private space company Thoth Technology that was recently awarded a patent for its space elevator design isn't the only company in the game. One of the other major players is a U.S.-based company called LiftPort Group, founded by space entrepreneur Michael Laine in 2003. Its plan for a space elevator is vastly different from the one for which Thoth received a patent, however. Whereas Thoth's plans entail tethering a 12-mile-high inflatable space elevator to the Earth, LiftPort is shooting for the moon. Originally, LiftPort had planned to build an Earth elevator, too, but it abandoned the idea in 2007 in favor of building a lunar elevator. The basic design for a lunar elevator is an anchor in the moon that is attached to a cable that extends to a space station situated at a very special point. Known as a Lagrange Point, this is the gravitational tipping point between the Earth and the moon, where their gravitational pulls essentially cancel one another out. A robot could then travel up and down the tether, ferrying cargo between the moon and the station. Out farther in space, a counterweight would balance out the system. Both types of space elevator are intended to increase space access, but in very different ways. Thoth's Earth elevator aims to make launches easier by starting off 12 miles above the Earth's surface. LiftPort's space elevator aims to increase access to the moon in particular, because it is much easier to launch a rocket to the Lagrange Point and dock it at a space station than it is to get to the moon directly. There's a third major company based in Japan called Obayashi Corp. whose plans look like a hybrid of Thoth's and LiftPort's. Obayashi is not a space company, however – it's actually a construction company. Like Thoth, Obayashi plans to build an Earth elevator. But its Earth elevator would consist of a cable tethered to the blue planet, a robotic cargo-carrier, a space station, and a counterweight. It essentially looks like LiftPort's plans, but stuck to the Earth instead of to the moon.

#### They’re feasible.

Smith 17 Vincent Smith 6-21-2017 "3 Challenges for Engineering A Space Elevator" <https://www.engineering.com/story/3-challenges-for-engineering-a-space-elevator> (Engineer)//Elmer

There's a lot of junk orbiting Earth. Thousands of hours have been poured into previous NASA missions, ensuring the least possible contamination by even the tiniest motes of dust and dirt. The kinds of instrumentation that would monitor a space elevator would need to be similarly discerning. However, the fact that it would be a permanent fixture means that sooner or later, a space elevator would cross paths with meteors and even remnants of previous space missions left behind as space debris. The extreme of this phenomenon even has a name: Kessler Syndrome, where the density of low earth debris becomes so large that nothing can pass it safely into outer space. This cascading problem of space debris collisions was featured in the film Gravity. As Bullock and Clooney can tell you, this phenomenon could cause catastrophic damage to the overall structure (or knock it off balance, returning to our 'oscillation' concerns). Edwards recognized this, and devoted an entire section of his report to addressing it. According to the report, part of dealing with this obstacle is recognizing and tracking low-earth orbit objects large enough to do damage to the structure. According to Section 10.3 of the report, “A study was done at Johnson Space Center on the construction of a system that could track objects down to 1cm in size with 100m accuracy using effectively current technology. This is very close to the tracking network we would need for the space elevator.” For situations in which avoidance is not always possible (the amount of low-earth orbit debris increases significantly from altitudes of approximately 300 to 1,000 miles), Edwards posits that increasing the thickness of the cable will make it robust enough to withstand all but the largest of objects, which could be tracked and avoided ahead of time using the systems previously mentioned. Even for these exceptional pieces of debris, Edwards illustrates in a section simply labeled “Meteors” that only (i) direct impact by an object (ii) over 3cm in diameter, (iii) with enough force to stay on the initial plane of impact (as opposed to being deflected or redirected by contact with the elevator apparatus), would create the kind of catastrophic damage that we associate with a complete severing of the cable. Designing the cable with curvature and panels specifically for deflection has been proposed by both Edwards as well as several other survivability reports, including this one, put together for the 2010 International Space Elevator Consortium (ISEC). Definitive answers as to the effectiveness of these measures are hopefully forthcoming, but it's at least comforting to know that there are first, second, and third lines of defense prepared for just such occasions.

#### Regardless of completion, Elevators spur investment in Nanotechnology

Liam O’Brien 16. University of Wollongong. 07/2016. “Nanotechnology in Space.” Young Scientists Journal; Canterbury, no. 19, p. 22.

Nanotechnology is at the forefront of scientific development, continuing to astound and innovate. Likewise, the space industry is rapidly increasing in sophistication and competition, with companies such as SpaceX, Blue Origin and Virgin Galactic becoming increasingly prevalent in what could become a new commercial space race. The various space programs over the past 60 years have led to a multitude of beneficial impacts for everyday society. Nanotechnology, through research and development in space has the potential to do the same. Potential applications of nanotechnology in space are numerous, many of them have the potential to capture and inspire generations to come. One of these applications is the space elevator. By using carbon nanotubes, a super light yet strong material, this concept would be an actual physical structure from the surface of the Earth to an altitude of approximately 36 000 km. The tallest building in the world would fit into this elevator over 42 000 times. The counterweight, used to keep the elevator taught, is proposed to be an asteroid. This would need to be at a distance of 100 000 km, a quarter of the distance to the moon. The benefits of such a structure would be enormous. 95% of a space shuttle's weight at take-off is fuel, costing US$ 20 000 per kilogram to send something into space. However, with a space elevator the cost per kilogram can be reduced to as little as US$ 200. Exploration to other planets can begin at the tower, and travel to and from the moon could become as simple as a morning commute to work. Solar sails provide the means to travel large distances and incredible speeds. Much like sails on a boat use wind, the solar sail uses light as a source of propulsion. Ideally these sails would be kilometres in length and only a few micrometres in thickness. This provides us with the ability to travel at speeds previously unheard of. Using carbon nanotubes once again, a solar sail has the capability to travel at 39 756 km/s which is 13% of the speed of light! This sail could reach Pluto in an astonishing 1.7 days, and Alpha Centauri in just 32 years. Space travel to other planets, other stars, could be possible with solar sails. The Planetary Society is funding for a space sail of itself, and has successfully launched one into orbit. NASA has also sent a sail into orbit, allowing it to burn up in the atmosphere after 240 days. Investing time and resources into nanotechnology for space exploration has benefits for society today. Materials such as graphene are being used in modern manufacturing at an increasing rate as the applications become utilised. Carbon nanotubes will change the way we think about materials and their strength. These nanotubes have a tensile strength one hundred times that of steel, yet are only a sixth of the weight. Imagine light weight vehicles using less petrol and energy as well as being just as strong as regular vehicles. With potentials to revolutionize the way we think about space travel, nanotechnology has a bright future. As a new field of science, it has the capability to push the human race to the outer reaches of our galaxy and hopefully one day to other stars. It will inspire generations of explorers and dreamers to challenge themselves and advance the human race into the next era. As Richard Feynman said in his 1959 talk 'There's Plenty of Room at the Bottom' "A field in which little has been done, but in which an enormous amount can be done. There is still plenty more to achieve.

#### Nanomaterials solves existential Warming and Water Scarcity

Khullar 17 Bhavya Khullar 9-4-2017 "Nanomaterials Could Combat Climate Change and Reduce Pollution" <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/nanomaterials-could-combat-climate-change-and-reduce-pollution/> (Former Programme Officer with the Food Safety and Toxins Unit, Centre for Science and Environment (CSE))//Elmer

August 18, 2017 — The list of environmental problems that the world faces may be huge, but some strategies for solving them are remarkably small. First explored for applications in microscopy and computing, nanomaterials—materials made up of units that are each thousands of times smaller than the thickness of a human hair—are emerging as useful for tackling threats to our planet’s well-being. Scientists across the globe are developing nanomaterials that can efficiently use carbon dioxide from the air, capture toxic pollutants from water and degrade solid waste into useful products. “Nanomaterials could help us mitigate pollution. They are efficient catalysts and mostly recyclable. Now, they have to become economical for commercialization and better to replace present-day technologies completely,” says Arun Chattopadhyay, a member of the chemistry faculty at the Center for Nanotechnology, Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati. HARVESTING CO2 To help slow the climate-changing rise in atmospheric CO2levels, researchers have developed nanoCO2 harvesters that can suck atmospheric carbon dioxide and deploy it for industrial purposes. “Nanomaterials can convert carbon dioxide into useful products like alcohol. The materials could be simple chemical catalysts or photochemical in nature that work in the presence of sunlight,” says Chattopadhyay, who has been working with nanomaterials to tackle environmental pollutants for more than a decade. Many research groups are working to address a problem that, if solved, could be a holy grail in combating climate change: how to pull CO2 out of the atmosphere and convert it into useful products. Chattopadhyay isn’t alone. Many research groups are working to address a problem that, if solved, could be a holy grail in combating climate change: how to pull CO2 out of the atmosphere and convert it into useful products. Nanoparticles offer a promising approach to this because they have a large surface-area-to-volume ratio for interacting with CO2 and properties that allow them to facilitate the conversion of CO2into other things. The challenge is to make them economically viable. Researchers have tried everything from metallic to carbon-based nanoparticles to reduce the cost, but so far they haven’t become efficient enough for industrial-scale application. One of the most recent points of progress in this area is work by scientists at the CSIR-Indian Institute of Petroleum and the Lille University of Science and Technology in France. The researchers developed a nanoCO2 harvester that uses water and sunlight to convert atmospheric CO2 into methanol, which can be employed as an engine fuel, a solvent, an antifreeze agent and a diluent of ethanol. Made by wrapping a layer of modified graphene oxide around spheres of copper zinc oxide and magnetite, the material looks like a miniature golf ball, captures CO2 more efficiently than conventional catalysts and can be readily reused, according to Suman Jain, senior scientist of the Indian Institute of Petroleum, Dehradun in India, who developed the nanoCO2harvester. Jain says that the nanoCO2 harvester has a large molecular surface area and captures more CO2 than a conventional catalyst with similar surface area would, which makes the conversion more efficient. But due to their small size, the nanoparticles have a tendency to clump up, making them inactive with prolonged use. Jain adds that synthesizing useful nanoparticle-based materials is also challenging because it’s hard to make the particles a consistent size. Chattopadhyay says the efficiency of such materials can be improved further, providing hope for useful application in the future. CLEANSING WATER Most toxic dyes used in textile and leather industries can be captured with nanoparticles. “Water pollutants such as dyes from human-created waste like those from tanneries could get to natural sources of water like deep tube wells or groundwater if wastewater from these industries is left untreated,” says Chattopadhyay. “This problem is rather difficult to solve.” An international group of researchers led by professor Elzbieta Megiel of the University of Warsaw in Poland reports that nanomaterials have been widely studied for removing heavy metals and dyes from wastewater. According to the research team, adsorption processes using materials containing magnetic nanoparticles are highly effective and can be easily performed because such nanoparticles have a large number of sites on their surface that can capture pollutants and don’t readily degrade in water. Chattopadhyay adds that appropriately designed magnetic nanomaterials can be used to separate pollutants such as arsenic, lead, chromium and mercury from water. However, the nanotech-based approach has to be more efficient than conventional water purification technology to make it worthwhile. In addition to removing dyes and metals, nanomaterials can also be used to clean up oil spills. Researchers led by Pulickel Ajayan at Rice University in Houston, Texas, have developed a reusable nanosponge that can remove oil from contaminated seawater. The technology shows promise, but it’s not yet ready for prime time. “While the nanosponge is a good material to deal with oil spills, these results are confined to the laboratory,” says Ashok Ganguli, director of the Institute of Nano Science and Technology in Mohali, Punjab, India. “Large-scale synthesis is required if we have to remove oil from seawater which is spread over several miles.” Although scientists have yet to successfully synthesize nanomaterials for cleaning oil spills at a scale large enough for practical application, “this may become possible with more research and industry partnerships,” Chattopadhyay says.

#### Space Elevators solve Space Debris – reduces Rocket Launches

Forgan 19, Duncan H. Solving Fermi's Paradox. Vol. 10. Cambridge University Press, 2019. (Associate Lecturer at the Centre for Exoplanet Science at the University of St Andrews, Scotland, founding member of the UK Search for Extra-terrestrial Intelligence (SETI) research network and leads UK research efforts into the search)//Elmer

All objects in HEO reside beyond the geostationary orbit (GEO). The orbital period at GEO (w'hich is aligned with the Earth's equator) is equal to the Earth’s rotational period. As a result, from a ground observer’s perspective the satellite resides at a fixed point in the sky, with clear advantages for uses such as global communication. Activities at HEO are considerably less than at LEO and MEO. Earth's orbital environment does contain a natural component - the meteoroids. These pose little to no threat to space operations - the true threat is self-derived. The current limitations of spacefaring technology ensure that every launch is accompanied by substantial amounts of space debris. This debris ranges in size from dust grains to paint flecks to large derelict spacecraft and satellites. According to NASA’s Orbital Debris Program Office, some 21.000 objects greater than 10 cm in size are currently being tracked in LEO. with the population below 10 cm substantially higher. Most debris produced at launch tends to be deposited with no supplemental velocity - hence these objects tend to follow the initial launch trajectory, which often orbits with high eccentricity and inclination. However, these orbits do intersect with the orbits of Earth’s artificial satellite population, resulting in impacts w'hich tend to produce further debris. The vast majority of the low-size debris population is so-called fragmentation debris. This is produced during spacecraft deterioration, and in the most abun- dance during spacecraft break-up and impacts. The first satellite-satellite collision occurred in 1961. resulting in a 400% increase in fragmentation debris (Johnson et al.. 2008). Most notably, a substantial source of fragmentation debris was the deliberate destruction of the Fengyun 1C satellite by the People’s Republic of China, which created approximately 2.000 debris fragments. As with collisions of ‘natural debris’, debris-debris collisions tend to result in an increased count of debris fragments. Since the late 1970s, it has been understood that man-made debris could pose an existential risk to space operations. Kessler and Cour-Palais (1978) worked from the then-population of satellites to extrapolate the debris production rate over the next 30 years. Impact rates on spacecraft at any location. /, can be calculated if one knows the local density of debris p, the mean relative velocity vrei\* and the cross-sectional area ct: [[EQUATION 13.5 OMITTED]] Each impact increases p without substantially altering vrel or o. We should there- fore expect the impact rate (and hence the density of objects) to continue growing at an exponential rate: [[EQUATION 13.6 OMITTED]] Kessler and Cour-Palais (1978) predicted that by the year 2000, p would have increased beyond the critical value for generating a collisional cascade. As new collisions occur, these begin to increase ^jjp, which in turn increases resulting in a rapid positive feedback, with p and I reaching such large values that LEO is rendered completely unnavigable. This has not come to pass - LEO remains navigable, partially due to a slight overprediction of debris produced by individual launches. The spectre of a collisional cascade (often referred to as Kessler syndrome) still looms over human space exploration, as debris counts continue to rise. Without a corresponding dedicated effort to reduce these counts, either through mitigating strategies to reduce the production of debris during launches, or through removal of debris fragments from LEO. we cannot guarantee the protection of the current flotilla of satellites, leaving our highly satellite-dependent society at deep risk. What strategies can be deployed to remove space debris? Almost all debris removal techniques rely on using the Earth’s atmosphere as a waste disposal sys- tem. Most debris is sufficiently small that atmospheric entry would result in its complete destruction, with no appreciable polluting effects. Atmospheric entry requires the debris fragments to be decelerated so that their orbits begin to intersect with lower atmospheric altitudes. Once a critical altitude is reached, atmospheric drag is sufficiently strong that the debris undergoes runaway deceleration and ultimately destruction. There are multiple proposed techniques for decelerating debris. Some mechani- cal methods include capturing the debris using either a net or harpoon, and applying a modest level of reverse thrust. These are most effective for larger fragments, and especially intact satellites (Forshaw et al., 2015). Attaching sails to the debris is also a possibility if the orbit is sufficiently low for weak atmospheric drag. The Japanese space agency JAXA’s Kounotori Integrated Tether Experiment (KITE) will trail a long conductive cable. As a current is passed through the cable, and the cable traverses the Earth’s magnetic field, the cable experiences a magnetic drag force that will de-orbit the spacecraft. Orbiting and ground-based lasers can decelerate the debris through a variety of means. For small debris fragments, the radiation pressure produced by the laser can provide drag. A more powerful laser can act on larger debris fragments through ablation. As the laser ablates the debris, the resulting recoil generated by the escaping material produces drag and encourages de-orbit. A more lateral solution is to ensure that launches and general space-based activity no longer generate debris. These approaches advocate lower-energy launch mechanisms that do not rely on powerful combustion. The most famous is the space elevator (see Aravind. 2007). Originally conceived by Tsiolkovsky, the ele- vator consists of an extremely durable cable extended from a point near the Earth’s equator, up to an anchor point located at GEO (most conceptions of the anchor point envision an asteroid parked in GEO). ‘Climber’ cars can then be attached to the cable and lifted to LEO, MEO and even GEO by a variety of propulsion methods. Most notably, the cars can be driven to GEO without the need for chemical rockets or nuclear explosions - indeed, a great deal of energy can be saved by having coupled cars, one ascending and one descending. Space elevators would solve a great number of problems relating to entering (and leaving) Earth orbit, substantially reducing the cost of delivering payload out of the Earth's atmosphere. The technical challenges involved in deploying a cable tens of thousands of kilometres long are enormous, not to mention the material science required to produce a cable of sufficient tensile strength and flexibility in the first place. The gravitational force (and centrifugal force) felt by the cable will vary significantly along its length. As cars climb the cable, the Coriolis force will move the car (and cable) horizontally also, providing further strain on the cable material. The relatively slow traversal of the biologically hazardous Van Allen Belt on the route to GEO is also a potential concern for crewed space travel. Whatever the means, a spacefaring civilisation (or at least, a civilisation that utilises its local orbital environment as we do) must develop a non-polluting solution to space travel, whether that is via the construction of a space elevator, a maglev launch loop, rail gun, or some other form of non-rocket acceleration. If it cannot perform pollution-free spacecraft launches (or fully clean up its pollution), then it will eventually succumb to Kessler syndrome, with potentially drastic consequences for future space use, with likely civilisation-ending effects (Solution C.13).

### Cosmic Colonialism

#### AT Jackson – won’t apply – our Turns are all Space specific – the warrant in this card are about Terrestrial Economies which don’t apply to our Warrants – there also is no spill-down from Space Economies to Terrestrial Economies which means they can’t go for generic Cap Bad.

#### AT Shammas and Holen – 1] It’s so sparsely highlighted, you shouldn’t give it to them as a total scenario story for all of environmental degradation – there is a singular line about “biospheric crisis” and 2] Is about destroying Space’s environment which is a disconnect from Kareiva which is about Earth.

#### AT Shammas and Holen 1 – this is power-tagged – it doesn’t say that it’s reverse causal – those resources are used for Space which doesn’t result in the collapse of non-Space related Industries like Tech or Entertainment.

#### Tech innovation undergirded by profit motives are driving the Second Machine Age, which dematerializes capitalism and makes growth a sustainable necessity to solve numerous existential threats.

McAfee 19, Andrew. More from Less: The Surprising Story of How We Learned to Prosper Using Fewer Resources—and What Happens Next. Scribner, 2019. Props to DML for finding. (Cofounder and codirector of the MIT Initiative on the Digital Economy at the MIT Sloan School of Management, former professor at Harvard Business School)//Elmer

The decreases in resource use, pollution, and other exploitations of the earth cataloged in the preceding chapters are great news. But are they going to last? It could be that we're just living in a pleasant interlude between the Industrial Era and another rapacious period during which we massively increase our footprint on our planet and eventually cause a giant Malthusian crash. It could be, but I don't think so. Instead, I think we're going to take better care of our planet from now on. I'm confident that the Second Machine Age will mark the time in our history when we started to progressively and permanently tread more lightly on the earth, taking less from it and generally caring for it better, even as we humans continue to become more numerous and prosperous. The work of Paul Romer, who shared the 2018 Nobel Prize in economics, is one of the sources of this confidence. Growth Mindset Romer's largest contribution to economics was to show that **it's best not to think of new technologies as something that companies buy and bring in from the outside, but instead as something they create themselves** (the title of his most famous paper, published in 1990, is "Endogenous Technological Change"). These technologies are like designs or recipes; as Romer put it, they’re "the instructions that we follow for combining raw materials." This is close to the definitions of technology presented in chapter 7. Why do companies invent and improve technologies? Simply, to generate profits. They come up with instructions, recipes, and blueprints that will let them grow revenues or shrink costs. As we saw repeatedly in chapter 7, capitalism provides ample incentive for this kind of tech progress. So far, all this seems like a pretty standard argument for how the first two horsemen work together. Romer's brilliance was to highlight the importance of two key attributes of the technological ideas companies come up with as they pursue profits. The first is that they're nonrival, meaning that they can be used by more than one person or company at a time, and that they don't get used up. This is obviously not the case for most resources made out of atoms—I can't also use the pound of steel that you've just incorporated into the engine of a car—but it is the case for ideas and instructions. The Pythagorean theorem, a design for a steam engine, and a recipe for delicious chocolate chip cookies aren't ever going to get "used up" no matter how much they're used. The second important aspect of corporate technologies is that they're partially excludable. This means that companies can kind of prevent others from using them. They do this by keeping the technologies secret (such as the exact recipe for Coca-Cola), filing for patents and other intellectual-property protection, and so on. However, none of these measures is perfect (hence the words partially and kind of). Trade secrets leak. Patents expire, and even before they expire, they must describe the invention they're claiming and so let others study it. Partial excludability is a beautiful thing. It provides strong incentives for companies to create useful, profit-enhancing new technologies that they alone can benefit from for a time, yet it also ensures that the **new techs will eventually "spill over**"—that with time they’ll diffuse and get adopted by more and more companies, even if that's not what their originators want. Romer equated tech progress to the production by companies of nonrivalrous, partially excludable ideas and showed that these ideas cause an economy to grow. What's more, he also demonstrated that this **idea-fueled growth** doesn't have to slow down with time. It's **not constrained by** the size of the **labor** force, the amount of natural **resources**, or other such factors. Instead, economic growth is limited only by the idea-generating capacity of the people within a market. Romer called this capacity "human capital" and said at the end of his 1990 paper, "The most interesting positive implication of the model is that an economy with a larger total stock of human capital will experience faster growth." This notion, which has come to be called "increasing returns to scale," is as powerful as it is counterintuitive. Most formal models of economic growth, as well as the informal mental ones most of us walk around with, feature decreasing returns—growth slows down as the overall economy gets bigger. This makes intuitive sense; it just feels like it would be easier to experience 5 percent growth in a $1 billion economy than a $1 trillion one. But Romer showed that as long as that economy continued to add to its human capital—the overall ability of its people to come up with new technologies and put them to use—it could actually grow faster even as it grew bigger. This is because the stock of useful, nonrivalrous, nonexcludable ideas would keep growing. As Romer convincingly showed, economies run and grow on ideas. The Machinery of Prosperity Romer's ideas should leave us optimistic about the planetary benefits of digital tools—hardware, software, and networks—for three main reasons. First, countless examples show us how good these tools are at fulfilling the central role of technology, which is to provide "instructions that we follow for combining raw materials." Since raw materials cost money, profit-maximizing companies are particularly keen to find ways to use fewer of them. So they use digital tools to come up with beer cans that use less aluminum, car engines that use less steel and less gas, mapping software that removes the need for paper atlases, and so on and so on. None of this is done solely for the good of the earth—it's done for the pursuit of profit that's at the heart of capitalism—yet it benefits the planet by, as we've seen, causing us to take less from it. Digital tools are technologies for creating technologies, the most prolific and versatile ones we've ever come up with. They're machines for coming up with ideas. Lots of them. The same piece of computer-aided design software can be used to create a thinner aluminum can or a lighter and more fuel-efficient engine. A drone can be used to scan farmland to see if more irrigation is needed, or to substitute for a helicopter when filming a movie. A smartphone can be used to read the news, listen to music, and pay for things, all without consuming a single extra molecule. In the Second Machine Age, the global stock of digital tools is increasing much more quickly than ever before. It's being used in countless ways by profit-hungry companies to combine raw materials in ways that use fewer of them. In advanced economies such as America's, the cumulative impact of this combination of capitalism and tech progress is clear: **absolute dematerialization** of the economy and society, **and thus a smaller footprint on our planet**. The second way Romer's ideas about technology and growth are showing up at present is via decreased excludability. Pervasive digital tools are making it much easier for good designs and recipes to spread around the world. While this is often not what a company wants—it wants to exclude others from its great cost-saving idea— excludability is not as easy as it used to be. This isn't because of weaker patent protection, but instead because of stronger digital tools. Once one company shows what's possible, others use hardware, software, and networks to catch up to the leader. Even if they can't copy exactly because of intellectual-property restrictions, they can use digital tools to explore other means to the same end. So, many farmers learn to get higher yields while using less water and fertilizer, even though they combine these raw materials in different ways. Steve Jobs would certainly have preferred for Apple to be the only provider of smartphones after it developed the iPhone, but he couldn't maintain the monopoly no matter how many patents and lawsuits he filed. Other companies found ways to combine processors, memory, sensors, a touch screen, and software into phones that satisfied billions of customers around the world. The operating system that powers most non-Apple smartphones is Android, which is both free to use and freely modifiable. Google's parent company, Alphabet, developed and released Android without even trying to make it excludable; the explicit goal was to make it as widely imitable as possible. This is an example of the broad trend across digital industries of giving away valuable technologies for free. The Linux operating system, of which Android is a descendant, is probably the best-known example of free and open-source software, but there are many others. The online software repository GitHub maintains that it's "the largest open source community in the world" and hosts millions of projects. The Arduino community does something similar for electronic hardware, and the Instructables website contains detailed instructions for making equipment ranging from air-particle counters to machine tools, all with no intellectual-property protection. Contributors to efforts such as these have a range of motivations (Alphabet's goals with Android were far from purely altruistic—among other things, the parent of Google wanted to achieve a quantum leap in mobile phone users around the world, who would avail themselves of Google Search and services such as YouTube), but they're all part of the trend of technology without excludability, which is great news for growth. As we saw in chapter 10, smartphone use and access to the Internet are increasing quickly across the planet. This means that people no longer need to be near a decent library or school to gain knowledge and improve their abilities. Globally, people are taking advantage of the skill-building opportunities of new technologies. This is the third reason that the spread of digital tools should make us optimistic about future growth: these tools are helping human capital grow quickly. The free Duolingo app, for example, is now the world's most popular way to learn a second language. Of the nearly 15 billion Wikipedia page views during July of 2018, half were in languages other than English. Google's chief economist, Hal Varian, points out that hundreds of millions of how-to videos are viewed every day on YouTube, saying, "We never had a technology before that could educate such a broad group of people anytime on an as-needed basis for free." Romer's work leaves me hopeful because it shows that it's our ability to build human capital, rather than chop down forests, dig mines, or burn fossil fuels that drives growth and prosperity. His model of how economies grow also reinforces how well capitalism and tech progress work together, which is a central point of this book. The surest way to boost profits is to cut costs, and modern technologies, especially digital ones, offer unlimited ways to combine and recombine materials—to swap, slim, optimize, and evaporate—in cost-reducing ways. **There's no reason to expect that the two horsemen of capitalism and tech progress will stop** riding together anytime soon. Quite the contrary. Romer's insights reveal that they're likely to gallop faster and farther as economies grow. Our Brighter, Lighter Future The world still has billions of desperately poor people, but they won't remain that way. All available evidence strongly suggests that most will become much wealthier in the years and decades ahead. As they earn more and consume more, what will be the impact on the planet? The history and economics of the Industrial Era lead to pessimism on this important question. Resource use increased in lockstep with economic growth throughout the two centuries between James Watt's demonstration of his steam engine and the first Earth Day. Malthus and Jevons seemed to be right, and it was just a question of when, not if, we'd run up against the hard planetary limits to growth. But in America and other rich countries something strange, unexpected, and wonderful happened: we started getting more from less. We decoupled population and economic growth from resource consumption, pollution, and other environmental harms. Malthus's and Jevons's ideas gave way to Romer's, and the world will never be the same. This means that instead of worrying about the world's poor becoming richer, we should instead be helping them upgrade economically as much and as quickly as possible. Not only is it the morally correct thing to do, it's also the smart move for our planet. As today’s poor countries get richer, their institutions will improve and most will eventually go through what Ricardo Hausmann calls "the capitalist makeover of production." This makeover doesn't enslave people, nor does it befoul the earth. As today’s poor get richer, they'll consume more, but they'll also consume much differently from earlier generations. They won't read physical newspapers and magazines. They'll get a great deal of their power from renewables and (one hopes) nuclear because these energy sources will be the cheapest. They’ll live in cities, as we saw in chapter 12; in fact, they already are. They'll be less likely to own cars because a variety of transportation options will be only a few taps away. Most important, they'll come up with ideas that keep the growth going, and that benefit both humanity and the planet we live on. Predicting exactly how technological progress will unfold is much like predicting the weather: feasible in the short term, but impossible over a longer time. Great uncertainty and complexity prevent precise forecasts about, for example, the computing devices we’ll be using thirty years from now or the dominant types of artificial intelligence in 2050 and beyond. But even though we can't predict the weather long term, we can accurately forecast the climate. We know how much warmer and sunnier it will be on average in August than in January, for example, and we know that global average temperatures will rise as we keep adding greenhouse gases to the atmosphere. Similarly, we can predict the "climate" of future technological progress by starting from the knowledge that it will be heavily applied in the areas where it can affect capitalism the most. As we've seen over and over, tech progress supplies opportunities to trim costs (and improve performance) via dematerialization, and capitalism provides the motive to do so. As a result, the Second Enlightenment will continue as we move deeper into the twenty-first century. I'm confident that it will accelerate as digital technologies continue to improve and multiply and global competition continues to increase. We’ll see some of the most striking examples of slim, swap, evaporate, and optimize in exactly the places where the opportunities are biggest. Here are a few broad predictions, spanning humanity's biggest industries. Manufacturing. Complex parts will be made not by the techniques developed during the Industrial Era, but instead by three- dimensional printing. This is already the case for some rocket engines and other extremely expensive items. **As 3-D printing** improves and becomes cheaper, it will spread to automobile engine blocks, manifolds and other complicated arrangements of pipes, airplane struts and wings, and countless other parts. Because 3-D printing **generates virtually no waste** and doesn't require massive molds, it accelerates dematerialization.

#### AT Shammas and Holen 2 – Rocket Launches aren’t aspects of Appropriation – they’re used for things like Space Tourism that are temporary in nature – massive Alt Cause

#### Ozone Layer is increasing – flips U/Q.

Horton 21 Helena Horton 9-15-2021 "‘Larger than usual’: this year’s ozone layer hole bigger than Antarctica" <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/sep/16/larger-than-usual-ozone-layer-hole-bigger-than-antarctica> (Environmental Journalist for the Guardian)//Elmer

The hole in the ozone layer that develops annually is “rather larger than usual” and is currently bigger than Antartica, say the scientists responsible for monitoring it. Researchers from the Copernicus Atmosphere Monitoring Service say that this year’s hole is growing quickly and is larger than 75% of ozone holes at this stage in the season since 1979. Ozone exists about seven to 25 miles (11-40km) above the Earth’s surface, in the stratosphere, and acts like a sunscreen for the planet, shielding it from ultraviolet radiation. Every year, a hole forms during the late winter of thesouthern hemisphere as the sun causes ozone-depleting reactions, which involve chemically active forms of chlorine and bromine derived from human-made compounds. In a statement Copernicus said that this year’s hole “has evolved into a rather larger than usual one”. Vincent-Henri Peuch, the service’s director, told the Guardian: “We cannot really say at this stage how the ozone hole will evolve. However, the hole of this year is remarkably similar to the one of 2020, which was among the deepest and the longest-lasting – it closed around Christmas – in our records since 1979.

#### Three Thumpers:

#### 1] Dichloromethane

Perkins 17 Sid Perkins 6-27-2017 "New threat to ozone layer found" <https://www.science.org/content/article/new-threat-ozone-layer-found> (Sid is a freelance science journalist based in Crossville, Tennessee. He specializes in earth sciences and paleontology but often tackles topics such as astronomy, planetary sciences, materials sciences, and engineering. Sid has a bachelor’s degree in natural science from Christian Brothers College in Memphis, Tennessee; bachelor’s and master’s degrees in aeronautical engineering from the Air Force Institute of Technology in Ohio; and a master’s degree in journalism from the University of Missouri in Columbia)//Elmer

The ozone layer—a high-altitude expanse of oxygen molecules that protects us from the sun's ultraviolet rays—has been on the mend for the past decade or so. But a newly discovered threat could delay its recovery. Industrial emissions of a chemical commonly used in solvents, paint removers, and the production of pharmaceuticals have doubled in the past few years, researchers have found, which could slow the healing of the ozone layer over Antarctica anywhere between 5 and 30 years—or even longer if levels continue to rise. The findings are "frightening" and "a big deal," says Robyn Schofield, an environmental scientist at the University of Melbourne in Australia who was not involved with the work. The chemical in question is called dichloromethane (CH2Cl2). Natural sources of this substance are small, says Ryan Hossaini, an atmospheric chemist at Lancaster University in the United Kingdom. Thus, he notes, the increase in emissions seen in recent years likely stems from human sources. Between 2000 and 2012, low-altitude concentrations of CH2Cl2 vapor rose, on average, about 8% per year, he adds. Globally, concentrations of CH2Cl2 approximately doubled between 2004 and 2014. Current CH2Cl2 emissions are about 1 million metric tons per year, Hossaini and his team estimate. Like chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) and several other ozone-destroying chemicals you may have heard of, CH2Cl2 breaks apart when struck by sunlight. The chlorine atoms that are released then dismantle any ozone molecules they interact with. In 1987, an international agreement known as the Montreal Protocol led to a ban on the production and use of CFCs and many related compounds in industrial nations, but it ignored CH2Cl2 because researchers thought it didn't stay intact in the atmosphere long enough to rise into the stratosphere. Recent evidence now suggests, however, that the molecules can reach the lower edge of the stratosphere, which includes the ozone layer, despite its height 8 kilometers above the poles. To gauge the current and future threat to high-altitude ozone from CH2Cl2, Hossaini and his colleagues used computer simulations. In 2016, their analyses suggest, about 3% of the summer ozone loss in the Antarctic could be traced to CH2Cl2. That seems small, but in 2010 the substance was responsible for only 1.5% of the region's summer ozone loss, Hossaini says. If CH2Cl2 emissions continue to rise at the rate seen in the last decade, recovery of the ozone hole would be delayed about 30 years, the researchers estimate in Nature Communications. But if emissions of CH2Cl2 are held to current levels, healing of the ozone hole would be delayed only 5 years or so, the team finds. Simulations that don't include the effect of CH2Cl2 suggest that high-altitude ozone in the Antarctic will return to pre-1980 levels, the concentration measured before CFCs and other ozone-destroying chemicals were recognized as a problem, in 2065. The team's analyses "are quite important," says Björn-Martin Sinnhuber, an atmospheric scientist at Karlsruhe Institute of Technology in Germany. "It's clear that concentrations [of CH2Cl2] have increased quite a lot," he notes. But one critical question, he contends, is what will happen to emissions over the long term: "They've been quite variable in recent years, and it's difficult to say how they might evolve." Although the rapid rise in CH2Cl2 emissions may one day level off, it's also possible that emissions of this multipurpose chemical may accelerate even further. Hossaini and his team also assessed what would happen to high-altitude ozone if CH2Cl2 emissions rose at twice the rate seen in the past decade. The answer? Not good. Antarctic ozone wouldn't recover to pre-1980 levels until well after the year 2100, the analyses suggest. All this means that scientists now reviewing the Montreal Protocol should consider expanding the agreement to also regulate substances like CH2Cl2 that have atmospheric lifetimes of less than 6 months, Schofield says. Possibly as important, however, the team's results might also help other researchers identify which sources of CH2Cl2 are contributing most to the recent rise in emissions. That sort of information, Hossaini admits, is sadly lacking as of now.

#### No Ozone Impact.

Ridley 14 (Matthew White Ridley, BA and PhD in Zoology from Oxford. “THE OZONE HOLE WAS EXAGGERATED AS A PROBLEM,” *Rational Optimist*, 9/25/14, <http://www.rationaloptimist.com/blog/the-ozone-hole-was-exaggerated-as-a-problem.aspx>) dwc 19

Serial hyperbole does the environmental movement no favours My recent Times column argued that the alleged healing of the ozone layer is exaggerated, but so was the impact of the ozone hole over Antarctica: The ozone layer is healing. Or so said the news last week. Thanks to a treaty signed in Montreal in 1989 to get rid of refrigerant chemicals called chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), the planet’s stratospheric sunscreen has at last begun thickening again. Planetary disaster has been averted by politics. For reasons I will explain, this news deserves to be taken with a large pinch of salt. You do not have to dig far to find evidence that the ozone hole was never nearly as dangerous as some people said, that it is not necessarily healing yet and that it might not have been caused mainly by CFCs anyway. The timing of the announcement was plainly political: it came on the 25th anniversary of the treaty, and just before a big United Nations climate conference in New York, the aim of which is to push for a climate treaty modelled on the ozone one. Here’s what was actually announced last week, in the words of a Nasa scientist, Paul Newman: “From 2000 to 2013, ozone levels climbed 4 per cent in the key mid-northern latitudes.” That’s a pretty small change and it is in the wrong place. The ozone thinning that worried everybody in the 1980s was over Antarctica. Over northern latitudes, ozone concentration has been falling by about 4 per cent each March before recovering. Over Antarctica, since 1980, the ozone concentration has fallen by 40 or 50 per cent each September before the sun rebuilds it. So what’s happening to the Antarctic ozone hole? Thanks to a diligent blogger named Anthony Watts, I came across a press release also from Nasa about nine months ago, which said: “ Two new studies show that signs of recovery are not yet present, and that temperature and winds are still driving any annual changes in ozone hole size.” As recently as 2006, Nasa announced, quoting Paul Newman again, that the Antarctic ozone hole that year was “the largest ever recorded”. The following year a paper in Nature magazine from Markus Rex, a German scientist, presented new evidence that suggested CFCs may be responsible for less than 40 per cent of ozone destruction anyway. Besides, nobody knows for sure how big the ozone hole was each spring before CFCs were invented. All we know is that it varies from year to year. How much damage did the ozone hole ever threaten to do anyway? It is fascinating to go back and read what the usual hyperventilating eco-exaggerators said about ozone thinning in the 1980s. As a result of the extra ultraviolet light coming through the Antarctic ozone hole, southernmost parts of Patagonia and New Zealand see about 12 per cent more UV light than expected. This means that the weak September sunshine, though it feels much the same, has the power to cause sunburn more like that of latitudes a few hundred miles north. Hardly Armageddon. The New York Times reported “an increase in Twilight Zone-type reports of sheep and rabbits with cataracts” in southern Chile. Not to be outdone, Al Gore wrote that “hunters now report finding blind rabbits; fisherman catch blind salmon”. Zoologists briefly blamed the near extinction of many amphibian species on thin ozone. Melanoma in people was also said to be on the rise as a result. This was nonsense. Frogs were dying out because of a fungal disease spread from Africa — nothing to do with ozone. Rabbits and fish blinded by a little extra sunlight proved to be as mythical as unicorns. An eye disease in Chilean sheep was happening outside the ozone-depleted zone and was caused by an infection called pinkeye — nothing to do with UV light. And melanoma incidence in people actually levelled out during the period when the ozone got thinner.

#### No Disease Impact

Ord 20 Dr. Toby Ord 20, Senior Research Fellow in Philosophy at Oxford University, DPhil in Philosophy from the University of Oxford, The Precipice: Existential Risk and the Future of Humanity, Hachette Books, Kindle Edition, p. 124-126

Are we safe now from events like this? Or are we more vulnerable? Could a pandemic threaten humanity’s future?10 The Black Death was not the only biological disaster to scar human history. It was not even the only great bubonic plague. In 541 CE the Plague of Justinian struck the Byzantine Empire. Over three years it took the lives of roughly 3 percent of the world’s people.11 When Europeans reached the Americas in 1492, the two populations exposed each other to completely novel diseases. Over thousands of years each population had built up resistance to their own set of diseases, but were extremely susceptible to the others. The American peoples got by far the worse end of exchange, through diseases such as measles, influenza and especially smallpox. During the next hundred years a combination of invasion and disease took an immense toll—one whose scale may never be known, due to great uncertainty about the size of the pre-existing population. We can’t rule out the loss of more than 90 percent of the population of the Americas during that century, though the number could also be much lower.12 And it is very difficult to tease out how much of this should be attributed to war and occupation, rather than disease. As a rough upper bound, the Columbian exchange may have killed as many as 10 percent of the world’s people.13 Centuries later, the world had become so interconnected that a truly global pandemic was possible. Near the end of the First World War, a devastating strain of influenza (known as the 1918 flu or Spanish Flu) spread to six continents, and even remote Pacific islands. At least a third of the world’s population were infected and 3 to 6 percent were killed.14 This death toll outstripped that of the First World War, and possibly both World Wars combined. Yet even events like these fall short of being a threat to humanity’s longterm potential.15 [FOONOTE] In addition to this historical evidence, there are some deeper biological observations and theories suggesting that pathogens are unlikely to lead to the extinction of their hosts. These include the empirical anti-correlation between infectiousness and lethality, the extreme rarity of diseases that kill more than 75% of those infected, the observed tendency of pandemics to become less virulent as they progress and the theory of optimal virulence.

However, there is no watertight case against pathogens leading to the extinction of their hosts. [END FOOTNOTE] In the great bubonic plagues we saw civilization in the affected areas falter, but recover. The regional 25 to 50 percent death rate was not enough to precipitate a continent-wide collapse of civilization. It changed the relative fortunes of empires, and may have altered the course of history substantially, but if anything, it gives us reason to believe that human civilization is likely to make it through future events with similar death rates, even if they were global in scale. The 1918 flu pandemic was remarkable in having very little apparent effect on the world’s development despite its global reach. It looks like it was lost in the wake of the First World War, which despite a smaller death toll, seems to have had a much larger effect on the course of history.16 It is less clear what lesson to draw from the Columbian exchange due to our lack of good records and its mix of causes. Pandemics were clearly a part of what led to a regional collapse of civilization, but we don’t know whether this would have occurred had it not been for the accompanying violence and imperial rule. The strongest case against existential risk from natural pandemics is the fossil record argument from Chapter 3. Extinction risk from natural causes above 0.1 percent per century is incompatible with the evidence of how long humanity and similar species have lasted. But this argument only works where the risk to humanity now is similar or lower than the longterm levels. For most risks this is clearly true, but not for pandemics. We have done many things to exacerbate the risk: some that could make pandemics more likely to occur, and some that could increase their damage. Thus even “natural” pandemics should be seen as a partly anthropogenic risk.

### US-Russia Relations

#### AT CSIS – No I/L – it’s limited to space – zero risk of spill-over into broader cooperation – proven by Putin-Biden tensions.

#### AT Weir – U/Q overwhelms the Link – first line is “Russia’s relations with the United States appears to be plumbing depths … unseen even during the original cold war” – no chance small co-op over Deep Space solves any of that.

#### Space coop doesn’t reverse causally solve relations – specifically US and Russia

Knipfer, 17 - BA in Polisci & IR from McDaniel College with a specialized focus on outer space history, affairs, and policy; pursuing Masters studies in Space Policy at George Washington University’s Space Policy Institute Cody Knipfer, “International Cooperation and Competition in Space” http://www.reallycoolblog.com/international-cooperation-and-competition-in-space/

It need be remembered that while space cooperation may serve as diplomatic signaling and as “grease on the wheels” for a country seeking to achieve its foreign policy aims, it is more often an effect of developments in international relations than a direct cause. While the Apollo-Soyuz Test Project was a marker and symbol of détente between the United States and Soviet Union, for example, it was not the catalyst nor the primary driver. Likewise, American cooperation with – and indeed current reliance on, for crew transportation – Russia in the International Space Station did not prevent nor has stymied the reemergence and growth of tensions between the two countries. Nonetheless, when coupled with an active diplomatic strategy on Earth, space cooperation can serve to strengthen a country’s foreign policy pursuits. And, by process of establishing diplomatic channels and acclimating leaders to partners’ decision-making processes, institutional cultures, and standard operating procedures, it enables future cooperation between countries in space and on Earth – and, critically, builds trust.

### Debris

#### Top-Level – U/Q overwhelms the Link – 1AC Intagliata and Orwig are about Status Quo Debris being a risk – doesn’t presume the increased Debris from the Plan – no ability to clean-up which means the Impact is Inevitable.

#### AT Thompson –

#### 1] Rocket Launches are from non-appropriation based actions – private launches for tourism are massive alt causes.

#### 2] No Kessler Effect

Fange 17 Daniel Von Fange 17, Web Application Engineer, Founder and Owner of LeanCoder, Full Stack, Polyglot Web Developer, “Kessler Syndrome is Over Hyped”, 5/21/2017, http://braino.org/essays/kessler\_syndrome\_is\_over\_hyped/

The orbital area around earth can be broken down into four regions. Low LEO - Up to about 400km. Things that orbit here burn up in the earth’s atmosphere quickly - between a few months to two years. The space station operates at the high end of this range. It loses about a kilometer of altitude a month and if not pushed higher every few months, would soon burn up. For all practical purposes, Low LEO doesn’t matter for Kessler Syndrome. If Low LEO was ever full of space junk, we’d just wait a year and a half, and the problem would be over. High LEO - 400km to 2000km. This where most heavy satellites and most space junk orbits. The air is thin enough here that satellites only go down slowly, and they have a much farther distance to fall. It can take 50 years for stuff here to get down. This is where Kessler Syndrome could be an issue. Mid Orbit - GPS satellites and other navigation satellites travel here in lonely, long lives. The volume of space is so huge, and the number of satellites so few, that we don’t need to worry about Kessler here. GEO - If you put a satellite far enough out from earth, the speed that the satellite travels around the earth will match the speed of the surface of the earth rotating under it. From the ground, the satellite will appear to hang motionless. Usually the geostationary orbit is used by big weather satellites and big TV broadcasting satellites. (This apparent motionlessness is why satellite TV dishes can be mounted pointing in a fixed direction. You can find approximate south just by looking around at the dishes in your northern hemisphere neighborhood.) For Kessler purposes, GEO orbit is roughly a ring 384,400 km around. However, all the satellites here are moving the same direction at the same speed - debris doesn’t get free velocity from the speed of the satellites. Also, it’s quite expensive to get a satellite here, and so there aren’t many, only about one satellite per 1000km of the ring. Kessler is not a problem here. How bad could Kessler Syndrome in High LEO be? Let’s imagine a worst case scenario. An evil alien intelligence chops up everything in High LEO, turning it into 1cm cubes of death orbiting at 1000km, spread as evenly across the surface of this sphere as orbital mechanics would allow. Is humanity cut off from space? I’m guessing the world has launched about 10,000 tons of satellites total. For guessing purposes, I’ll assume 2,500 tons of satellites and junk currently in High LEO. If satellites are made of aluminum, with a density of 2.70 g/cm3, then that’s 839,985,870 1cm cubes. A sphere for an orbit of 1,000km has a surface area of 682,752,000 square KM. So there would be one cube of junk per .81 square KM. If a rocket traveled through that, its odds of hitting that cube are tiny - less than 1 in 10,000