### 1AC – Plan

#### Plan – The appropriation of outer space through the production of orbital debris by private entities is unjust.

#### Orbital debris is

NASA.gov 21 [NASA – 5/26/21. “Space Debris and Human Spacecraft.” <https://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/station/news/orbital_debris.html>] Justin

Orbital Debris

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

Orbital debris is any human-made object in orbit about the Earth that no longer serves a useful function. Such debris includes nonfunctional spacecraft, abandoned launch vehicle stages, mission-related debris, and fragmentation debris.

#### The aff interprets enforcement as an OUF (Orbital Use Fee). Proportionality in relation to the space industry solves best without harming it and any other solution only worsens the threat – models. Only the affirmative can address the underlying incentive problem.

Rao et al 20. Akhil, Matthew Burgess, and Daniel Kaffine \*Department of Economics, Middlebury College, Middlebury \*\*Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences, University of Colorado, Environmental Studies Program, and Department of Economics \*\*\*Department of Economics. 2020 [PNAS, “Orbital-use fees could more than quadruple the value of the space industry,” <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7293599/>] Justin

The space industry’s rapid recent growth represents the latest tragedy of the commons. Satellites launched into orbit contribute to—and risk damage from—a growing buildup of space debris and other satellites. Collision risk from this orbital congestion is costly to satellite operators. Technological and managerial solutions—such as active debris removal or end-of-life satellite deorbit guidelines—are currently being explored by regulatory authorities. However, none of these approaches address the underlying incentive problem: satellite operators do not account for costs they impose on each other via collision risk. Here, we show that an internationally harmonized orbital-use fee can correct these incentives and substantially increase the value of the space industry. We construct and analyze a coupled physical–economic model of commercial launches and debris accumulation in low-Earth orbit. Similar to carbon taxes, our model projects an optimal fee that rises at a rate of 14% per year, equal to roughly $235,000 per satellite-year in 2040. The long-run value of the satellite industry would more than quadruple by 2040—increasing from around $600 billion under business as usual to around $3 trillion. In contrast, we project that purely technological solutions are unlikely to fully address the problem of orbital congestion. Indeed, we find debris removal sometimes worsens economic damages from congestion by increasing launch incentives. In other sectors, addressing the tragedy of the commons has often been a game of catch-up with substantial social costs. The infant space industry can avert these costs before they escalate.

In 2017, 466 new satellites were launched—more than double the previous year’s launches and more than 20% of all active satellites in orbit in 2017 (1, 2). Rapid space industry growth is projected to continue, driven largely by commercial satellites (Fig. 1). This growth is driving buildup of debris in low-Earth orbit, currently including over 15,000 objects (3). Collision risk from debris is costly; collisions damage or destroy expensive capital assets that are difficult or impossible to repair. Debris buildup could eventually make some low-Earth orbits economically unviable and other orbits difficult or impossible to access (4). In the worst case—although uncertain and occurring over long time sshorizons—debris growth could become self-sustaining due to collisions between debris objects, a tipping point called Kessler Syndrome (4, 5).

Proposed solutions have so far largely been technological and managerial, aimed at mapping, avoiding, and removing debris (6, 7). These include end-of-life deorbit guidelines and “keep out” zones for active satellites and nets, harpoons, and lasers to deorbit debris (6). However, with open access to orbits, reducing debris and collision risk incentivizes additional satellite launches, which eventually restore the debris and risk. For instance, if firms were willing to tolerate a 0.1% annual risk of satellite loss before a technological improvement in debris removal, they will be willing to launch more satellites until the 0.1% annual risk of satellite loss was restored.

Thus, the core of the space debris problem is incentives, not technology. Since satellite operators are unable to secure exclusive property rights to their orbital paths or recover collision-related costs imposed by others, prospective operators face a choice between launching profitable satellites, thereby imposing current and future collision risk on others, or not launching and leaving those profits to competitors. This is a classic tragedy of the commons problem (1, 3, 8, 9). It can be economically efficiently addressed via incentive-based solutions, such as fees or tradable permits per year in orbit, analogous to carbon taxes or cap and trade (8, 10–12). Incentives should target objects in orbit—rather than launches—because orbiting objects are what directly imposes collision risk on other satellites (13). We quantify the economic benefits of implementing such incentives to correct the underlying open-access problem.

We use a coupled physical–economic model combining rich physical dynamics with satellite economics to quantify the benefits of an internationally harmonized “orbital-use fee” (OUF) relative to a business as usual (BAU) open-access scenario and relative to a scenario with active debris removal. An OUF is a type of Pigouvian tax—a well-known economic instrument for addressing externality problems (14). Our model accounts for the effects of each scenario on satellite launch decisions (Materials and Methods and SI Appendix). While we focus on an OUF for analytical convenience, it is conceptually equivalent to other mechanisms for pricing orbits, such as tradable permits.

Our physical model of satellite and debris evolution in orbit obeys relevant accounting identities and utilizes reduced form approximations of physical processes validated in other works (15, 16). We fit and calibrate the model using data on collision risk and orbital debris from the European Space Agency (ESA) (17) and data on active satellites from the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS) (2) (Materials and Methods and SI Appendix). The ESA dataset covers 1958 to 2017, and the UCS dataset covers 1957 to 2017. Our physical model assumes runaway debris growth (Kessler Syndrome) cannot occur, which likely leads our model to understate the benefits of OUFs (Materials and Methods). Our economic model assumes that satellites are launched and operated to maximize per satellite private profits, net of any fees, subject to collision risk. We calibrate the model by fitting the BAU scenario (no fees or debris removal) to historical industry data and launch trends (1, 2) (Materials and Methods and SI Appendix).

We project future launch rates to 2040 under the BAU scenario using our fitted model and published projections of future growth of the space economy (18). The projections in ref. 18 were developed by projecting how the industries constituting the space sector—telecommunications, imaging, etc.—would grow from 2017 to 2040 under different assumptions on their individual profitability over time, then aggregating up to obtain projections for the space sector. We then calculate launch rates that would maximize the long-run value of the industry, and we calculate the time series of OUFs that would incentivize these optimal launch rates. The industry value is measured as net present value (NPV)—the long-run value of the entire fleet of satellites in orbit, accounting for both the financial costs of replacing satellites due to natural retirement and collisions as well as the opportunity cost of investing funds in satellites rather than capital markets. For instance, an NPV of $1 trillion in 2020 means the sum total of the stream of net benefits, looking from 2020 into the future and accounting for the timing of the net benefits, is $1 trillion.

Although our models are deliberately simplified for tractability, they are based on previously validated approaches to orbital object modeling (15, 16), and our calibrations allow us to reproduce observed trends and magnitudes in the growth of orbital debris and satellite stocks as well as the calculated collision risk (Fig. 3). Nonetheless, our projections should be interpreted as order of magnitude approximations that can be refined as needed by more detailed models. In these respects, our approach mirrors integrated assessment modeling approaches that have been useful in developing solutions to other natural resource management problems (e.g., ref. 19).

RESULTS

We project that shifting from open access to the optimal series of OUFs in 2020 would increase the NPV of the satellite industry from around $600 billion under BAU to around $3 trillion—a more than 4-fold increase (4.18- to 6.49-fold increases in 95% of parameter sets randomly drawn from their calibrated distributions) (Fig. 2D). Assuming a 5% market rate of return, an increase of $2.5 trillion in NPV would be equivalent to annual benefits of approximately $120 billion in perpetuity. The large immediate increase in NPV that we project in each OUF scenario, relative to BAU (Fig. 2A), comes primarily from the immediate effect of reducing launch activity while the satellite and debris stocks are suboptimally high (SI Appendix).

Based on our calculations (Materials and Methods), the optimal OUF starts at roughly $14,900 per satellite-year in 2020 and escalates at roughly 14% per year (aside from some initial transition dynamics) to around $235,000 per satellite-year in 2040. Rising optimal price paths are common in environmental pricing such as carbon taxes (20), although declining optimal price paths are also possible (21). The rising price path in this case partly reflects the rising value of safer orbits (resulting in rising industry NPV) (Fig. 2A) from the OUF. For comparison, the average annual profits of operating a satellite in 2015 were roughly $2.1 million. The 2020 and 2040 OUF values we describe amount to roughly 0.7 and 11% of average annual profits generated by a satellite in 2015.

Forgone NPV from the satellite industry in 2040—which is the cost of inaction under BAU—escalates from around $300 billion if optimal management begins in 2025 to around $700 billion if optimal management begins in 2035. Without OUFs, losses remain substantial even when active debris removal (implemented in the model as removal of 50% of debris objects in orbit each year) is available. In a best-case analysis where we assume debris removal is costless (i.e., it requires no payments nor additional satellites to implement), debris removal can only recover up to 9.5% of the value lost under open access. (The satellite industry’s willingness to pay for debris removal is not easily calculable in our model [SI Appendix, section 1.9.2].) At worst, debris removal can exacerbate orbital congestion via a rebound-type effect, causing additional losses on the order of 3% of the value already lost from open access (Fig. 4 and SI Appendix). The inability of debris removal to induce efficient orbit use is driven by open-access launching behavior and underscores the importance of policies to correct economic incentives to launch satellites.

DISCUSSION

The costly buildup of debris and satellites in low-Earth orbit is fundamentally a problem of incentives—satellite operators currently lack the incentives to factor into their launch decisions the collision risks their satellites impose on other operators. Our analysis suggests that correcting these incentives, via an OUF, could have substantial economic benefits to the satellite industry, and failing to do so could have substantial and escalating economic costs.

Escalating costs of inaction are a common feature of the tragedy of the commons, evident in several other sectors in which it went unaddressed for lengthy periods (22). For example, tens of billions of dollars in net benefits are lost annually from open-access or poorly managed fisheries globally (23). Similarly, open access to oil fields in the United States at the turn of the century drove recovery rates down to 20 to 25% at competitively drilled sites, compared with 85 to 90% potential recovery under optimal management (24). Open access to roadways—somewhat analogous to orbits—is estimated to create traffic congestion costs in excess of $120 billion/y in the United States alone (25). In contrast, there is still time to get out ahead of the tragedy of the commons in the young space industry.

The international and geopolitically complex nature of the space sector poses challenges to implementing orbital-use pricing systems, but these challenges need not be insurmountable. Theory suggests countries could each collect and spend OUF revenues domestically, without losing economic efficiency, as long as the fee’s magnitude was internationally harmonized (20). Engaging in such negotiations would be in the economic interests of all parties involved (26). An example of such a system is the Vessel Day Scheme (VDS) used by the Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA) to manage tuna fisheries. Under the VDS, PNA countries each lease fishing rights within their waters, using a common price floor (27). The European Union’s Emissions Trading System provides an example of an internationally coordinated tradable permit system (28). Notably, each of these pricing programs is built on a preexisting international governance institution (the Nauru Agreement and the European Union).

An OUF could also be built within existing space governance institutions, such as the Outer Space Treaty (29). For example, Article VI states that countries supervise their space industries, which provides a framework for OUFs to be administered nationally. Article II prohibits national appropriation of outer space but does not prohibit private property rights, potentially allowing for tradable orbital permitting.

### 1AC – Advantage

#### The private sector locks in the Kessler Syndrome as a structurally inevitability by 2035. The debris threat isn’t internalized, engineering studies, profit-motive AND inefficient guidelines.

Rao and Rondina 2/16/22 [Akhil Rao and Giacomo Rondina. \*Middlebury College in the Department of Economics. \*\*University of California, San Diego. “Open access to orbit and runaway space debris growth.” <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2202.07442.pdf>] Justin

In this paper we present a dynamic physico-economic model of orbit use under rational expectations with endogenous collision probability and Kessler Syndrome. We show how both economic and physical parameters drive equilibrium short- and long-run orbital-use patterns, derive the marginal external cost of a satellite, explore the multiplicity and stability of openaccess steady states, and examine the relationships between open-access orbit use, optimal orbit use, and Kessler Syndrome. We then calibrate the model to an important region of LEO and estimate the likely times when Kessler Syndrome will occur under different patterns of satellite industry economics. We highlight three messages regarding orbital-use management.

First, under open access too many firms will launch satellites because they won’t internalize the risks they impose on other orbit users. Though profit maximizing satellite owners have incentives to reduce launches as the risk of a collision grows, they do not respond to debris growth or collision risk optimally. This inefficiency is independent of whether Kessler Syndrome is possible or not. Unlike many other bioeconomic commons problems, higher discount rates can induce less (rather than more) open-access overexploitation.

Second, Kessler Syndrome is possible as long as debris objects can collide with each other and generate new fragments, i.e the new fragment formation debris coupling exists. Engineering studies indicate that this coupling does in fact exist. Due to open access, even profit maximizing firms with rational expectations may continue to launch satellites despite recognizing their role in causing Kessler Syndrome and even after the Kessler threshold has been crossed.

Third, under open access Kessler Syndrome is more likely as the excess return on a satellite rises, even if firms will respond to orbital congestion by launching fewer satellites. As launch costs fall and new commercial satellite applications become viable, LEO is thus increasingly and inefficiently likely to experience Kessler Syndrome. While it may seem paradoxical that the very changes which make orbit use profitable can also increase the risk of resource collapse, such dynamics occur frequently in bioeconomic commons problems. Calibrated simulations reveal that space economy growth rates projected by investment banks and industry associations are consistent with Kessler Syndrome occurring as early as 2035. Our results suggest that, absent institutional reform, continued growth of the space economy may trigger Kessler Syndrome in the near future. This can occur even in regions perceived to have relatively high rates of natural renewability, providing new evidence that compliance with the 25-year rule is insufficient to ensure sustainable orbit use.

#### Debris is exponentially increasing and current models underestimate the risk. The aff is our best shot making it try-or-die.

Shen & Blake 2/24/22 [Zili Shen, Internally citing James Blake \* I am a Ph.D. student in Astronomy at Yale University. My research focuses on ultra-diffuse galaxies and their globular cluster populations. Since I came to Yale, I have worked on two "dark-matter-free" galaxies NGC1052-DF2 and DF4 \*\* Department of Physics and Centre for Space Domain Awareness, University of Warwick, Coventry. “How not to bury ourselves under space trash.” astrobites. <https://astrobites.org/2022/02/24/space-sustainability/>] Justin

What’s wrong with having some stuff orbiting the Earth, you might ask? Like my trash analogy, the problem is that they block our way to space. Fragments as small as 10 cm can kill a satellite mission. Unlike my trash analogy, if enough space junk accumulates, they can produce more fragments on their own. Several bands of LEO are already at risk of what’s called a runaway collisional cascade. This happens when space junk collide with each other and fall apart, their fragments going on to seeding more collisions, generating more debris, and restarting the cycle. On the other hand, space debris in high altitude orbits (like GSO) don’t experience much atmospheric drag, and will stay up there for centuries. From this you probably gathered that most of these debris are either abandoned satellites or their fragments. Even though these objects were originally launched by humans, cataloging and tracking them are a huge challenge.

What’s up there?

Since the first manmade satellite was launched in 1957, space agencies have been keeping track of bodies orbiting the Earth. By mass, 98% of those are satellites and rocket bodies, but we know very little about the remaining 2%, millions of small debris. These small debris elude radars and optical telescopes used in ground-based surveys, but they can still cause mission-fatal damage to a satellite. With limited data, NASA and ESA cannot accurately estimate the risk from orbital debris. Their models don’t even agree on the number of expected debris because there is no good observational constraint for very small fragments.

Fig. 2: Number of tracked objects in Low-Earth Orbit (LEO) and Geo-synchronous orbit (GSO). Modified from Fig.2 of the paper.

Fig. 2 shows a breakdown of what we do know about objects in LEO and GSO. In LEO (left panel) , the most numerous objects are debris. These come from fragmentation events, or “break-ups,” most commonly due to propulsion-related subsystems exploding. In other words, when leftover fuel gets heated up in space, it can blow the satellite to pieces. Other sources of debris include intentional anti-satellite tests (in which countries develop technology to destroy each other’s satellites) and a small number of accidental satellite collisions. In GSO (right panel), a large number of objects are “unknown” because GSO is significantly farther away from Earth and has historically received less attention. To quote Dr. Blake, the author of today’s paper, “monitoring the mess of near-Earth space cannot solve the problem entirely, especially while the bulk of the dangerous debris population remains invisible and uncatalogued.” Now that I’ve alerted you to the grave danger we face, how do we make sure that future humanity can still go to space?

What can be done?

Like any environmental problem, the best solution is prevention. To prevent leftover fuel from exploding, satellite operators are now advised to “passivate” the spacecraft at the end of the mission. That means dumping out residual fuel and discharging batteries while they still control the spacecraft. The other safe disposal measures after the mission ends are to have the satellite re-enter the atmosphere or move into unused high-altitude orbits. Even though these prevention measures are the best way forward, they are (un)surprisingly hard to enforce. The authors says, “despite an apparent consensus that [anti-satellite weapon] tests represent irresponsible and reckless behaviour, legally binding and internationally recognised regulations are still lacking.” The level of adherence to the above safety guidelines remain concerningly low. Given that prevention is a “legal quagmire,” we can also try to remove debris that is already up there. Everything from harpoons to nets and tentacles have been used to collect orbital debris, but there’s no one-size-fits-all solution. Imagine how hard it is to capture metal shards tumbling at high speed without creating more debris.

Looking towards the future

Small satellites have flourished in recent years as LEO satellite constellations proved commercially lucrative. These satellites are not only a problem for astronomers but also a huge issue for the existing surveillance infrastructure. Dr. Blake says, “the problem is one that affects all operators in space, truly global in nature… [and] warrants a cross-sector, cross-disciplinary approach.” As astronomers, we can help society keep a watchful eye and ensure that the future of space flight is sustainable. If you want to learn more about space sustainability, Dr. Blake recommends the GNOSIS project.

#### Privatization exponentially increases debris – lack of regulations spikes it – models.

BERNAT 20. Pawel @ Military University of Aviation. 11/4/20. [SAFETY ENGINEERING OF ANTHROPOGENIC OBJECTS, “ORBITAL SATELLITE CONSTELLATIONS AND THE GROWING THREAT OF KESSLER SYNDROME IN THE LOWER EARTH ORBIT,” Volume 4, PDF] Justin

5. Orbital satellite constellations and the growing threat of the Kessler syndrome

Space 2.0 – the new era of space exploration that we witness now in the 21st century means, in words of Buzz Aldrin, “moving human enterprise into space” (Pyle, 2019, p. xiv). The process of commercialization of outer space has already begun and is not limited to private companies providing technologies and services for national or international space agencies, as it was in the past. On the contrary, private companies from the space sector have now matured to carry out their own independent projects.

As for 2020, SpaceX is a company that serves as the best example – it launches satellites to the orbit, both for state and private contractors, it successfully realized two crew missions to the International Space Station, and is in the process of constructing Starlink satellite constellation that will provide high-speed internet access across the planet.

Each satellite weighs around 260 kg, is equipped with an ion propulsion system, autonomous collision avoidance system, and orbits Earth at approximately 540-560 km altitude (Starlink, 2020). At the beginning of November 2020, more than 860 Starlink satellites were orbiting the Earth (Jewett, 2020). Immediate plans include launching 12,000 satellites, but they assume a potential later extension to 42,000 (Henry, 2019a). Of course, SpaceX has employed, at least declaratively, all necessary measures to keep the space clean – the satellites are equipped with the deorbiting system, and in the event of inoperability of the propulsion system (Starlink, 2020). The orbital collisions are, however, inevitable. As it was shown before, the possibility of collisions grows with the number of orbital objects. Bastida Virgili with the team compared (2016, p. 154-155) orbital debris environment development without and with a large hypothetical constellation consisting of merely 1080 satellites, distributed across 20 orbital planes at 1,100 km altitude (Fig. 5).
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Figure 5. Comparison of long term evolution of the number of objects in LEO with and without the constellation (Virgili et al., 2016, p. 155)

It has to be noted that although SpaceX’s Starlink is the only constellation that is being built in orbit, it is not the only one planned. There are at least a few initiatives aiming at the same goal – to construct internet infrastructure at the Earth’s orbit. The planned Kuiper Systems LLC, which is a subsidiary of Amazon and intends to place 3,236 broadband satellites in the LEO, is one of Starlink’s biggest competitors (Henry, 2019b). Now, there is even a rivalry between the two companies because Kuiper’s lowest orbital shell is planned to be 590 km, with a tolerance of 9 km either above or below (Cao, 2020), which is the altitude of Starlink satellites. Moreover, the race for space in orbit is now at the beginning.

The outer space is vast. It increasingly becomes more cluttered with both operational satellites and space debris. The threat of collisions increases and no institution or body has enough power to license, coordinate and regulate what is sent to the orbit. The UNOOSA has not such power. National states decide what the companies from the space industry can launch to space. In the United States, which is most advanced in the area of private constellations, it is the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) that issues the appropriate approvals. The race to put broadband internet satellites bears similarities to the gold rush – there are no rules, at the global level, apart from first-come, first-served.

#### Models are rigorous – inserted below.

Virgili et al. 16 – Bastida, J.C. Dolado, H.G. Lewis, J. Radtke, H. Krag, B. Revelin, C. Cazaux b , C. Colombo, R. Crowther, M. Metz. 4/26/16. [Act Astranautica “Risk to space sustainability from large constellations of satellites,” <https://sci-hub.se/10.1016/j.actaastro.2016.03.034>.] Justin

1.3. Simulation approach and result analysis A Monte Carlo (MC) approach was used to simulate the evolution of the object population over a period of 200 years under different post-mission disposal requirements, with four different tools (MEDEE – Modelling the Evolution of Debris on Earth's Environment [9], LUCA – Long Term Utility for Collision Analysis [10], DAMAGE – Debris Analysis and Monitoring Architecture to the Geosynchronous Environment [11] and DELTA – Debris Environment Long Term Analysis [12]). For analysis purposes, the effective number of objects was used where the contribution to the population by each object was weighted by the proportion of the orbital period spent in LEO. In a first step, four different evolutionary models performed an analysis of two reference scenarios. One scenario considered only the evolution of the background population and non-constellation traffic. The second scenario augmented the first with the addition of the representative constellation, with the requirement that 90% of the constellation satellites achieved post-mission disposal to orbits with remaining lifetimes of 25 years. The manoeuvres performed at the mission end to meet the disposal requirement are assumed to be impulsive (i.e. instantaneous) and result in an eccentric orbit with the apogee near the original (constellation) altitude and the perigee at an altitude such that the effects of atmospheric drag would cause the orbit to decay within 25 years. Two of the models considered an apogee remaining at the operational constellation altitude, while the other two reduced the apogee by 50 km. The purpose of these scenarios is to provide a cross-comparison of the models in terms of their predictions of the total object population, which take into account the effects of the constellation. As the distribution of the MC results for the models is of the same nature and the results are independent, a bootstrapping [20] approach is used to derive the mean, the standard deviation and the confidence levels at 95% of the combined results of all the MC runs from the four models (cf. Fig. 1), although not all the models performed the same number of MC runs (see Table 1). The main source of variation inside a particular model's MC runs included the randomness in collision activity, while the different models used their own solar activity forecast.

#### Fragmentation leads to speedy debris – that’s laws of physics.

Aerospace.org n.d. [As an independent, nonprofit corporation operating the only FFRDC for the space enterprise, The Aerospace Corporation performs objective technical analyses and assessments for a variety of government, civil, and commercial customers. “SPACE DEBRIS 101.” AEROSPACE. <https://aerospace.org/article/space-debris-101>] Justin

Can you see space debris coming at you?

It is very unlikely that you would see space debris. Relative to a person in orbit, space debris is moving about ten times faster than a bullet, and the vast majority of debris is as small as or smaller than a bullet. No one can see a bullet coming, let alone an object moving ten times faster.

What is an on-orbit collision like?

It looks more like an explosion of each object, as if they passed through each other and exploded on the other side. A hyper-velocity collision like those at orbital speed doesn’t behave like collisions that we are used to seeing. The objects are moving so fast that they travel through each other faster than the shock waves can travel. The shock waves in the structures of each object then shatter them into fragments of varying sizes and, in the process, give each fragment a boost in a different direction. Each one of these fragments is then in a different orbit than the original object and will move away according to the laws of orbital motion. With thousands of fragments, each moving in slightly different directions, it looks a lot like an explosion.

Do breakups look like the movies?

For dramatic purposes, movies, TV, and commercials tend to show space breakups at a much slower speed than they would happen at in real life. A breakup in space, especially a collision, can involve a lot of energy, and the pieces are flung away at extremely high speeds. Since there is no air to slow the pieces down the fragments would all fly away from one another and rapidly disappear from view. For many breakups, a softball-sized fragment would fly the length of the space station (a little less than a football field) in less than half a second. If you were watching it from nearby, you would see a flash, and the object that broke up would just disappear and be gone. It would be very unlikely for you to see pieces drifting away. Similarly, a low orbit space collision is unlikely to look much like a car crash — the speeds are much too high. The collisions would look like explosions to a nearby observer.

#### Debris threatens catastrophic global warming AND ozone depletion.

Liu et al. 12/14/21 [Liping Liu, Puqi Jia, Yalin Huang, and Jie Han. \*Institute of Global Environmental Change, School of Human Settlements and Civil Engineering, Xi’anJiaotong University, Xi’an, 710049, People’s Republic of China \*\*Department of Environmental Science and Engineering, College of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, 730000, People’s Republic of China. \*\*\*Department of Environmental Sciences, Fujian Normal University, Fuzhou, People’s Republic of China. “Dawn of space tourism: It is time to address the environmental impact of anthropogenicdebrisupon above earth.” <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3979481>] Justin

Like the ‘ozone hole’, changes in the upper atmosphere have significant impact on the environment and climate on earth (Laštovička et al. 2006). As early as in 2010, NASA warned that the upper layer of the earth's atmosphere had shrunk abruptly in just four decades, which had abnormally low densities that were about 30% lower than previous contractions on record since 1967 (Derrick 2010). Studies showed that, unlike in the lower atmosphere, carbon dioxide (CO2) acts as a ‘coolant’ in the upper atmosphere on earth, constantly shedding heat via infrared radiation. As carbon dioxide levels build up on earth, it makes its way into the upper atmosphere and magnifies the cooling effect during the ‘solar minimum’ (Derrick 2010; Laštovičkaet al.2006). There are three known sources of carbon dioxide in the thermosphere, namely, from the earth’s surface, emissions from fuel combustion during rocket flights, and the combustion of space debris in the thermosphere. Further, some metals and polymers in the orbit undergo chemical reactions when burning through the atmosphere, depleting ozone and generating carbon oxides and nitrogen oxides in the thermosphere(Staughton 2020) (Fig. 1). Further, metallic debris such as tungsten, beryllium, aluminum may also undergo chemical reactions when they re-enter the atmosphere, and their impact on earth’s atmosphere is also worthy to research (Physics Today 2009). Also, emissions from solid fuels and liquid propellants during rocket launches can cause pollution in the atmospheric environments, of which the depletion of stratospheric ozone is the most studied and concerning issue (Dallas et al. 2020).

#### Global warming is existential.

Simon Beard et al. 21. Centre for the Study of Existential Risk, University of Cambridge; Lauren Holt, Centre for the Study of Existential Risk, University of Cambridge; Asaf Tzachor, Centre for the Study of Existential Risk, University of Cambridge. Cambridge Global Food Security Interdisciplinary Research Centre, University of Cambridge; Luke Kemp, Australia National University; Shahar Avin, Centre for the Study of Existential Risk, University of Cambridge; Phil Torres, Institute of Philosophy, Leibniz University Hannover; Haydn Belfield, Leverhulme Centre for the Future of Intelligence, University of Cambridge, "Assessing Climate Change’s Contribution to Global Catastrophic Risk," Futures, Vol. 127, March 2021, ScienceDirect.

While most of the impacts of climate change so far have fallen within the range of what was experienced during the Holocene, the rate of change is faster than in the Holocene and we are now beginning to see climate change push beyond these boundaries. In the latest edition of the planetary boundaries’ framework, climate change is placed in the zone of increasing risk, implying that while this boundary has been breached, there remains some potential for normal functioning and recovery (Steffen et al. 2015). It thus lies between what the authors identify as the ‘safe zone’ and other ‘high risk’ transgressions, such as disruption to the biochemical flows of nitrogen and phosphorus and loss of biosphere integrity.

As part of their discussion of BRIHN Baum and Handoh (2014) note that climate change is the planetary boundary for which the risk to humanity has received most meaningful consideration and they suggest that this attention is deserved. Yet little research attention has been paid to climate change’s extreme or catastrophic effects. Kareiva and Carranza (2018) argue that, despite currently falling outside of the area of high risk, climate change has the clear potential to push humanity across a threshold of irreversible loss by “changing major ocean circulation patterns, causing massive sea-level rise, and increasing the frequency and severity of extreme events… that displace people, and ruin economies.” Even if humanity was resilient to each of these individual impacts, a global catastrophe could occur if these impacts were to occur rapidly and simultaneously.

One scenario that has received comparatively more attention is that of the global climate crossing a tipping point that would trigger environmental feedback loops (such as declining albedo from melting ice or the release of methane from clathrates) and cascading effects (such a shifting rainfall patterns that trigger desertification and soil erosion). After this point, anthropogenic activity may cease to be the main driver of climate change, making it accelerate and become harder to stop (King et al. 2015).

Other scenarios can be discerned from the numerous historical cases in which the modest, usually regional, climatic changes experienced during the Holocene have been implicated in the collapse of previous societies, including the Anasazi, the Tiwanaku, the Akkadians, the Western Roman Empire, the lowland Maya, and dozens of others (Diamond 2005, Fagan 2008). These provide a precedent for how a changing climate can trigger or contribute to societal breakdown. At present, our understanding of this phenomena is limited, and the IPCC has labelled its findings as “low confidence” due to a lack of understanding of cause and effect and restrictions in historical data (Klein et al. 2014). Further study and cooperation between archaeologists, historians, climate scientists and global catastrophic risk scholars could overcome some of these limitations by identifying how the impacts of climate change translate into social transformation and collapse, and hence what the impacts of more rapid and extreme climatic changes might be. There is also the potential for larger studies into how global climate variations have coincided with collapse and violence at the regional level (Zhang 2005; 2006). However, these need to be interpreted and generalized with care given the differences between pre-industrial and modern societies.

Societies also have a long history of adapting to, and recovering from, climate change induced collapses (McAnay and Yoffee 2009). However, there are two reasons to be sceptical that such resilience can be easily extrapolated into the future. First, the relatively stable context of the Holocene, with well-functioning, resilient ecosystems, has greatly assisted recovery, while anthropogenic climate change is more rapid, pervasive, global, and severe. Large-scale states did not emerge until the onset of the Holocene (Richerson et al, 2001), and societies have since remained in a surprisingly narrow climatic niche of roughly 15 mean annual average temperature (Xu et al, 2020). A return to agrarian or hunter-gatherer lifestyles could thus have more devastating and long-lasting effects in a world of rapid climate change and ecological disruption (Gowder 2020).[12] Second, modern human societies may have developed hidden fragilities that amplify the shocks posed by climate change (Mannheim 2020) and the complex, tightly-coupled and interdependent nature of our socio-economic systems makes it more likely that the failure of a few key states or industries due to climate change could cascade into a global collapse (Kemp 2019b).

A third set of plausible scenarios stem from climate change’s broader environmental impacts. Apart from being a planetary boundary of its own, Steffen et al. (2015) point out that climate change is intimately connected with other planetary boundaries (see Table 1). Climate change is thus identified by the authors as one of two ‘core' boundaries with the potential “to drive the Earth system into a new state should they be substantially and persistently transgressed.” This transformative potential was elaborated on in subsequent work exploring how the world could be pushed towards a ‘Hothouse Earth’ state, even with anthropogenic temperature rises as low as 2°C (Steffen et al. 2018).

[Figure omitted]

The connection between climate change and biosphere integrity (the survival of complex adaptive ecosystems supporting diverse forms of life) is particularly strong. The IPCC is highly confident that climate change is adversely impacting terrestrial ecosystems, contributing to desertification and land degradation in many areas and changing the range, abundance and seasonality of many plant and animal species (Arneth et al. 2019). Similarly, the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) has reported that climate change is restricting the range of nearly half the world’s threatened mammal species and a quarter of threatened birds, with marine, coastal, and arctic ecosystems worst affected (Diaz et al. 2019). According to one estimate, climate change could cause 15-37% of all species to become ‘committed to extinction’ by mid-century (Thomas et al. 2004).

Disruption to biosphere integrity can have profound economic and social repercussions, ranging from loss of ecosystem services and natural resources to the destruction of traditional knowledge and livelihoods. For instance, desertification, which threatens a quarter of Earth’s land area and a fifth of the population, is already estimated to cost developing nations 4-8% of their GDP (United Nations 2011). Many other rapid regime shifts involving loss of biosphere integrity have been observed, including shifts in arid vegetation, freshwater eutrophication, and the collapse of fish populations (Amano et al. 2020). There is a theoretical possibility of still more profound regime shifts at the global level (Rocha et al. 2018). However, the contribution of loss of biosphere integrity to GCR is yet to be assessed. Kareiva and Carranza (2018) argue that it is unlikely to threaten human civilization, due both to a lack of plausible mechanisms for this threat and the fact that “local and regional biodiversity is often staying the same because species from elsewhere replace local losses.” However, in their classification of GCRs, Avin et al. (2018) suggest the potential for ecological collapse to threaten the safety boundaries of multiple critical systems with diverse spread mechanisms at a range of scales, from the biogeochemical and anatomical to the ecological and sociotechnological. Note that both these studies were conducted for largely conceptual purposes and should not be taken as rigorous analyses of this risk, this topic warrants further investigation.

3.2 Classifying Climate Change’s Contributions to Global Catastrophic Risk

Climate change's contribution to GCR goes well beyond its impact on the earth system. Taking Avin et al.’s list of critical systems, we note that previous studies have mostly focused on the effects of climate change on physical and biogeochemical systems (e.g. global temperature and sea-level rise) or the lower-level critical systems that are most directly related to human health and survival (e.g. Heath Stress). However, these represent a very limited assessment of risk as it only accounts for climate change as a direct hazard/threat and our "ontological" vulnerabilities to it. A more comprehensive risk assessment must consider the higher-order critical systems threatened by climate change passively (through a lack of alternatives) and actively (through intentional design).

The probability of a global catastrophe is higher when socio-technological and environmental systems are tightly coupled, creating a potential for reinforcing feedback loops. If environmental change produces social changes that perpetuate further environmental change, then this could actively work against our efforts at adaptation. When this change has the potential to produce significant harm, via human vulnerabilities and exposure, we describe such loops as ‘global systems death spirals.’ These spirals could produce self-perpetuating catastrophes, whereby the energy and resources required to reverse or adapt to collapse are beyond the means of dwindling human societies. Feedback loops like this could thus create tipping points beyond which returning to anything like present conditions would become extremely difficult. Global systems would shift to very different states in which the prospects for humanity would likely be bleaker.

In the rest of this section, we explore just one potential spiral, between an ecological system (the biosphere) and two sociotechnological systems (the human food and global political systems). We explore each system and its interactions. Figure 2 illustrates our model of this spiral.

[Figure omitted]

The human food system

Climate change’s impact on biosphere integrity (discussed in the previous section) could harm the human food system due to loss of ecosystem services, disruption of the cycles of water, nitrogen and phosphates, and changes in the dynamics of plant and animal health (Bélanger and Pilling 2019). Crossing this planetary boundary is already having severe implications for global food security, including loss of soil fertility and insect-mediated pollination (Diaz et al. 2019).

Systems for the production and allocation of food are already enduring significant stress. The sources of stress include climate change, soil erosion, water scarcity, and phosphorus depletion. The natural resource base, arable land and freshwater upon which food production rely are being degraded. While global food productivity and production has increased dramatically over the past century to meet rising demand from an expanding global population and rising standard of living, these constraints and risks are increasing the vulnerability of our global food supply to rapid and global disruptions that could constitute global catastrophes (Baum et al. 2015).

Climate change will further reduce food security in at least three interconnected ways. First, it will affect growing conditions, including direct threats to agricultural yields from heat, humidity, and precipitation in many regions; although initially improving conditions in some (Lott, Christidis and Stott 2013). Second, it will increase the range of agricultural pests and diseases (Harvell 2002). Third, it will increase the occurrence of extreme weather events that impair the integrity of food production and distribution networks, from production to harvest, post-harvest, transport, storage, and distribution, thereby increasing our vulnerability and exposure to supply shocks (Bailey et al. 2015). The IPCC estimates, with medium confidence, that at around 2°C of global warming the risk from permafrost degradation and food supply instabilities will be ‘very high’, while at around 3°C of global warming the risk from vegetation loss, wildfire damage, and dryland water scarcity will also be very high (Arneth et al. 2019). Very few studies have considered the impacts of 4°C of global warming or more; however, the IPCC highlighted one study finding that any potential agricultural gains from climate change will be lost by this point and there could be a decrease of 19% in maize yields and 68% in bean yields in Africa, an 8% reduction in yields in South Asia, and a substantial negative impact on fisheries by 2050 (Porter et al. 2014). Furthermore, multiple extreme weather events could disrupt food distribution networks (Baily and Wellesley 2017).

While there are opportunities to adapt, disruption to the entire global food system cannot be resolved via food aid alone. Indeed, there is the potential for isolationist or heavy-handed responses that would do more harm than good. Given the high degree of interconnectivity and feedback within the global food system, our initial research suggests that any one of these climate change effects could trigger scenarios that would critically undermine the global food system’s ability to meet the minimum nutrition for well-being; making food security for all an unachievable goal, let alone rise to the challenge of continuing to grow (Tzachor 2019a; 2020); this would constitute what Kuhlemann (2019) terms a ‘threshold of significance.’

The global political system

Disrupting the global food system can create and exacerbate conflict and state failure (Brinkman and Hendrix 2011). However, once again, this needs to be seen against the backdrop of a global political system under stress, with climate change as a significant contributing factor. Climate change influences political systems in many ways, from being a locus of activism and a stimulus for reform to driving rising inequality and population displacement (Arneth et al. 2019, Diffenbaugh and Burke 2019). This is not a new phenomenon, changes in the climate are believed to have contributed to conflict between people and states throughout human history, driven by resource scarcity, population displacement, and inequality (Lee 2009, Mach et al. 2019). As part of a comprehensive risk assessment of climate change, David King and colleagues (2015) conducted an extensive literature review on climate change and conflict and used this to inform a series of international wargaming exercises. These found that climate change is expected to increase international conflict while highlighting the role that population displacement, state failure, and water and food insecurity would play in this (see also Natalini, Jones and Bravo 2015, Mach et al. 2019).

Quantitative studies of the impact of climate change on violence and conflict have provided more mixed results. A survey of empirical studies by Detges (2017) found that there may be multiple differing trends: extreme weather events appear to have more significant effects on violence than do long-term climate trends, while levels of small-scale conflict and interpersonal violence appear to be more affected than large-scale conflicts and international war. Empirical studies also highlight how climate change’s impact on conflict is predominantly as a risk multiplier and intensifier. Thus, climate change may contribute more by increasing our vulnerability to other conflict-inducing factors, such as loss of livelihood, forced migration, environmental change, and food insecurity, than by acting as a direct cause of conflict (Schubert et al. 2008, Hsiang et al. 2013, Abel et al. 2019).[13]

Of particular relevance to GCR is the effect of climate change on the risk of nuclear war (Parthemore, Femia and Werrell 2018). However, to our knowledge, this has never been rigorously assessed, although the potential is certainly there. One recent model of the risk of nuclear war highlighted how varied, and common, incidents with the potential to trigger a nuclear exchange are (Baum, de Neufville and Barrett 2018). It outlined 14 different causal pathways to an exchange, including the escalation of conventional wars and international crises, human error, and the emergence of new non-state actors. For all but two of these, they identify historical examples of potentially precipitating incidents, with 60 incidents in total (i.e. a little less than one a year). This suggests that the absence of nuclear war was less due to a lack of potential causes, than the global political system’s ability to defuse them. Thus, the real significance of climate change may be its capacity to undermine this system: the combination of social, political, and environmental disruption, a lingering sense of global injustice, and rising food, water, and energy insecurity could increase the probability that crises escalate or that false alarms are mistaken for genuine emergencies. This topic needs further research.

3.3 The emergence of a global systems death spiral

Yet, we should not conclude that a nuclear exchange is the only, or even most likely, scenario in which political instability might produce a global catastrophe. Conflict and political instability, even of moderate severity, are themselves two of the most significant drivers of biodiversity loss due to breakdowns in monitoring, governance, and (public and private) property rights (Baynham-Herd et al. 2018). This closes a potentially reinforcing feedback loop between loss of biosphere integrity, food insecurity and political breakdown.

The mechanisms by which these cascading failures might spread include many of the natural, anthropogenic, and replicator effects identified by Avin et al. (2018), making them harder to contain. At the natural level, climate change involves changes to the global atmospheric and biogeochemical systems and poses other naturally spreading harms, like global ecological collapse. At the anthropogenic level, the global interconnectedness of sociotechnological systems means that while small shocks are easier to recover from, larger shocks can be harder to contain and control. Finally, biological and informational replication can also spread the negative impacts of climate change, from vector-borne diseases and invasive species to climate fatalism and dangerous geoengineering technologies.

Given these numerous spread mechanisms, critical system failures could precipitate global catastrophes. Furthermore, the spiral we have explored is unlikely to be the only set of interlinked systemic disruptions that climate change could initiate (other death spirals could involve bio-insecurity and disease), nor are these the only causal connections between these three systems. Until we understand the nature of such death spirals better, we must act cautiously. We now turn to consider what this would mean.

#### Ozone depletion causes extinction.

Dogra 6/26/20 [Sarthak, Author at the India Times. “Ozone Layer Depletion Caused Mass Extinction On Earth, **Which May Repeat Say Scientists**.” India Times. <https://www.indiatimes.com/technology/science-and-future/ozone-layer-depletion-mass-extinction-earth-516536.html>] Justin

Around 359 million years ago, there was a mass extinction of terrestrial life forms on Earth, and it all happened due to ozone layer depletion.

Much of the prevailing forest ecosystems and species of fish and tetrapods were killed during the last great mass extinction event.

To date, the event was unexplained for its causes. Now scientists say that the mass extinction was caused by harmful UV-B radiation that entered the Earth due to a reduced ozone layer.

Researchers at the University of Southampton have found out that the mass extinction at the transition of Earth from Devonian to Carboniferous (geological time periods) was “coincident with a major climatic warming.” The warming ended an intense Devonian glacial cycle but with it, caused the reduction of the ozone layer. Scientists analysed the rocks dating back to the time to conclude that, unlike other mass extinctions, volcanic eruptions were not the reason for this mass extinction. Such an extinction mechanism has been “newly discovered” as per the scientists and has serious consequences for Earth in today’s time, with global warming on the rise. Ozone layer experiment The team collected rock samples from the ice-capped and steep mountains of East Greenland as well as from the Andean Mountains above Lake Titicaca in Bolivia. While the former region was located in the southern hemisphere in the Devonian period, the latter was much closer to the Earth’s south pole at the time. The variation thus helped scientists judge what was happening at different locations at the time of the mass extinction. The team then dissolved the rocks in hydrofluoric acid, thus releasing microscopic plant spores, preserved in the cold climate for hundreds of millions of years. When the scientists examined these samples under a microscope, they found bizarre spines on the surface of many of the spores.

This was concluded to be a sign of a damaged DNA because of exposure to UV radiation. Many spores had even developed dark pigmented walls as a protection from the high UV levels.

Ozone layer importance for life

The mass extinction was thus, not caused by any geological event on Earth but due to high UV radiations on the planet, indicating a collapse in the ozone layer for a brief period. In this period, a huge portion of the prevailing life on Earth died to due to exposure to harmful levels of UV radiation.

The study is significant in a crucial aspect. Scientists warn that this is a fundamental aspect of planet Earth. Whenever it becomes too hot, its ozone layer is considerably depleted, allowing harmful UV radiations to enter the Earth’s atmosphere.

Now published in the journal Science Advances, the study concludes “ozone loss during rapid warming is an inherent Earth system process with the unavoidable conclusion that we should be alert for such an eventuality in the future warming world.”

#### Rivalrous orbits create space conflict and turn good satellites.

Samson 22 – Victoria Samson is the Washington office director for the Secure World Foundation, an organization that focuses on space sustainability, and she has over 20 years of experience in military space and security issues. Previously, Ms. Samson was a senior analyst for the Center for Defense Information. She also was a senior policy associate at the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, a consortium of arms control groups. Earlier, she was a researcher at Riverside Research Institute, where she worked on war-gaming scenarios for the Missile Defense Agency. 1/17/22. [Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, “The complicating role of the private sector in space,” DOI: 10.1080/00963402.2021.2014229] Justin

At this exact moment, we are seeing the increasing dominance of commercial actors in space – specifically the rise of mega-constellations, or large numbers of small satellites flying in formation to provide global coverage for a variety of governmental and commercial uses, including both communications and Earth observation. Consequently, the fundamental nature of space is changing, to one of a domain dominated by commercial actors. This change will have major consequences for international stability, both in terms of how it demonstrates that the old governance structure for space is being left behind – and how it highlights Russia’s declining rank in global space powers. Certain orbits may be effectively taken over by a handful of entities, and there will be competition for useful portions of the electromagnetic spectrum. With eyes on the sky everywhere, there will be little or no room for state secrets – for better or worse. This is happening at the same time that Russia’s space identity is floundering, which may further upset the stability of the domain of space.

As of November 2021, there are roughly 4,800 active satellites in orbit around Earth, around 1,850 of which belong to just one entity: SpaceX’s Starlink mega-constellation (Thompson 2021). This change has happened very quickly, as Starlink satellites just began to be launched in May 2019 (O’Callaghan 2019). This is only the first wave of the megaconstellations as well. While it is hard to say exactly how many satellites will be launched as part of this new use of space, there are requests or plans for mega-constellations that could mean well over 100,000 new satellites could potentially be in low Earth orbit. While not all of these satellites will be launched, even a small fraction of that proposed number will fundamentally shift the situation so that the major actors in space will no longer be nation-states (as has been the case to date) but the private sector, changing the timbre of the space domain.

This leads to challenges in discussing space security issues: Space is a shared, international domain; if we cannot include all the stakeholders in the discussions, we will not come to complete solutions to the problems. But first, some background.

A little history

The commercial sector is not new to space. Commercial entities have been active in space for decades now; in fact, it was a dispute over what should be the extent of their role in space that shaped part of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty. Article VI of that treaty notes:

States Parties to the Treaty shall bear international responsibility for national activities in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, whether such activities are carried on by governmental agencies or by non-governmental entities . . .. The activities of nongovernmental entities in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, shall require authorization and continuing supervision by the appropriate State Party to the Treaty. (Outer Space Treaty 1967)

This was a compromise between the United States and the USSR, in which the latter argued that there was no such thing as commercial space. Having language requiring state actors to carry out “authorization and continuing supervision” gave the United States the flexibility it wanted to develop a commercial space sector while ensuring that there would still be national oversight.

A lack of coordination

One way in which the rise of these mega-constellations may complicate international security in space is through concerns about these satellites hampering access to certain orbits. While slots in geosynchronous Earth orbit are set by the International Telecommunication Union, there is no international entity coordinating orbital slots at low Earth orbit. This means that, given the potentially tens of thousands of satellites that could be launched given company plans, certain orbits could be de facto ceded to a handful of entities – in defiance of Article II of the Outer Space Treaty, which says that space “is not subject to national appropriation.” Consequently, this could lead to strife or competition over certain orbits.

It is possible that, given the number of satellites that companies are asking the United States’ Federal Communications Commission for broadcasting rights to, certain orbits may reach their carrying capacities – meaning that they are at the maximum number of satellites that can be operated, as defined by physical and radiofrequency interference aspects. This could lead to disputes over which country has the right to use certain orbits, or, alternatively, resentment when one country’s commercial sector essentially takes over a particular orbit

Competition over parts of the electromagnetic spectrum is another possible path for international security issues to arise from mega-constellations. Satellites are only as good as their ability to receive and communicate information, which requires spectrum; if one or a few entities from one country use up all the readily accessible spectrum for specific capabilities at certain orbits, that could possibly lead to confrontation as well. For the most part, the companies launching mega-constellations are largely based in the West, which can shape the global perception of their effects and intent – although there have been some plans for at least one Chinese company to launch a mega-constellation of potentially 13,000 satellites, and the South Koreans have expressed interest in their own mega-constellation.

#### Triggers space escalation and nuclear war.

Perez 21 – Veronica Delgado-Perez is a Staff Writer at The International Scholar. 12/14/21 – Note, doesn’t say date but most recent cited event is 2021, correct if I’m wrong. [The International Scholar, “Argument | The Commercialization of Space Risks Launching a Militarized Space Race,” <https://www.theintlscholar.com/periodical/12/14/2020/analysis-commercialization-space-risk-international-law-military-space-race>] Justin

With new actors on the game stage, conflicts of interest may arise. There is a risk that each actor adopts a kind of short-term Realist approach to space policy — one which is driven by self-interest in reaping the greatest benefits of extraterrestrial exploration and commercialization while controlling access to others. If unmitigated, states may choose to militarize outer space to gain a strategic edge over competitors and adversaries.

This process has already begun. Under the Trump administration, the Pentagon established the U.S. Space Force as a new branch of the Armed Forces to protect the country and allied interests in space. Already, Delta 4 — one of the U.S. Space Force’s missions — conducts strategic and theater missile warnings, manages weapon systems, and provides information to missile defense forces. The measure shows that for the U.S., outer space is not only a domain of scientific exploration but has the potential to become increasingly securitized.

With the impending expiration of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) between the U.S. and Russia on February 5, 2021, a number of security dilemmas could arise. If the world’s two largest nuclear powers do not edge toward extending the treaty, Washington and Moscow risk returning to the era of unrestricted expansion of launch platforms and strategically-deployed nuclear warheads — potentially with the aid of military infrastructure in space.

Although President-elect Biden has expressed his interest in negotiating an extension of New START, how Moscow and Washington might proceed remains an open question. Bilateral progress towards a new arms-control regime would require establishing limits on the number and range of long- and mid-range missiles, establishing measures to limit the expansion of traditional missile deployment to space, and banning the deployment of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction in outer space.

#### Satellites are key to preventing droughts---they are a large conflict multiplier AND triggers international security threats.

Givetash 12/25/18 [Linda Givetash is a Johannesburg-based freelance journalist. “Early-warning tools aim to prevent 'water wars,' curb droughts.” NBC News. <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/world/early-warning-tools-aim-prevent-water-wars-curb-droughts-n917001>] Justin

LONDON — In a year of extreme heat and water-related tensions, researchers are trying to develop an early-warning system to prevent the devastating consequences of droughts that exacerbate geopolitical tensions.

The Water, Peace and Security partnership aims to find better methods to monitor risks and trigger early interventions. Such technology is necessary as climate change amplifies water shortages plaguing countries across the globe.

The U.S. Department of Defense has warned that water scarcity is a global security threat because it drives instability that can lead to wider terrorism and violence.

The partnership — formed earlier this year by academics in Europe and the U.S. — aims to pinpoint locations where water crises and other overlapping vulnerabilities could stir conflicts.

"The idea is to identify hotspots early enough so policy action can be taken before something escalates into violence," said Susanne Schmeier, a lecturer in water law and diplomacy at IHE Delft and coordinator of the partnership.

Schmeier cautioned against labeling events as "water wars," explaining that there’s no evidence to suggest water scarcity directly triggers war. But it can compound tensions in regions wracked with political instability or poverty. Water scarcity has been attributed to playing a role in Syria’s civil war and the spread of militant groups such as Boko Haram in the Lake Chad basin.

The warning system being developed uses a range of data including hydrological information and satellite imaging to monitor and calculate risks to water access around the globe. To determine the risk for conflicts, it tracks media reports in more than 100 languages by flagging a list of keywords in real time.

#### Water wars escalate and cause global nuclear conflict.

Jamail 2/11/19 [Dahr Jamail, a Truthout contributing writer, Board of Advisers member and former staff reporter, is the author of The End of Ice: Bearing Witness and Finding Meaning in the Path of Climate Disruption (The New Press, 2019), The Will to Resist: Soldiers Who Refuse to Fight in Iraq and Afghanistan (Haymarket Books, 2009), and Beyond the Green Zone: Dispatches From an Unembedded Journalist in Occupied Iraq (Haymarket Books, 2007). Jamail reported from Iraq for more than a year, as well as from Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and Turkey over the last 10 years, and has won the Izzy Award and the Martha Gellhorn Award for Investigative Journalism, among other awards. His third book, The Mass Destruction of Iraq: Why It Is Happening, and Who Is Responsible, co-written with William Rivers Pitt, is available now on Amazon. He lives and works in Washington State. “The World Is on the Brink of Widespread Water Wars.” Truthout. <https://truthout.org/articles/the-world-is-on-the-brink-of-widespread-water-wars/>] Justin

The most recent United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report warned of increasingly intense droughts and mass water shortages around large swaths of the globe.

But even more conservative organizations have been sounding the alarm. “Water insecurity could multiply the risk of conflict,” warns one of the World Bank’s reports on the issue. “Food price spikes caused by droughts can inflame latent conflicts and drive migration. Where economic growth is impacted by rainfall, episodes of droughts and floods have generated waves of migration and spikes in violence within countries.”

In some places conflict is practically guaranteed.

Meanwhile, a study published in the journal Global Environmental Change, looked at how “hydro-political issues” — including tensions and potential conflicts — could play out in countries expected to experience water shortages coupled with high populations and pre-existing geopolitical tensions.

The study warned that these factors could combine to increase the likelihood of water-related tensions — potentially escalating into armed conflict in cross-boundary river basins in places around the world by 74.9 to 95 percent. This means that in some places conflict is practically guaranteed.

These areas include regions situated around primary rivers in Asia and North Africa. Noted rivers include the Tigris and Euphrates, the Indus, the Nile, and the Ganges-Brahmaputra.

Consider the fact that 11 countries share the Nile River basin: Egypt, Burundi, Kenya, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Uganda, Rwanda, Sudan, South Sudan, Tanzania and the Democratic Republic of Congo. All told, more than 300 million people already live in these countries, — a number that is projected to double in the coming decades, while the amount of available water will continue to shrink due to climate change.

For those in the US thinking these potential conflicts will only occur in distant lands — think again. The study also warned of a very high chance of these “hydro-political interactions” in portions of the southwestern US and northern Mexico, around the Colorado River.

India and Pakistan

Potential tensions are particularly worrisome in India and Pakistan, which are already rivals when it comes to water resources. For now, these two countries have an agreement, albeit a strained one, over the Indus River and the sharing of its water, by way of the 1960 Indus Water Treaty.

However, water claims have been central to their ongoing, burning dispute over the Kashmir region, a flashpoint area there for more than 60 years and counting.

The aforementioned treaty is now more strained than ever, as Pakistan accuses India of limiting its water supply and violating the treaty by placing dams over various rivers that flow from Kashmir into Pakistan.

In fact, a 2018 report from the International Monetary Fund ranked Pakistan third among countries facing severe water shortages, This is largely due to the rapid melting of glaciers in the Himalaya that are the source of much of the water for the Indus.

For those in the US thinking these potential conflicts will only occur in distant lands — think again.

To provide an idea of how quickly water resources are diminishing in both countries, statistics from Pakistan’s Islamabad Chamber of Commerce and Industry from 2018 show that water availability (per capita in cubic meters per year) shrank from 5,260 in 1951, to 940 in 2015, and are projected to shrink to 860 by just 2025.

In India, the crisis is hardly better. According to that country’s Ministry of Statistics (2016) and the Indian Ministry of Water Resources (2010), the per capita available water in cubic meters per year was 5,177 in 1951, and 1,474 in 2015, and is projected to shrink to 1,341 in 2025.

Both of these countries are nuclear powers. Given the dire projections of water availability as climate change progresses, nightmare scenarios of water wars that could spark nuclear exchanges are now becoming possible.

As if to underscore all of this, even the US military recently warned that climate change is a worldwide threat. The military’s Worldwide Threat Assessment report warned that climate change and other types of environmental degradation threatened global stability because they are “likely to fuel competition for resources, economic distress, and social discontent through 2019 and beyond.”

#### Debris cascades triggers global grid shutdown---generator dispersion is dependent on satellites.

Silberg 1/26/14 [Bob Silberg, NASA’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory. “Satellites help power grid keep its balance.” Climate.NASA.Gov. <https://climate.nasa.gov/news/1027/satellites-help-power-grid-keep-its-balance/>] Justin

Imagine a generator pumping more electricity than a nuclear power plant into the grid, but inconsistently and without the grid’s caretakers being able to see what it was doing. How could they maintain the critical balance between generation and consumption that the grid requires? A key to the answer hovers some 22,000 miles overhead.

The amount of electricity fed into an electrical grid at any given moment must equal the amount that is being used at that moment. Too much or too little could damage the millions of electrical devices connected to the grid or even trigger a power outage. Nine of North America’s largest grids have special independent organizations charged with maintaining that balance.

California Independent Service Operator (ISO) manages the grid that serves most of California and a chunk of Nevada. They rebalance the grid’s intake and output every four seconds, using sophisticated algorithms to forecast demand and a variety of ways to adjust the wattage they introduce into the system throughout the day. But they can only manage what they can see: the big power plants that produce the bulk of the system’s electricity. “We can’t see the solar panels on the rooftop of your house,” said Jim Blatchford, the ISO’s short-term forecasting manager. “We don’t know how much they are reducing your demand or feeding back into the grid.” And that’s a significant challenge.

More electricity than a power plant

The nearly 200,000 solar installations on private homes and businesses in California, taken together, generate more electricity than any power plant in the state. Clearly, grid managers need to take them into account to calculate accurately how much electricity the grid should carry.

But this multitude of small solar setups is scattered over a vast area with a wide range of highly variable weather conditions that affect how much sunlight each one receives—and therefore how much electricity it produces—at any given moment. The sun may shine brightly on a rooftop in Bakersfield while a bungalow in Santa Monica is shrouded in fog. When the fog lifts and those panels begin to produce, a morning shower may dampen productivity in San Francisco while a giant cloud bank plays peekaboo with the sun over Sacramento.

Tracking all those solar panels and their ever-changing environments may seem like herding cats, but a company called Clean Power Research (CPR) has developed a solution that the California ISO is currently testing. CPR accumulated information about the state’s small solar installations by playing a role in registering them for rebates. So they know where the solar panels are and the size, angle and shading characteristics of each group.

What remains is to determine how much sunlight reaches each set of solar panels at any given time, and that’s where the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite (GOES) system comes in.

CPR uses a stream of data from GOES in real time to characterize how much sunlight each relevant square kilometer of California is receiving and to forecast how the picture is going to change over the course of a week. “If you look at a series of those GOES images, you can track the motion of the clouds,” said Adam Kankiewicz, Solar Research Specialist at CPR. “You can say if it’s gone from here to here in the last hour, we predict that it’s going to go, say, 10 kilometers in that direction in two hours. For short-term forecasting, that's the most accurate method out there.”

Hour by hour

“We model each of those nearly 200,000 systems individually,” said Mark Liffmann, who is Vice President of Business Development, Sales and Marketing at CPR. “We use the irradiance (the measurement of sunlight intensity) to determine how much electricity each system is likely to produce each hour for the next seven days, and then we aggregate those forecasts and feed that into the ISO’s software so they can determine how much generation they’ll need to meet the net load.”

CPR’s software and the ISO’s software engage in an ongoing dialogue to keep the balancing authority up to date. “It needs to happen quickly in real time,” Liffmann said. “You need the ongoing forecast continuously to be able to accurately calculate what solar panels are going to provide and therefore what traditional resources you are going to need to turn on and off.”

California ISO’s Blatchford points out that the monitoring and forecasting that GOES enables can also help his organization determine what to expect from the large, commercial solar stations in its system. Their output is just as dependent on weather conditions as a small rooftop system.

“The sun angle plays a big part in it, too,” he said. “A cloud 10 miles away from the plant could be in between the plant and the sun.”

Despite the challenges they present, having California’s single largest generator in the form of 200,000 widely dispersed solar-panel setups has a big potential upside. “It gives you two advantages,” Liffmann said. “One, you don’t have a single point of failure. If one system goes down, it’s a small percentage of the total generation. The other is that it smooths out a lot of the weather variation. As long as you can forecast it well, it’s a great benefit.”

And the view from 22,000 miles up is indispensible to making those forecasts. “GOES satellites are the only available source for the images we need over North America,” Kankiewicz said.

#### Grid security is an impact filter.

Denkenberger 21 – David Denkenberger, Anders Sandberg, Ross John Tieman, and Joshua M. Pearce, \*Assistant professor of mechanical engineering at University of Alaska Fairbanks, “Long-term cost-effectiveness of interventions for loss of electricity/industry compared to artificial general intelligence safety,” 2021, *European Journal of Futures Research*, Vol. 9, Issue 1, https://doi.org/10.1186/s40309-021-00178-z, EA Recut Justin

Civilization relies on a network of highly interdependent critical infrastructure (CI) to provide basic necessities (water, food, shelter, basic goods), as well as complex items (computers, cars, space shuttles) and services (the internet, cloud computing, global supply chains), henceforth referred to as industry. Electricity and the electrical infrastructure that distributes it plays an important role within industry, providing a convenient means to distribute energy able to be converted into various forms of useful work. Electricity is one component of industry albeit a critical one. Industry provides the means to sustain advanced civilization structures and the citizens that inhabit them. These structures play a critical role in realizing various futures by allowing humanity to discover and utilize new resources, adapt to various environments, and resist natural stressors.

Though industry is capable of resisting small stressors, a sufficiently large event can precipitate cascading failure of CI systems, resulting in a collapse of industry. If one does not temporally discount the value of future people, the long-term future (thousands, millions, or even billions of years) could contain an astronomically large amount of value [18]. Events capable of curtailing the potential of civilization (existential risks, such as human extinction or an unrecoverable collapse) would prevent such futures from being achieved, implying reducing the likelihood of such events is of the utmost importance [100]. Reducing the prevalence of existential risks factors; events, systemic structures, or biases which increase the likelihood of extinction but do not cause extinction by themselves is also highly valuable. Complete collapse or degraded function of industry would drastically reduce humanity’s capacity to coordinate and deploy technology to prevent existential risks, representing an existential risk factor. Consequently, interventions preventing loss of industry, reducing the magnitude of impacts, or increasing speed of recovery could be extremely valuable.

Existential risk research is, by nature, future focused, requiring the investigation of events that have not yet occurred. Futures studies methodologies are often applied to uncover salient trends or events, and explore potential causal structures [54, 123]. Probabilistic modeling techniques can then be used to determine the likelihood of such events occurring, including adequate treatment of uncertainty [101]. The cost-effectiveness modeling approach outlined in this paper is an example of this, attempting to assess the marginal utility of losing industry interventions on improving the long-term future. This approach could guide future efforts to assess the relative cost-effectiveness of interventions for different risks, existential or otherwise. More practically, this research can inform prioritization efforts of industrialized countries by providing estimates of the cost of global industrial collapse, and the utility of resilience interventions. This is relevant to the European Union which has a highly industrialized economy, providing $2.3 Trillion USD of the $13.7 Trillion USD global total of value add manufacturing [122]. The EU has shifted toward a more proactive foresight approach about natural and man-made disasters, noting the importance of rare high-impact events, systemic risks, and converging trends requiring better data and forecasting to drive a more ambitious crisis management system [47]. Still, it is clear that most academic and institutional emphasis has been on “ordinary” rather than extreme disasters, and risks from industry to the public and environment rather than widespread failures of industrial services causing harm. The integrated nature of the electric grid, which is based on centralized generation makes the entire system vulnerable to disruption.1 There are a number of anthropogenic and natural catastrophes that could result in regional-scale electrical grid failure, which would be expected to halt the majority of industries and machines in that area. A high-altitude electromagnetic pulse (HEMP) caused by a nuclear weapon could disable electricity over part of a continent [16, 48, 66, 93]. This could destroy the majority of electrical grid infrastructure, and as fossil fuel extraction and industry is reliant on electricity [49], industry would be disabled. Similarly, solar storms have destroyed electrical transformers connected to long transmission lines in the past [117]. The Carrington event in 1859 damaged telegraph lines, which was the only electrical infrastructure in existence at the time. It also caused Aurora Borealis that was visible in Cuba and Jamaica [70]. This could potentially disable electrical systems at high latitudes, which could represent 10% of electricity/industry globally. Though solar storms may last less than the 12 h that would be required to expose the entire earth with direct line of sight, the earth’s magnetic field lines redirect the storm to affect the opposite side of the earth [117]. Lastly, both physical [6, 8, 69, 89, 111] and cyber attacks [3, 63, 90, 96, 118, 128, 130] could also compromise electric grids. Physical attacks include traditional acts of terrorism such as bombing or sabotage [130] in addition to EMP attacks. Significant actors could scale up physical attacks, for example by using drones. A scenario could include terrorist groups hindering individual power plants [126], while a large adversary could undertake a similar operation physically to all plants and electrical grids in a region. Unfortunately, the traditional power grid infrastructure is simply incapable of withstanding intentional physical attacks [91]. Damage to the electric grid resulting in physical attack could be long lasting, as most traditional power plants operate with large transformers that are difficult to move and source. Custom rebuilt transformers require time for replacement ranging from months and even up to years [91]. For example, a relatively mild 2013 sniper attack on California’s Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) substation, which injured no one directly, was able to disable 17 transformers supplying power to Silicon Valley. Repairs and improvements cost PG&E roughly $100 million and lasted about a month [10, 102]. A coordinated attack with relatively simple technology (e.g., guns) could cause a regional electricity disruption. However, a high-tech attack could be even further widespread. The Pentagon reports spending roughly $100 million to repair cyber-related damages to the electric grid in 2009 [57]. There is also evidence that a computer virus caused an electrical outage in the Ukraine [56]. Unlike simplistic physical attacks, cyber attackers are capable of penetrating critical electric infrastructure from remote regions of the world, needing only communication pathways (e.g., the Internet or infected memory sticks) to install malware into the control systems of the electric power grid. For example, Stuxnet was a computer worm that destroyed Iranian centrifuges [73] to disable their nuclear industry. Many efforts are underway to harden the grid from such attacks [51, 63]. The U.S. Department of Homeland Security responded to ~ 200 cyber incidents in 2012 and 41% involved the electrical grid [103]. Nations routinely have made attempts to map current critical infrastructure for future navigation and control of the U.S. electrical system [57]. The electric grid in general is growing increasingly dependent upon the Internet and other network connections for data communication and monitoring systems [17, 112, 118, 127, 135]. Although this conveniently allows electrical suppliers management of systems, it increases the susceptibility of the grid to cyber-attack, through denial of webpage services to consumers, disruption to supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) operating systems, or sustained widespread power outages [3, 72, 118, 120]. Thus global or regional loss of the Internet could have similar implications. A less obvious potential cause is a pandemic that disrupts global trade. Countries may ban trade for fear of the disease entering their country, but many countries are dependent on imports for the functioning of their industry. If the region over which electricity is disrupted had significant agricultural production, the catastrophe could be accompanied by a ~ 10% food production shortfall as well. It is uncertain whether countries outside the affected region would help the affected countries, do nothing, or conquer the affected countries. Larger versions of these catastrophes could disrupt electricity/industry globally. For instance, it is possible that multiple HEMPs could be detonated around the world, due to a world nuclear war [105] or due to terrorists gaining control of nuclear weapons. There is evidence that, in the last 2000 years, two solar storms occurred that were much stronger than the Carrington event [85]. Therefore, it is possible that an extreme solar storm could disable electricity and therefore industry globally. It is conceivable that a coordinated cyber or physical attack (or a combination) on many electric grids could also disrupt industry globally. Many of the techniques to harden the electric grid could help with this vulnerability as well as moving to more distributed generation and microgrids [23, 29, 75, 76, 103, 114]. An extreme pandemic could cause enough people to not show up to work such that industrial functioning could not be maintained. Though this could be mitigated by directing military personnel to fill vacant positions, if the pandemic were severe enough, it could be rational to retreat from high human contact industrial civilization in order to limit disease mortality. The global loss of electricity could even be self-inflicted as a way of stopping rogue artificial general intelligence (AGI) [124]. As the current high agricultural productivity depends on industry (e.g., for fertilizers), it has been assumed that there would be mass starvation in these scenarios [107].

Repairing these systems and re-establishing electrical infrastructure would be a goal of the long term and work should ideally start on it immediately after a catastrophe. However, human needs would need to be met immediately (and continually) and since there is only a few months of stored food, it would likely run out before industry is restored with the current state of preparedness. In some of the less challenging scenarios, it may be possible to continue running some machines on the fossil fuels that had previously been brought to the surface or from the use microgrids or shielded electrical systems. In addition, it may be feasible to run some machines on gasified wood [31]. However, in the worst-case scenario, all unshielded electronics would be destroyed.

#### Debris triggers miscalculated war.

Robert Farley 22, Now a 1945 Contributing Editor, Dr. Robert Farley is a Senior Lecturer at the Patterson School at the University of Kentucky. Dr. Farley is the author of Grounded: The Case for Abolishing the United States Air Force (University Press of Kentucky, 2014), the Battleship Book (Wildside, 2016), and Patents for Power: Intellectual Property Law and the Diffusion of Military Technology (University of Chicago, 2020). 1/9/22. [19 Fourty Five, “Does A Space War Mean A Nuclear War?,” <https://www.19fortyfive.com/2022/01/does-a-space-war-mean-a-nuclear-war/>] Justin

The recent Russian anti-satellite test didn’t tell the world anything new, but it did reaffirm the peril posed by warfare in space. Debris from explosions could make some earth orbits remarkably risky to use for both civilian and military purposes. But the test also highlighted a less visible danger; attacks on nuclear command and control satellites could rapidly produce an extremely dangerous escalatory situation in a war between nuclear powers. James Acton and Thomas Macdonald drew attention to this problem in a recent article at Inside Defense. As Acton and MacDonald point out, nuclear command and control satellites are the connective tissue of nuclear deterrence, assuring countries that they’re not being attacked and that they’ll be able to respond quickly if they are.

For a long time, these strategic early-warning satellites were akin to a center of gravity in ICBM warfare. Nuclear deterrence requires awareness that an attack is underway. Attacks on the monitoring system could easily be read as an attempt to ~~blind~~ an opponent in preparation for general war, and could themselves incur nuclear retaliation. Thus, the nuclear command and control satellites are critical to the maintenance of nuclear deterrence. They make it possible to distribute an order from the chief of government to the nuclear delivery systems themselves. Consequently, their destruction might lead to hesitation or delay in performing a nuclear launch order.

It was only later that the relevance of satellites for conventional warfare became clear. Satellites could reconnoiter enemy positions and, more importantly, provide communications for friendly forces. Indeed, the expansion of the role of satellites in conventional warfare has complicated the prospect of space warfare. States have a clear reason for targeting enemy satellites which support conventional warfare, as those satellites enable the most lethal part of the kill chain, the communications and recon networks that link targets with shooters. Thus, we now have a situation in which space military assets have both nuclear and conventional roles. In a conflict confusion and misperception could rapidly become lethal. If one combatant views an attack against nuclear command and control as a prelude to a general nuclear attack, it might choose to pre-empt.

Nuclear powers have dealt with problems in this general category for a good long while; would a conventional attack against tactical nuclear staging areas represent an escalation, for example? Would the use of ballistic missiles that can carry either conventional or nuclear weapons trigger a nuclear response? Do attacks against air defense networks that have both strategic and tactical responsibilities run the risk of triggering a nuclear response? There’s also the danger that damage to communications networks designated for conventional combat could force traffic onto the nuclear control systems, further confusing the issue.

#### **No checks on escalation.**

MacDonald 18. Bruce W. MacDonald, professor at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), ("Outer Space; Earthly Escalation? Chinese Perspectives on Space Operations and Escalation," August 2018, *NSI* white paper, <https://nsiteam.com/social/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/SMA-White-Paper_Chinese-Persepectives-on-Space_-Aug-2018.pdf>, accessed 7-14-2019) bm

Challenges across all five phases: Another escalation threat is the inexperience that nations share in the space and cyber domains, unlike in conventional domains of conflict and in the nuclear domain to a lesser extent. This inexperience gives rise to a “sorcerer’s apprentice” problem, placing leaders at risk of making potentially unwise judgment calls without a full grasp of their implications. The space and cyber domains are sufficiently new and dynamic that such decisions are highly likely. Adding to this uncertainty is the ever-growing interdependence of infrastructures within and among advanced countries, making the impact of major attacks against a country’s space and/or cyber infrastructures inherently unknowable. In considering all these factors, it is important to keep in mind that events in space do not happen in isolation. Any space conflict would likely be part of a multidimensional field of play, with space being important because of the effects it has on the earth. Significant instability in space is unlikely to lead to war if there is stability in other domains and in the larger geopolitical relationship between participants, while conflict could easily spread to a stable space domain if war in other domains appeared preferable to the alternative. While any use of nuclear weapons would pose a serious threat of escalation to full-scale nuclear war, any use of space or cyber offense would not pose a comparable escalation threat. That said, a series of reciprocal escalations could easily become unstable. No clear-cut escalation barrier exists in the space and cyber domains, and given the short-term tactical benefits of escalating ahead of an adversary, each additional escalation could create incentives for further escalation that an adversary would not always anticipate. Escalation in space, then, is a slippery slope with few off-ramps.

#### No limited nuclear wars – extinction.

Webber 19 – Dr Philip Webber has written widely on nuclear issues and is Chair of Scientists for Global Responsibility (SGR) – a membership organisation promoting responsible science and technology. We will all end up killing each other and one nuclear blast could do it. 5/18/19. [METRO.UK “We will all end up killing each other and one nuclear blast could do it,” <https://metro.co.uk/2019/05/18/we-will-all-end-up-killing-each-other-and-one-nuclear-blast-could-do-it-9370115/>] Recut Justin

The nuclear armed nations have inadvertently created a global Doomsday machine, built with 15,000 nuclear weapons.

Most (93%) have been built by Russia and in the US, 3,100 of them are ready to fire within hours.

Pre-programmed targets include main cities as well as a range of military and civilian targets across the world primarily in the UK, Europe, US, Russia and China but also in Japan, Australia and South America.

One nuclear blast, one mistake, one cyber attack could trigger it.

But first a reminder about the incredible destructive power of a nuclear weapon. Modern nuclear warheads are typically 20 times larger than either of the two bombs that obliterated Hiroshima and Nagasaki at the end of the Second World War. What just one nuclear warhead can do is unimaginable. We’ve drawn some of the key features to scale against cityscapes in the UK for a Russian SS-18 RS 20V (NATO designation ‘Satan’) 500kT warhead. US submarines deploy a similar weapon – the Trident II Mk5, 475kT warhead. A deafening, terrifying noise will be created, like an intense thunder that lasts for 10 seconds or longer.

After a blinding flash of light bright destroying the retina of anyone looking, and a violent electromagnetic pulse (EMP) knocking out electrical equipment several miles away, a bomb of this size quickly forms an incandescent fireball 850 metres across.

This is about the same height as the world’s tallest building, the Burj Khalifa. Drawn against the London Canary Wharf financial district or the Manchester skyline, the huge fireball dwarfs one Canary Sq. (240m), the South Tower Deansgate (201m) and the Beetham Tower Hilton, (170m). The fireball engulfs both city centres completely, melting glass and steel and forms an intensely radioactive 60m deep crater zone of molten earth and debris. A devastating supersonic blast wave flattens everything within a radius of two to three km, the entire Manchester centre, an area larger than the City of London, with lighter damage out to eight km. Most people in these areas would be killed or very seriously injured.

The fireball quickly rises forming an enormous characteristic mushroom shaped cloud raining highly radioactive particles (fallout). It rises to 60,000 ft (18,000m) – twice the altitude of Everest – and is 15 miles, 24km across.

This is one warhead. There are 10 such warheads on each of Russia’s 46 missiles (460 in total) and 48 on each of eight US Trident submarines (384 in total). In reality, in a nuclear conflict all of these warheads and a further 956 ready-to-fire are likely to be launched.

Whilst this scale of destruction is horrific and hundreds of millions of people would be killed in a few hours from a combination of blast, radiation and huge fires, there are also terrible longer-term effects.

Scientists predict that huge city-wide firestorms combined with very the high-altitude debris clouds would severely reduce sunlight levels and disrupt the world’s climate for a decade causing drought, a prolonged winter, global famine and catastrophic impacts for all life on earth and in the seas due to intense levels of UV with the destruction of the ozone layer.

But even at the level of a few hundred nuclear warheads, the consequences of a nuclear war would be extremely severe across the world far beyond the areas hit directly. A nuclear conflict between India and Pakistan with ‘only’ 100 small warheads would kill hundreds of millions and cause climate damage leading to a global famine. The sheer destructive nature of nuclear explosions combined with long lasting radiation, means that nuclear weapons are of no military use. ‘Enemy’ territory would be unusable for years because of intense radiation – especially when nuclear power stations and reprocessing plants are hit.

Even if your own country is not hit, radiation and climate damage will spread across the globe. No one escapes the consequences.

But the nuclear nations argue that they build and keep nuclear weapons to make sure that they are never used. After all no one would be stupid enough to actually launch a nuclear weapon facing such terrible retaliation? It sounds obvious. If you threaten any attacker with terrible nuclear devastation of course they won’t attack you. That might be true most of the time. It is very unlikely that any country would launch a nuclear attack deliberately. But there are two very major problems. First, a terrorist organisation with a nuclear weapon cannot be deterred in this way. Secondly, there are several ways in which a nuclear war can start by mistake. A report by the prestigious Chatham House in 2014 documents 30 instances between 1962 and 2002 when nuclear weapons came within minutes of being launched due to miscalculation, miscommunication, or technical errors. What prevented their use on many of these occasions was the intervention of individuals who, against military orders, either refused to authorise a nuclear strike or relay information that would have led to launch. Examples include a weather rocket launch mistaken for an attack on Russia, a US satellite misinterpreting sunlight reflecting off clouds as multiple missiles firings, a 42c chip fault creating a false warning of 220 missiles launched at the United States. Such risks are heightened during political crises.

The risk of mistake is very high because, in a hangover from the Cold War, the USA and Russia each keep 900 warheads ready to fire in a few minutes, in a ‘launch on warning’ status, should a warning of nuclear attack come in.

These nuclear weapons form a dangerous nuclear stand-off – rather like two people holding guns to each other’s heads.

With only a few minutes to evaluate a warning of nuclear attack before warheads would strike, one mistake can trigger disaster. A similar nuclear stand-off exists between India and Pakistan.

### 1AC – Framework

#### The standard is maximizing expected well-being – to clarify, saving lives. Extinction mathematically outweighs.

MacAskill 14 [William, Oxford Philosopher and youngest tenured philosopher in the world, Normative Uncertainty, 2014]

The human race might go extinct from a number of causes: asteroids, supervolcanoes, runaway climate change, pandemics, nuclear war, and the development and use of dangerous new technologies such as synthetic biology, all pose risks (even if very small) to the continued survival of the human race.184 And different moral views give opposing answers to question of whether this would be a good or a bad thing. It might seem obvious that human extinction would be a very bad thing, both because of the loss of potential future lives, and because of the loss of the scientific and artistic progress that we would make in the future. But the issue is at least unclear. The continuation of the human race would be a mixed bag: inevitably, it would involve both upsides and downsides. And if one regards it as much more important to avoid bad things happening than to promote good things happening then one could plausibly regard human extinction as a good thing.For example, one might regard the prevention of bads as being in general more important that the promotion of goods, as defended historically by G. E. Moore,185 and more recently by Thomas Hurka.186 One could weight the prevention of suffering as being much more important that the promotion of happiness. Or one could weight the prevention of objective bads, such as war and genocide, as being much more important than the promotion of objective goods, such as scientific and artistic progress. If the human race continues its future will inevitably involve suffering as well as happiness, and objective bads as well as objective goods. So, if one weights the bads sufficiently heavily against the goods, or if one is sufficiently pessimistic about humanity’s ability to achieve good outcomes, then one will regard human extinction as a good thing.187 However, even if we believe in a moral view according to which human extinction would be a good thing, we still have strong reason to prevent near-term human extinction. To see this, we must note three points. First, we should note that the extinction of the human race is an extremely high stakes moral issue. Humanity could be around for a very long time: if humans survive as long as the median mammal species, we will last another two million years. On this estimate, the number of humans in existence in the The future, given that we don’t go extinct any time soon, would be 2×10^14. So if it is good to bring new people into existence, then it’s very good to prevent human extinction. Second, human extinction is by its nature an irreversible scenario. If we continue to exist, then we always have the option of letting ourselves go extinct in the future (or, perhaps more realistically, of considerably reducing population size). But if we go extinct, then we can’t magically bring ourselves back into existence at a later date. Third, we should expect ourselves to progress, morally, over the next few centuries, as we have progressed in the past. So we should expect that in a few centuries’ time we will have better evidence about how to evaluate human extinction than we currently have. Given these three factors, it would be better to prevent the near-term extinction of the human race, even if we thought that the extinction of the human race would actually be a very good thing. To make this concrete, I’ll give the following simple but illustrative model. Suppose that we have 0.8 credence that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 0.2 certain that it’s a good thing to produce new people; and the degree to which it is good to produce new people, if it is good, is the same as the degree to which it is bad to produce new people, if it is bad. That is, I’m supposing, for simplicity, that we know that one new life has one unit of value; we just don’t know whether that unit is positive or negative. And let’s use our estimate of 2×10^14 people who would exist in the future, if we avoid near-term human extinction. Given our stipulated credences, the expected benefit of letting the human race go extinct now would be (.8-.2)×(2×10^14) = 1.2×(10^14). Suppose that, if we let the human race continue and did research for 300 years, we would know for certain whether or not additional people are of positive or negative value. If so, then with the credences above we should think it 80% likely that we will find out that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 20% likely that we will find out that it’s a good thing to produce new people. So there’s an 80% chance of a loss of 3×(10^10) (because of the delay of letting the human race go extinct), the expected value of which is 2.4×(10^10). But there’s also a 20% chance of a gain of 2×(10^14), the expected value of which is 4×(10^13). That is, in expected value terms, the cost of waiting for a few hundred years is vanishingly small compared with the benefit of keeping one’s options open while one gains new information.

#### Only consequentialism explains degrees of wrongness—if I break a promise to meet for lunch, that is not as bad as breaking a promise to not kill. Only consequences explain why which is intuitive. Outweighs—a) parsimony—metaphysics relies on long chains of questionable claims that make conclusions less likely b) hijacks—intuitions are inevitable since every framework must take some starting point.

### 1AC – Underview

#### 1] 1AR theory is legit – anything else means infinite abuse – drop the debater, competing interps, and the highest layer – 1AR are too short to make up for the time trade-off – no RVIs – 6 min 2NR means they can brute force me every time. Fairness is a gateway issue to the ballot and education is the reason schools fund debate.

#### 2] Reasonability on 1NC theory with the brightline of link and impact turn ground – there are infinite bidirectional interps that I can never meet – the four-minute 1AR doesn’t have enough time to line by line every argument, make offense, and go for substance.

**Nuanced debates about the intricacies of space policy are key to preventing militarization – narrowing debates intellectual aperture to meta-theories for governmental behavior makes constructive advocacy impossible**

**Weeden 15** [Brian Weeden is a former U.S. Air Force space and missile operations officer and currently technical adviser for Secure World Foundation, a non-profit organization dedicated to the long-term sustainable use of outer space for benefits on Earth. He is also a doctoral candidate in public policy and public administration at George Washington University. 1/7. "The End of Sanctuary in Space." https://medium.com/war-is-boring/the-end-of-sanctuary-in-space-2d58fba741a]

Plus, there’s the **larger question** of whether a more **aggressive approach** is in the best interest of all of America’s space organizations, including the burgeoning **commercial space sector.** We live in an age of **proliferating anti-satellite capabilities.** There is a growing body of evidence that China is actively developing at least two hit-to-kill **ASAT** weapon systems. The development process has included at least **five tests** of these systems, including one that created thousands of pieces of space **debris**. Russia has fielded operational ASAT capabilities in the past, and Russian officials have recently stated that development work has started again on an **air-based ASAT** system. Not to be outdone, elements of the Indian government have also **signaled** interest in developing both missile defense and ASAT **capabilities** themselves. The United States and many of its allies in Europe and Asia are fielding missile defense capabilities that have significant ASAT capabilities, as demonstrated by the United States’ use of the same missile defense system to destroy a non-functioning satellite in 2008. The number of other countries that already possess ballistic missile and space launch technology—and could thus develop their own crude ASAT capabilities—is growing. The U.S. national security space community sees this shift towards a more “contested” space environment as a very worrisome trend. There are currently more than 150 U.S. military and intelligence satellites in orbit, providing important national security capabilities such as precision navigation and timing, global communications, missile warning, and intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance. The proliferation of ASAT capabilities and the **threat** they are thought to pose to these space systems presents a **serious challenge** to the **U**nited **S**tates’ military and intelligence capabilities. The concern extends not only to the ability of the United States to defend its own national security interests, but also to its ability to continue to contribute to the defense of its **allies**. The United States announced a new National Security Space Strategy in early 2011 that detailed five strategic approaches for dealing with a more “congested, competitive and contested space environment.” The strategy includes a strong push for developing and promoting responsible norms of behavior in space, increased partnership and cooperation with allies and commercial firms and a shift toward making U.S. national security space capabilities more resilient to attacks. The strategy also includes preventing and deterring aggression on U.S. national security space systems, and, should deterrence fail, defeating attacks on said systems. Since the release of the strategy, the U.S. government has been relatively public about how it will implement the first three approaches, but less so about the last two. That has now changed. Congress has included language in the National Defense Authorization Act for the 2015 fiscal year, the primary piece of legislation that authorizes and directs the activities of the U.S. military, calling on the U.S. national security space community to report to Congress how it plans to deter and defeat adversary attacks on U.S. space systems. The NDAA language requires the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence to produce a study on the role of offensive space operations, and specifies that the majority of the $32.3 million that Congress gave to the Space Security and Defense Program in 2015 must be used for “the development of offensive space control and active defensive strategies and capabilities.” The NDAA language does not stipulate what is meant by offensive or active defensive capabilities, but when combined with recent academic writings from within the U.S. military, it suggests that America’s strategy for protecting its satellites is taking a more aggressive turn. This essay discusses the evolution of U.S. national security space community’s approach to using space and protecting space assets over the last several decades, and explains why some in the community are now contemplating a more aggressive approach. It frames the discussion through four established schools of thought on the military uses of space: sanctuary, space control, high ground and survivability. These schools were first developed as potential space power doctrines by David Lupton in an article for Strategic Review in 1983, and more fully fleshed out in his 1988 book On Space Warfare: A Space Power Doctrine. They were re-conceptualized as schools of thought, rather than doctrine, by Peter Hays in his 1994 doctoral dissertation. In Hays’ view, the four schools of thought are less codified and have more overlap between them than a strict doctrinal definition. U.S. policy on national security space is a **conglomeration** of the **four schools of thought**, with one school of thought usually prioritized over the others. This conglomeration is a result of the interagency process for creating policy on national security issues, and the bargaining that takes place between the different agencies involved in the decision. The U.S. government is not a **unitary actor**, and the perspective of each of the **many agencies** within the **interagency decision-making process** usually reflects a preference for one of these **schools** over the other. As a result, **decisions** made by the U.S. government on national security space policy often reflect a **compromise** between **multiple schools of thought**, rather than a **strict adherence** to one **over all the others**. Why choose to contextualize this issue from the **perspective of the military** when space activities encompass much more than just the military? The **reason** is that in the realm of policy, and space policy in particular, **national security** has **dominated decision making** since the very beginning of the Space Age, and still holds a **privileged position** in space **policy debates**. This dominance is seen in the size of the U.S. national security space budget—nearly $27.5 billion compared to NASA’s $17.8 billion in 2012—but also in the use of the National Security Council process to make many space policy decisions. Finally, it is important to understand why the **focus** of this essay is on the policies and activities of the **U**nited **S**tates and not on the **other countries** involved. The intent is not to place **blame** for the current strategic instability in space solely on the **U**nited **S**tates. The situation is the result of the actions of **several** different **countries**, as well as the overarching **geopolitical dynamics** present in the world today. As a result of America’s **democratic** and **pluralistic nature**, its policies and actions are **subject** to more **scrutiny** and **debate than others**. That should be seen as a **virtue and not a defect**. The United States is still the world leader in space, in terms of both soft and hard power. The intent of this essay is to encourage **constructive debate** on this **important issue** in the hope that it leads to **policies** and **actions** that continue to enable the **U**nited **S**tates to be a **force for good** and a world leader for the foreseeable **future**.