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

Grove ‘19

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### The 1AC is embedded within an critical astropolitics of empire – the desire to command, control, and cooperate over the unique processes of space represent an attempt to make the cosmos into a geopolitical chess game
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Astropolitics: realist and liberal strands Realism and astropolitik Everett Dolman3 draws on the writings of Mackinder and Mahan as inspiration for his development of a theory, which he titles Astropolitik. By the term, astropolitik, Dolman means “the application of the prominent and refined realist vision of state competition into outer space policy, particularly the development and evolution of a legal and political regime for humanity’s entry into the cosmos” (Dolman 2002a: 1). While Mahan focused on the structure of the ocean to develop his theories, and Mackinder focused on the topography of land, Dolman turns his attention toward the cartography of outer space. Whereas, at first glance, space may appear to be a “featureless void,” Dolman argues that it “is in fact a rich vista of gravitational mountains and valleys, oceans and rivers of resources and energy alternately dispersed and concentrated, broadly strewn danger zones of deadly radiation, and precisely placed peculiarities of astrodynamics” (Dolman 2002a: 61). In a manner similar to Mahan’s focus on natural sea lanes and “choke points” and Mackinder’s emphasis of geographic regions, Dolman emphasizes orbits, regions of space, and launch points as geopolitically vital assets over which states can be expected competitively and strategically to struggle for control. Orbital paths are important because stable orbits require virtually no fuel expenditure for satellites, whereas unstable orbits make it impossible for satellites to remain in space for a long time. Furthermore, different types of orbits pass over different parts of the earth at different frequencies. As such, the mission of a spacecraft determines in large part which orbit is most useful for it. There are essentially four types of orbits: low-altitude (between 150 km and 800 km above the Earth’s surface); medium-altitude (ranging from 800 km–35,000 km); high-altitude (above 35,000 km); and highly elliptical (with a perigee of 250 km and an apogee of 700,000 km) (Dolman 2002a: 65–7). In addition to pointing to the division of space into orbital planes, Dolman also identifies four key regions of space: 1 Terra, which includes the Earth and its atmosphere up until “just below the lowest altitude capable of supporting unpowered orbit” (Dolman 2002: 69); 2 Earth Space, which covers the region from the lowest possible orbit through to geo-stationary orbit; 3 Lunar Space, which extends from geo-stationary orbit to the Moon’s orbit; and 4 Solar Space, which “consists of everything in the solar system . . . beyond the orbit of the moon” (Dolman 2002a: 70). For Dolman, Earth Space is the astropolitical equivalent of Mackinder’s Outer Crescent, because controlling it will permit a state to limit strategic opportunities of potential rivals and at the same time allow the projection of force for indirect control (i.e. without occupation) of extensive territory of vital strategic importance, in this case (unlike Mackinder’s) potentially the entire Earth. “Control of Earth Space not only guarantees long-term control of the outer reaches of space, it provides a near-term advantage on the terrestrial battlefield” (Dolman 1999: 93). On the basis of these principles, Dolman develops an “Astropolitik policy for the United States” (Dolman 1999: 156), which calls on the U.S. government to control Earth Space. In the current historical–political juncture, no state controls this region. However, rather than leave it as a neutral zone or global commons, Dolman calls for the U.S. to seize control of this geo-strategically vital asset. According to Dolman’s reasoning, the neutrality of Earth Space is as much a threat to U.S. security as the neutrality of Melos was to Athenian hegemony. To leave space a neutral sanctuary could be interpreted as a sign of weakness that potential rivals might exploit. As such, it is better for the U.S. to occupy Earth Space now. Dolman’s astropolitik policy has three steps. The first involves the U.S. withdrawing from the current space regime on the grounds that its prohibitions on commercial and military exploitation of outer space prevent the full exploitation of space resources. In place of the global commons approach that informs that regime, Dolman calls for the establishment of “a principle of free-market sovereignty in space” (Dolman 2002a: 157), whereby states could establish territorial claims over areas they wish to exploit for commercial purposes. This space rush should be coupled with “propaganda touting the prospects of a new golden age of space exploration” (Dolman 2002a: 157). Step two calls for the U.S. to seize control of low-Earth orbit, where “space-based laser or kinetic energy weapons could prevent any other state from deploying assets there, and could most effectively engage and destroy terrestrial enemy ASAT facilities” (Dolman 2002a: 157). Other states would be permitted “to enter space freely for the purpose of engaging in commerce” (Dolman 2002a: 157). The final step would be the establishment of “a national space coordination agency ... to define, separate and coordinate the efforts of commercial, civilian and military space projects” (Dolman 2002a: 157). Within Dolman’s theory of astropolitik is a will-to-space-based-hegemony fuelled by a series of assumptions, of which we would point to three as especially important. First, it rests on a strong preference for competition over collaboration in both the economic and military spheres. Dolman, like a good realist, is suspicious of the possibilities for sustained political and economic cooperation, and assumes instead that competition for power is the law of international political–economic life. He believes, though, that through a fully implemented astropolitical policy “states will employ competition productively, harnessing natural incentives for self-interested gain to a mutually beneficial future, a competition based on the fair and legal commercial exploitation of space” (Dolman 2002a: 4). Thus, underpinning his preference for competition is both a liberal assumption that competitive markets are efficient at producing mutual gain through innovative technologies, and the realist assumption that inter-state competition for power is inescapable in world politics. As we will note more fully below, this conjunction of liberal and realist assumptions is a hallmark of the logic of empire as distinct from the logic of a system of sovereign states. The second and most explicit of Dolman’s key assumptions is the belief that the U.S. should pursue control of orbital space because its hegemony would be largely benign. The presumed benevolence of the U.S. rests, for Dolman, on its responsiveness to its people. If any one state should dominate space it ought to be one with a constitutive political principle that government should be responsible and responsive to its people, tolerant and accepting of their views, and willing to extend legal and political equality to all. In other words, the United States should seize control of outer space and become the shepherd (or perhaps watchdog) for all who would venture there, for if any one state must do so, it is the most likely to establish a benign hegemony. (Dolman 2002a: 157) However, even if the U.S. government is popularly responsive in its foreign policy – a debatable proposition – the implication of Dolman’s astropolitik is that the U.S. would exercise benign control over orbital space, and, from that position, potentially all territory on Earth and hence all people, by being responsible to its 300 million citizens. As such, this benign hegemony would in effect be an apartheid regime where 95 percent of the world would be excluded from participating in the decision-making of the hegemonic power that controls conditions of their existence. This, too, is a hallmark of empire, not of a competitive system of sovereign states. Third, Dolman’s astropolitik treats space as a resource to be mastered and exploited by humans, a Terra Nulius, or empty territory, to be colonized and reinterpreted for the interests of the colonizer. This way of looking at space is similar to the totalizing gaze of earlier geopolitical theorists who viewed the whole world as an object to be dominated and controlled by European powers, who understood themselves to be beneficently, or, at worst, benignly, civilizing in their control of territories and populations (Ó Tuathail 1996: 24–35). This assumption, like the first two, thus also implicates a hallmark of the logic of empire, namely what Ó Tuathail (1996) calls the ‘geopolitical gaze’ (about which we have more to say below), which works comfortably in tandem with a self-understanding of benign hegemony. When these three assumptions are examined in conjunction, Dolman’s astropolitik reveals itself to be a blueprint for a U.S. empire that uses the capacities of space-based weapons to exercise hegemony over the Earth and to grant access to the economic resources of space only to U.S. (capitalist) interests and their allies. This version of astropolitics, which is precisely the strategic vision underlying the policy pronouncements of the National Security Space Management and Organization Commission (Commission 2001) – and subsequently President George W. Bush – with which we began this chapter, is a kind of spatial, or geopolitical, power within the context of U.S. imperial relations of planetary scope. Its ostensive realist foundations are muted, except as a rather extreme form of offensive realism, because the vision is not one of great power competition and strategic balancing, but rather one of imperial control through hegemony. As such, it brings into question the constitution of sovereignty, since empire and sovereignty are fundamentally opposed constitutive principles of the structure of the international system – the subjects of empire are not sovereign. Thus, if astropolitics is to be in the form of Dolman’s astropolitik (and current U.S. policy aspirations), the future of sovereignty is in question, despite his efforts to position the theory as an expression of the realist assumption of great power competition. In later sections of this chapter, we attempt to show what this bringing sovereignty into question is likely to mean, conceptually and in practice. Before turning to that principal concern, however, we consider an alternative geopolitical theory of astropolitics. Liberal-republican astropolitics Over the past twenty-five years, in a series of articles and recently a major book, Daniel Deudney has attempted to rework the tenets of geopolitics and apply them to the contemporary challenges raised by new weapons technologies – particularly nuclear and space weapons (Deudney 1983, 1985, 1995, 2000, 2002, 2007).4 While Deudney finds geopolitical theory of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century theoretically unsophisticated and reductionist, he believes that geopolitical attention to material conditions, spatiality, change, and political processes could form the basis of a theoretically sophisticated contextual–materialist security theory of world politics. Deudney starts from a premise about space weaponization similar to the core of Dolman’s astropolitik, namely that if any state were able to achieve military control of space, it would hold potential mastery over the entire Earth. One preliminary conclusion, however, seems sound: effective control of space by one state would lead to planet-wide hegemony. Because space is at once so proximate and the planet’s high ground, one country able to control space and prevent the passage of other countries’ vehicles through it could effectively rule the planet. Even more than a monopoly of air or sea power, a monopoly of effective space power would be irresistible. (Deudney 1983: 17) Rather than developing the implications of this as a strategic opportunity for any one state (e.g. the U.S.), however, Deudney sees it as a collective problem to be kept in check through collaboration; his project is to avoid space-based hegemony through cooperation among states. In a series of articles on global security written in the 1980s – while Cold War tensions between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. continued to frame much theoretical discussion in international relations – Deudney saw the space age as a double-edged sword in superpower relations. On the one side, space weaponization posed a risk that the superpowers would extend their conflict extra-terrestrially and devise new, deadlier technologies that would enhance the risk of exterminating all of humanity; on the other, according to Deudney, the space age had found productive opportunities for the superpowers to deal with their rivalries in stabilizing collaboration. He notes that the Sputnik mission, while in the popular understanding only an escalation of the Cold War, initially was the result of an internationally organized research program – the International Geophysical Year (Deudney 1985; though see Dolman 2002a: 106–107 for an alternate interpretation of these events as Cold War competition). Another example was President Eisenhower’s proposed “Atoms for Peace” project, which involved the great powers sharing nuclear technology with developing nations for energy purposes. Most famous was the collaboration between the Soviet Union and the U.S. during the 1970s on the rendezvous between an Apollo capsule and the Soyuz space station. Similar multinational collaborations continue to this day, with the most notable example being the International Space Station. In addition to promoting collaboration, according to Deudney, the space age has also enhanced the ability of space powers to monitor each other – through spy satellites – thereby increasing the likelihood that they abide by arms control treaties. Deudney believes that these types of collaboration and increased surveillance could be strengthened and deepened so that great powers could be persuaded over time to “forge missiles into spaceships” (Deudney 1985: 271). In the 1980s this led Deudney to develop a set of specific proposals for a peaceful space policy, including collaboration between space powers on manned missions to the Moon, asteroids, and Mars. The development of an International Satellite Monitoring Agency would make “space-based surveillance technology accessible to an international community” for monitoring ceasefires, crises, compliance with international arms control treaties, and the Earth’s environment (Deudney 1985: 291). These proposals are aimed at promoting collaboration on projects of great scientific and military significance for the individual states. Deudney’s expectation is that such cooperation would mitigate security dilemmas and promote greater ties between states that would co-bind their security without sacrificing their sovereignty. While Deudney has not been explicit about how his astropolitics of collaboration would alter world order, in his more theoretical writings he has elaborated the logic of a liberal-republican international system. In a 2002 article on geopolitics and international theory, he developed what he called a‘historical security materialist’ theory of geopolitics: “[I]n which changing forces of destruction (constituted by geography and technology) condition the viability of different modes of protection (understood as clusters of security practices) and their attendant ‘superstructures’ of political authority structures (anarchical, hierarchical, and federal-republican)” (Deudney 2002: 80). In that work, he identified four different eras in which distinct modes of destruction were predominant: Pre-modern; Early Modern; Global Industrial; and Planetary-Nuclear, as well as two modes of protection: real-statism, which is based on an internal monopoly of violence and external anarchy; and federal-republicanism, which is based on an internal division of powers and an external symmetrical binding of actors through institutions that reduces their autonomy in relation to one another. According to Deudney, in the Planetary-Nuclear age the federal-republican mode of protection is more viable because states “are able to more fully and systematically restrain violence” than under the power balancing practices of real-statist modes of protection (Deudney 2002: 97; see also Deudney 2007: 244–277 for an elaboration of this argument). Although Deudney has not extended his “historical security materialist” approach into explicitly theorizing space weapons, per se (dealt with only tangentially and implicitly in the last two chapters of his recent book), his proposals during the Cold War to foster institutional collaboration between space powers as a way of promoting peace can safely be understood as a form of the mutually binding practices that he associates with the federalrepublican mode of protection. In addition, one of the general conclusions that Deudney reaches about “historical security materialism” is that the more a security context is rich in the potential for violence, the better suited a federal-republican mode of protection is to avoid systemic breakdown. Therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that within Deudney’s work is a nascent theory of how a federal-republican international system could limit conflict between space powers by binding them together in collaborative uses of space for exploratory and security uses. In this sense, Deudney can be read as the liberal-republican astropolitical counterpart to Everett Dolman.5 While Deudney’s astropolitical theorizations hold out the promise of a terrestrial pacification through space exploration it is interesting to note a significant aporia in his theory – empire as a possible mode of protection. While real-statist modes of protection have an internal hierarchical authority structure, they are based on assumptions of external-anarchy, which is to say a system of sovereign states. Conversely, the federal-republican model is based on a symmetrical binding of units, in a way that no single unit can come to dominate others and accordingly in which they preserve their sovereignty (Deudney 2000, 2002, 2007). In a third mode, to which Deudney gives only scant attention, the case of empire, the hegemony of a single unit is such that other units are bound to it in an asymmetrical pattern that locates sovereignty only in the hegemon, or imperial center. Successful empires, including the Roman, British, and American, permit local autonomy in areas that are not of the imperial power’s direct concern while demanding absolute obedience in areas that are of vital concern to it, particularly when it comes to issues of security.6 Deudney’s implicit astropolitical theory thus ignores structurally asymmetric relations – in effect he ignores power. It is as if in wanting to have the world avoid the possibility of a planetary hegemony at the heart of the premise with which he and Dolman began their respective analyses, he white-washes it by failing to acknowledge the profound asymmetries of aspirations and technological–financial–military capacities among states for control of orbital space. In the next two sections we respond to Deudney’s call for “historical security materialism” by focusing on the premise that he skirts but that Dolman emphasizes, that military control of space means (at least the possibility of) mastery of the Earth. Specifically we examine how a new mode of destruction – space weapons – is the ideal basis for the third mode of protection – empire – through its potential for substantial asymmetry. We argue that the power asymmetries of space weapons have very significant constitutive effects on sovereignty and international systemic anarchy, and underlie the constitution of a new, historically unprecedented, form of empire. Before turning to that central thesis, however, we will first sketch the general contours of a critical astropolitics, which builds on the foundational premise of Dolman and Deudney, but modifies their theories in light of the significant insights of critical theory, particularly with respect to constitutive power. We ask: what consequences of astropolitics can a critical approach illuminate that may be concealed by an astropolitics informed by either liberal-republican or realist assumptions? How can insights offered by the revival of geopolitics in the writings of Deudney and Dolman – particularly the call for a new security materialist mode of analysis – be used to supplement and refine critical international relations theory?

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

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

Grove ‘19

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Halberstam says of this queer moment:

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

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

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

Bousquet et al ‘20

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

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

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

## Case

### 1NC – Elitism

#### Delgado evidence they don’t get to access it because they aren’t the material redistribution of reform being done in this evidence one its about policy action which you don’t defend second its not about space that does nothing to contribute to revolution it is this defelection of the issues on earth onto space that creates pacified narratives resulting in us dying hear but criticizing the technoicrats outheir

#### We don’t disagree that corporate technocrats are bad

#### the world of the alt isn’t where musk gets the colony the distinction is what do we do with the earth on the meantime in the chaotic conditions of the eurocene.

#### Projecting that the core problem that he is just a space guy he is just a bad robber baron guy pumping bitcoin he tried to coup Bolivia as an afrikaaners and apartheid blood emerald mining think about this in the context of the earth

The eurocene is making life on earth uninhabitable

Their incapacity to grapple with that question means that their view of space elitism is a deflection of problems in space

Private exploitation on space

Space colonization doesn’t make worse anything that doens t prior exist with the eurocene

Havecroft duval – states do these fucked up things in space

In the era of late stage capitalism the line between public and private

Only the alt can rescuperate ourselves in the face of caollapse by being together through international question

Uniqueness question frames this debate

Stopping space colonization doesn’t stop eurocene but we defienelty collapse eurocene which solves that

### 1NC – Debris

#### Companies have profit incentive to protect themselves from Debris which means debris isn’t caused by private entities Westside reads blue

Shah 20 – Sachin, 8/30/20, [“Aug 30 The International Legal Regulation of Space Debris,” CORNELL UNDERGRADUATE LAW & SOCIETY REVIEW, Administrative, Policy, Technology, <https://www.culsr.org/articles/the-international-legal-regulation-of-space-debris>] Justin

Although there do exist international laws and regulations governing the use of space for states and governmental entities (albeit weak ones), the private enterprises sending objects into space are subject to even less stringent regulations than states are. SpaceX, for example, to authorize their sending of 42,000 Starlink satellites into orbit, only had to submit paperwork to the U.S. Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and the International Telecommunication Union (ITU). [12] Paul Larsen posits that, in the face of less stringent regulations, nongovernmental satellite companies send many satellites into orbit in order to maximize their profit, which is their primary objective. Unlike the vagueness and lack of enforcement that came with written law (which is apparent in the Outer Space Treaty), the unwritten market-oriented incentives for profit by large-scale satellite providers and operators provide a reason for actors to mitigate space debris in orbit around Earth. Larsen states that “They have huge sums of money invested in each satellite, perhaps as much as a half-billion dollars, when all costs are included. Loss of one satellite is a major event. They want their assets to be safe.” [13] Thus, these satellite companies have a major stake in space traffic management and their market incentives do a better job of mitigating space debris than the existing legal regulation does. The company SpaceX, as mentioned above, plans to send 42,000 satellites into space. While doing so would likely result in significant profits for the company, many believe this will diminish astronomical visibility as well as increase the chance of collisions with space debris. [14] Due to these effects, scientists and space law experts alike have called for a legal delay to the ITU’s decision on whether or not to accept SpaceX’s proposal to launch more satellites. If these parties are successful, a precedent-setting legal case regarding space debris mitigation and satellite use in space may well provide a solution to the outdated Outer Space Treaty of 1967.

#### No distinction between public and private considering NASA contracts comapnies

#### Their models are old and don’t assume appropriate solar activity decay – debris is stable

**Wang and Liu 19** – Advances in Astronomy(Xiao-wei and Jing, PhDs, National Astronomical Observatories, Chinese Academy of Sciences, “An Introduction to a New Space Debris Evolution Model: SOLEM”, https://www.hindawi.com/journals/aa/2019/2738276/)

1. Introduction During the past decades, the number of space objects has been growing rapidly. Until now, the cataloged in-orbit space objects number has reached about 24,000, about 19000 of which are publicly listed at Space Track [1]. Uncataloged objects number with smaller size has approximately reached hundreds of millions. These space objects, mostly space debris, pose great threats to operational safety of in-orbit spacecraft. Adopting space debris mitigation measures is an important way to relieve the threats from space debris and prevent the number of resident space objects from growing. However, some studies indicated that the space debris environment would be stable for only 50 years under current mitigation measures, even without new launches in future [2]. This statement has aroused widespread concern over the world. In order to check and quantify the effectiveness of mitigation measures on controlling the growth of space debris in future, many space debris evolution models are established and compared to study the long-term stability of the future space environment. At present, the well-known space debris evolution models mainly include the LEGEND model from National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) [3], DAMAGE model from United Kingdom Space Agency (UKSA) [4], MEDEE model from Centre National d’Etudes Spatiales (CNES) [5], DELTA model from European Space Agency (ESA) [6], LUCA model from Technische Universität Braunschweig [7], and NEODEEM model from Kyushu University and the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency (JAXA)[8]. Some of these models have been used to study the stability of the future space environment in the joint research organized by Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee (IADC) [9, 10]. Besides, further work on the uncertainties affecting the long-term evolution of space debris is encouraged in international community to better assess the uncertainty induced by the modelling assumptions [11]. Therefore, more space debris evolution models are welcomed to participate in such research activities, which may provide the technical support for making new space debris mitigation guidelines as well as other related policies for space traffic management to guarantee the long-term sustainability of outer space activities. SOLEM (Space Objects Long-term Evolution Model) is a Low Earth Orbit (LEO) space debris long-term evolution model established by China. It has participated in the joint researches of IADC as a representative of China National Space Administration (CNSA). SOLEM is capable of predicting the number evolution trends of space debris, estimating the rate of collision events of space objects during the evolution in future, and analyzing the effects of different mitigation and remediation measures or other potential uncertainties on the long-term evolution of space debris. The reliability of SOLEM has been validated during the joint research of IADC. This paper introduces the components, algorithms, and workflow of SOLEM. After that, the effects of different mitigation measures based on SOLEM model are analyzed. 2. The SOLEM Model The space debris evolution model is expected to predict the evolution of space debris population and possible collision rates for a long period in future, usually for decades and even centuries. It can be used to study the evolution processes with various assumptions. The future evolution of space debris is affected by natural factors such as various perturbations, atmosphere evolutions, periodic solar activities, accidental explosions, and even the surface degradations. In fact, it could also be affected by human space activities such as launches, collision avoidance manoeuvres, mitigation and remediation measures. In space debris evolution model, usually the most important source and sink mechanisms are considered. Generally, a space debris evolution model is composed of orbital propagation model, collision probability estimation model, fragment generation model, future launch model, postmission disposal model, and active debris removal model (if the active debris removal measures are considered). These components will significantly affect the model evolution results if some key parameters are changed. The composition of space debris evolution model is illustrated in Figure 1. Figure 1: The general components of space debris evolution models. The left components are the main source mechanisms, and the right components are the main sink mechanisms. 3. Orbital Propagation Orbital propagation is to project the current orbits of space objects to the future. It is the core component of space debris evolution model. Through orbital propagation, the space debris evolution model is able to obtain the space objects orbital distribution at any moment in future. There are three basic orbital prediction algorithms: numerical method, analytical method, and semianalytical method. Numerical method has the highest precision but takes the most time in orbit propagation. Due to the long evolution time of space debris, usually from decades to hundreds of years, moreover, the high-precision position has no practical significance in long-term evolution; it is more appropriate to use analytical method or semianalytical method. SOLEM model adopts a simplified semianalytical orbital propagator, in which the integration is done on the perturbation functions with the short-periodic terms removed. Essentially, it is performed on the averaged orbital dynamic system. At present, SOLEM covers only LEO region, including objects residing in LEO with near-circular orbits and those crossing LEO with high eccentricity orbits. For near-circular orbits, the main perturbations considered include the Earth’s nonspherical gravity perturbation J2, J3, J4, J2,2, and atmospheric drag. For high eccentricity orbits, besides the Earth’s nonspherical gravity and atmospheric drag, the perturbations due to solar radiation pressure and gravity of the Sun and Moon are also considered. The atmosphere density model used for drag calculation is the NRLMSIS00 model. The values of solar radiation flux at 10.7 cm and the geomagnetic index can be read from a configuration file which can be replaced according to assumptions. In order to verify this orbital propagator of SOLEM, we conducted an experiment on the evolution of a small population. It is to compare the SOLEM propagation results with historical data for the number evolution of a small population in a statistical view. We used all the 1021 cataloged LEO-crossing objects on 1980.01.01 to do the experiment. It includes 38 objects with high eccentricity orbits () and 983 objects with near-circular orbits (). The area-to-mass ratio of these objects is calculated according to the UNW type of perturbed motion equation together with the method of least squares, using the orbital data for months previously. For SOLEM propagation, we used historical solar activities recorded in CelesTrak website [12] considering no collision avoidance and station keeping manoeuvres. The real decay information of the 1021 objects is drawn from SSR on the Space Track website [13]. The propagation result of SOLEM orbital propagator and the real data of historical evolution of the 1021 objects are compared in Figure 2, which shows a high consistency with a relative error of about 2%. Figure 2: The statistical results comparison of SOLEM propagation (denoted as test) and historical evolution (denoted as real). The semianalytical method has a limit precision in orbit propagation. However, comparing with the evolution of a single orbit, the space debris long-term evolution model cares more about the number evolution of the whole population in statistics. Considering the experiment above, we think the SOLEM orbital propagator is applicable to space debris long-term evolution model. 4. Fragment Generation Model In-orbit breakup is one important source of space debris growth. Therefore, the accuracy of fragment generation model simulating the breakup events has an important impact on the simulation results of space debris evolution model. The fragment generation model is to simulate the space debris collisions or explosions and give the instantaneous information of generated fragments which is necessary for the subsequent evolution prediction. The information includes the fragments number and each fragment’s mass, size, velocity, etc. In SOLEM, we adopt NASA’s standard breakup model to simulate the generation of fragments produced by in-orbit breakups. NASA’s standard breakup model is the most popular fragment generation model at present. The implementation is following the process presented in paper [14, 15]. 5. Collision Probability Estimation When considering the fragmentation due to in-orbit collisions, there is a key component in the space debris evolution model, that is, the collision probability estimation algorithm. In SOLEM, we adopt an Improved-CUBE (I-CUBE) model to do the calculation of collision probabilities. It is based on the CUBE method proposed by NASA [16, 17]. In CUBE model, the evolution system is uniformly sampled in time. At each sampling moment, the space around the Earth is discretized in small cubes in geocentric Cartesian coordinates. By obtaining updated orbital elements, the location of each space objects is calculated. CUBE model assumes that the collision probability only exists between objects residing in the same cube. And the collision probability is calculated by where and are the spatial densities of objects and in the cube, is the collision cross-section, is collision speed, is the volume of the cube, and is the time interval between two sampling moments. Actually, calculated by (1) is the mean number of collisions between objects and in the volume during the propagation time interval . The time interval is given as 5 days, i.e., seconds. As it does not approach 0, for some objects with collision cross-section large enough, will reach a value greater than 1. That is not reasonable. To avoid this, in I-CUBE model, we used (2) to express the collision probability with the consideration that the collision process follows a Poisson distribution. where represents the collision probability and is the mean number of collisions between objects and in the volume during the propagation time interval . According to Heiner Klinkrad [18], the approximation yields results with less than 10% error for . That means, for , the approximation will bring error bigger than 10%. For most space objects, the approximation is well suited. But for those with collision cross-sections large enough (dozens or even hundreds of square meters), the collision probability may be greatly overestimated if still using the approximation. Besides, CUBE model assumes that only the objects residing in the same cube are considered for collisions. For space debris evolution, the divided cube size is given as 10 km. However, it has been queried by CNES for the effects on evolution results from the divided cube size [19, 20]. In I-CUBE model, we assume that collision probability exists in all close approaches with a distance from the target satisfying the threshold. The distance threshold is the diagonal of the divided cube. Thus, the value of in (1) is no longer the volume of cube, but the volume of a sphere with radius equal to the distance threshold; i.e., where is the divided cube size. As relates to the spatial densities, and are now the spatial densities of objects and in the volume of the sphere. The two-dimensional representation is illustrated in Figure 3. Figure 3: Two-dimensional representation for considering possible collisions between debris residing in neighbouring cubes. In this approach, the divided cube size will never influence the evolution result of space debris evolution models. The comparison results using CUBE and I-CUBE model running by SOLEM are presented in Figure 4. The divided cube size varies from 5 km to 50 km. Except for the divided cube size, all the other configurations are the same. Every curve is the average result of 50 Monte Carlo runs. Figure 4: Comparison of simulation results with different cube size. (a) Using CUBE model. (b) Using I-CUBE model. 6. Future Launch Activities The launch of spacecraft in future is another important source of space debris increase. However, it is highly related to technical development and space policies which cannot be predicted. Therefore, the future launch model usually takes the current launch level as a reference. The data of a launch model includes all the characteristics of launched objects, such as the launched number, each object’s type, mass, area, or/and size, target orbit, and launch time. In SOLEM model, we adopt the launch traffic during the last 8 years, from September 1, 2009, to August 31, 2017, as future launch model. It will be repeated during the overall simulation time. The traffic data is collected mainly from websites of Space Launch Report [21], Space Track [22], and Union of Concerned Scientists [23]. It is prepared previously as a configuration file containing the information of launched numbers, types (including satellites, rocket bodies, and mission-related objects), each object’s mass, area (or/and size), target orbit, launch date, etc. 7. Postmission Disposal Postmission Disposal (PMD) is an important mitigation measure to stop space debris population from growing. In SOLEM model, PMD measures are implemented on nonfunctional satellites and rockets launched during the evolution time. For newly launched satellites, the mission life is uniformly set as 8 years by default. It can also be set as other values by user. For rockets, the mission life will end at once when the carried satellites are sent into the target orbits. When the mission life of a satellite or rocket ends, the natural orbital lifetime will be estimated. If the natural orbital lifetime exceeds 25 years, the satellite or upper stage of the rocket will be deorbited to a disposed orbit that will naturally decay within 25 years, complying with the 25-year rule. The PMD success rate in SOLEM can be set freely by users. Currently this value is estimated to be lower than 20% for region above 600 km. The procedure of PMD is shown in Figure 5. Figure 5: The procedure of PMD. For mission ended satellites or rockets (R/Bs), if the evaluated natural orbital lifetime exceeds 25 years, it will be disposed to a new orbit complying with the 25-year rule. 8. Active Debris Removal To better limit the growth of LEO space debris populations, measures of active debris removal (ADR) are suggested. Although the ADR has not become practical due to the technical difficulties and high costs, its effects on space debris evolution have been proved through computer simulations. Considering the developing technology, ADR will be another important measure in stopping the growth of the space debris population in future. As suggested, ADR measure is to remove existing large and massive objects from regions where high collision activities are expected [24]. The selection criterion that should be used in choosing which objects to remove has also been researched, and the criterion based on the mass and collision probability of each object has been proposed [25–27]. By annually removing several targets, the space environment can be stabilized according to computer simulations. In SOLEM model, the selection criterion is implemented as follows: where is the mass of object and is the cumulated collision probabilities between object and object , where during the last year. Their product is the selection index for ADR. The larger the value of , the more dangerous the object . At the beginning of each projection year, all objects in orbit are sorted in descending order by the value of . A predefined number of space debris objects with the largest s will be immediately removed from orbits. Only the operating satellites and objects with high eccentricity orbits are excluded. The beginning year of implementing ADR measures is set by users. In SOLEM, it is set as 2030 by default. 9. The Initial Population Space objects initial population is the baseline of space debris evolution model. It is the description of current space environment. For SOLEM, the population data on 2017.09.01 is used as initial population. Just like the future launch model, the information of space objects is obtained from Space Track, Space Launch Report, and Union of Concerned Scientists. The orbital distribution and the area-to-mass ratio (A/M) versus size distribution are shown in Figures 6 and 7. Figure 6: The semimajor axis versus eccentricity distribution of population data of 2017.09.01. Figure 7: The A/M versus size distribution of population data of 2017.09.01. 10. The Workflow of SOLEM Model The workflow of SOLEM model is simply represented by Figure 8. As presented, before projection, initialization will be done first by setting key parameters which are based on simulated assumptions, taking prepared initial population data as input. All space objects contained in the initial population are propagated after initialization. As time evolves, the newly launched objects from future launch model will also be propagated. If the newly launched active satellite or rocket ends its mission, the PMD measure will be done. All space objects with size over 10 cm are included for collision consideration. Once a collision happens, the breakup model will be used to generate new fragments. And the population for next propagation step will be updated. Figure 8: The workflow of SOLEM model. 11. Model Application As key parameters of each module are flexible to users, SOLEM model is able to simulate the evolution of space debris under various assumptions with high flexibility. Since 2015, SOLEM, as a representative of CNSA, has participated in a joint research of IADC. With uniform input data and assumptions, SOLEM has achieved results consistent with other space debris evolution models (IADC internal reports). In this paper, the effects of different mitigation measures on space debris evolution are analyzed with the SOLEM model. 11.1. Input Data The initial input data and relevant assumptions are shown in Table 1. Three scenarios are performed with PMD rate set as 30%, 60%, and 90%, and the other input data and assumptions are all the same. For each scenario, 50 Monte Carlo simulation runs are performed to obtain the averages. Table 1: Assumptions of scenarios simulated by SOLEM model. The solar activity used in SOLEM for future evolution is shown in Figure 9. It is generated according to the monthly fit formula offered by CelesTrak website [12]. The geomagnetic index is set as a constant median value of Ap=9. Figure 9: The solar activity recorded in history (green line, denoted as real) and the solar activity model adopted in SOLEM (purple line). 11.2. Simulation Results In the evolution results, space objects are classified into three types: intact objects include all satellites, R/Bs, and mission-related objects; old fragments are all the DEB already existing in the initial population; new fragments are all the DEB generated during the evolution time. Separating new fragments from old fragments can help us have a clear view of the increasing process of space debris population. The space debris evolution results of the scenario setting PMD rate as 30% is presented in Figure 10. It is the average result of 50 Mont-Carlo runs by SOLEM. As Figure 10 shows, the total number of objects in LEO shows a decrease in the first two decades, then turns into increase throughout the evolution time, and finally reaches more than 115% of the initial population. This scenario predicts 34 catastrophic collisions and 25 noncatastrophic collisions in average in future 200 years. Figure 10: The evolution results of scenario 1, with PMD rate of 30%. (a) The population evolution. The line of total is plotted with the error bar of 1 σ standard deviation. (b) The cumulative number of collisions. Figure 11 shows the evolution results of the scenario setting PMD rate as 60%. The reinforcement of such mitigation measure makes the final effective number of LEO objects in future 200 years decrease greatly comparing with the baseline scenario. The final total effective number of LEO objects is only 23% more than the initial population. And the cumulative number of collisions also decreases greatly in both collision types. Figure 11: The evolution results of scenario 2, with PMD rate of 60%. (a) The population evolution. The line of total is plotted with the error bar of 1 σ standard deviation. (b) The cumulative number of collisions. In Figure 12, the evolution result shows, with PMD rate of 90%, there is a clear decrease by approximately 30% in the total effective number of space objects crossing LEO orbits for the next 50 years, and then the population remains at a long-term stable level. The decrease in the first 50 years is mainly due to the natural decay of old fragments. The number of new fragments generated by breakup events increases in nearly the whole evolution time with a low rate and finally seems to stop increasing at the end of evolution. The cumulative number of catastrophic collisions is decreased down to 15, and for noncatastrophic collisions the number is only 7. Generally, this scenario predicts a space debris environment becoming better with PMD rate as high as 90%. Figure 12: The evolution results of scenario 3, with PMD rate of 90%. (a) The population evolution. The line of total is plotted with the error bar of 1 σ standard deviation. (b) The cumulative number of collisions. Simulation results of the three scenarios are quantified in Table 2. It can be seen that, with PMD rate increasing, the space debris population after 200 years will greatly decrease, as well as the average catastrophic collision rates. High PMD rates will make the current space environment better and safer. Table 2: Quantification of evolution results of the three scenarios simulated by SOLEM model. Taking the IADC comparison study about “Stability of the Future LEO Environment” [9, 10] as a reference, the evolution results shown above look rather optimistic. The IADC comparison study predicted about +30% changes in population after 200 years and one catastrophic collision every 5 to 9 years with PMD rate of 90%. And we predict -30% change in population and one catastrophic collision every 13 years with the same PMD compliance level. That might be mainly due to the differences in solar activity model and the input initial population used for simulation. The solar activity used in this paper (Figure 9) is in a higher level than those used in [9, 10], which is shown in Figure 13. This will make more objects decay during the evolution. Besides, the initial population we used in this paper is obtained from the public data on 2017.09.01, which is about 13000 space objects. While the initial population used in [9, 10] is the reference population of MASTER2009 on 2009.05.01, which is about 17000 space objects, the difference in initial population is as high as about 24%. Additionally, the area-to-mass ratio distribution of the initial population in this paper (Figure 7) is also different from [9, 10], which is shown in Figure 14. From the area-to-mass ratio distribution of the initial population, it can be seen that the initial population we used does not exclude those objects with high area-to-mass ratio. Figure 13: Solar flux projections used in IADC comparison study. Figure 14: Area-to-mass ratio distributions of the initial population used in IADC comparison study. The differences in solar activity projection and initial population including both the number and area-to-mass ratio finally lead to a very different evolution result. 12. Summary and Future Work This paper mainly introduced the composition, submodel algorithm, and workflow of SOLEM, the space debris long-term evolution model of China. The reliability of SOLEM has been validated during the joint research of IADC. After that, the application work of SOLEM model on analyzing the effects of different mitigation measures on the evolution of space environment is presented. The result shows, with higher PMD rate, the current space environment will become better and safer. SOLEM is a LEO space debris evolution model with high flexibility. It is capable of simulating the space environment evolution with various assumptions. Therefore, it can be used to simulate and analyze the uncertainties affecting the space debris evolution, such as the future launches, solar activities, manual collision avoidance measures, and mitigation and remediation measures. Through simulation and analysis, SOLEM can help us to deeply understand the evolution process of space environment and provides technical support for making space policies and laws to guarantee the sustainability of space activities in future. At present, the orbital range covered by SOLEM is limited to LEO region from 200 km to 2000 km. In the next step, the orbital range covered by SOLEM will be expanded from LEO region to GEO (Geostationary Earth Orbit) region. Besides, the postmission disposal model will be optimized, including the disposed orbit selection process and the computation time.

#### Their evidence says squo innovation + evolving regulation + maneuvering + warnings solve the aff in its entirety – westside reads blue

Muelhaupt et al. 19 – Theodore, Marlon Sorge, Jamie Morin, and Robert Wilson, 6/18/19, Center for Orbital and Reentry Debris Studies, Center for Space Policy and Strategy, The Aerospace Corporation, 30 year Space Systems Analyst and Operator, [“Space traffic management in the new space era,” Journal of Space Safety Engineering, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S246889671930045X?via%3Dihub>] Justin//rehighlighted to prove it’s a bad card

The last decade has seen rapid growth and change in the space industry, and an explosion of commercial and private activity. Terms like NewSpace or democratized space are often used to describe this global trend to develop faster and cheaper access to space, distinct from more traditional government-driven activities focused on security, political, or scientific activities. The easier access to space has opened participation to many more participants than was historically possible. This new activity could profoundly worsen the space debris environment, particularly in low Earth orbit (LEO), but there are also signs of progress and the outlook is encouraging. Many NewSpace operators are actively working to mitigate their impact. Nevertheless, NewSpace represents a significant break with past experience and business as usual will not work in this changed environment. New standards, space policy, and licensing approaches are powerful levers that can shape the future of operations and the debris environment. 2. Characterizing NewSpace: a step change in the space environment In just the last few years, commercial companies have proposed, funded, and in a few cases begun deployment of very large constellations of small to medium-sized satellites. These constellations will add much more complexity to space operations. Table 1 shows some of the constellations that have been announced for launch in the next decade. Two dozen companies, when taken together, have proposed placing well over 20,000 satellites in orbit in the next 10 years. For perspective, fewer than 8100 payloads have been placed in Earth orbit in the entire history of the space age, only 4800 [1] remain in orbit and approximately 1950 [2] of those are still active. And it isn't simply numbers – the mass in orbit will increase substantially, and long-term debris generation is strongly correlated with mass. Table 1. Some announced NewSpace constellations. Operator Number of satellites Altitude (km) Country SpaceX V-band 7518 335–345 US Capella 48 350–650 US Planet Swift 6 350–650 US Black Sky 60 450 US Satellogic NuSat 300 500 Argentina Kepler 140 550 US SpaceX Starlink 1584 550 US Skybox 30 576 US Fleet 100 580 Australia Amazon Kuiper 3236 590–630 US Commsat 800 600 China Kineis 20 600 France Yalini 135 600 Canada Spire 100 651 US Planet Doves 150 675 US Orbcomm 31 750 US Iridium 72 780 US Theia 112 800 US Lucky Star 156 1000 China Telesat LEO 72 1000 Canada Hongyan 300 1100 China Xinwei 32 1100 China SpaceX Starlink 2825 1110–1325 US OneWeb 720 1200 ESA Telesat LEO 45 1248 Canada Astrome Tech 600 1400 India LeoSat 108 1400 US Globalstar 40 1412 US This table is in constant flux. It is based largely on U.S. filings with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and various press releases, but many of the companies here have already altered or abandoned their original plans, and new systems are no doubt in work. Although many of these large constellations may never be launched as listed, the traffic created if just half are successful would be more than double the number of payloads launched in the last 60 years and more than 6 times the number of currently active satellites. Current space safety, space surveillance, collision avoidance (COLA) and debris mitigation processes have been designed for and have evolved with the current population profile, launch rates and density of LEO space. By almost any metric used to measure activity in space, whether it is payloads in orbit, the size of constellations, the rate of launches, the economic stakes, the potential for debris creation, the number of conjunctions, NewSpace represents a fundamental change. 3. Compounding effects of better SSA, more satellites, and new operational concepts The changes in the space environment can be seen on this figurative map of low Earth orbit. Fig. 1 shows the LEO environment as a function of altitude. The number of objects found in each 10 km “bin” is plotted on the horizontal axis, while the altitude is plotted vertically. Objects in elliptical orbits are distributed between bins as partial objects proportional to the time spent in each bin. Some notable resident systems are indicated in blue text on the right to provide an altitude reference. The (dotted) red line shows the number of objects in the current catalog tracked by the U.S. Space Surveillance Network (SSN). All the COLA alerts and actions that must be taken by the residents are due to their neighbors in the nearby bins, so the currently visible risk is proportional to the red line.



Fig. 1. Objects in LEO orbit by altitude per 10 km altitude bin. Elliptical orbit objects distributed by portion spent in each bin. Some notable existing resident systems are listed on the right. New residents, including some replacement systems, are on the left. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.) The red line of the current catalog does not represent the complete risk; it indicates the risk we can track and perhaps avoid. A rule of thumb is that the current SSN LEO catalog contains objects about 10 cm or larger. It is generally accepted that an impact in LEO with an object 1 cm or larger will cause damage likely to be fatal to a satellite's mission. Therefore, there is a large latent risk from unobserved debris. While we cannot currently track and catalog much smaller than 10 cm, experiments have been performed to detect and sample much smaller objects and statistically model the population at this size [3]. The (solid) blue line represents the model of the 1 cm and larger debris that is likely mission-ending, usually called lethal but not trackable. If LEO operators avoid collisions with all the objects in the red line, they are nonetheless inherently accepting the risk from the blue line. This risk is already present. The (dashed) orange line is an estimate of the population at 5 cm and larger and is thus an estimate of what the catalog might conservatively be a few years after the Space Fence, a new radar system being built by the Air Force, comes on line (currently planned for 2019) [4]. Commercial companies offering space surveillance services, such as LeoLabs, ExoAnalytics, Analytic Graphics Inc., Lockheed, and Boeing, might also add to the number of objects currently tracked. Space Policy Directive 3 (SPD-3) [13] specifically seeks to expand the use of commercial SSA services. Existing operators can expect a sharp increase in the number of warnings and alerts they will receive because of the increase in the cataloged population. Almost all the increase will come from newly detected debris [5]. The pace of safety operations for each satellite on orbit will significantly change because of the increase in the catalog from the Space Fence. This effect is compounded because the NewSpace constellations described in Table 1 will drastically change the profile of satellites in LEO. The green bars in Fig. 1 represent the number of objects that will be added to the catalog (red or orange lines) from only the NewSpace large LEO constellations at their operational altitudes. This does not include the rocket stages that launch them, or satellites in the process of being phased into or removed from the operational orbits. Neighbors of one of these new constellations may face a radically different operations environment than their current practices were designed to address. Satellites in these large LEO constellations typically have planned operational lifetimes of 5–10 years. Some companies have proposed to dispose of their satellites using low thrust electric propulsion systems, which would spiral satellites down over a period of months or years from operating altitudes as high as 1500 km through lower orbits where the Hubble Space Telescope, the International Space Station, and other critical LEO satellites operate [6]. Similar propulsive techniques would raise replacement satellites from lower launch injection orbits to higher operational orbits. These disposal and replenishment activities will add thousands of satellites each year transiting through lower altitudes and posing a risk to all resident satellites in those lower orbits. More importantly, failures will occur both among transiting satellites and operational constellations, potentially leaving hundreds more stranded along the transit path. Aerospace studies [7–9] have shown that failed satellites, whether they fail during operations or fail during disposal, can pose as great or even greater risk than the many thousands of operational satellites (Fig. 2). Given the rapid flux in the proposed large LEO constellations (LLC), we created a Future Constellations Model (FCM) with elements that represented the characteristics of the different systems being proposed. In our models, almost all the collisions and the resulting debris from those collisions occur because of failed systems. Most large constellation operators intend to perform active collision avoidance for active systems, whether operational or in some stage of check-out or disposal, but failed satellites are assumed to be incapable of maneuver. Fig. 2 also shows that satellites in the disposal phase can contribute to collisions similarly to satellites in the operational phase. Fig 2 Download : Download full-size image Fig. 2. Collisions during operations and disposal over 10 years for various NewSpace Future Constellation Models (FCMs). 4. A notional illustration of workload The highest risk to operational satellites comes from the lethal but non-trackable debris that is depicted in the blue line in Fig. 2. However, operators perform collision avoidance only on the objects that can be tracked and cataloged. Advances in tracking and NewSpace launches will both act to increase this workload. A key element of the problem is that an increase in the LEO population will lead to an increase in close approaches to existing satellites [5], and the potential for accidental collisions. Conjunction prediction, collision probability (Pc), and maneuver planning for most existing satellite operators is a time- and personnel-intensive operation. Orbit analysts, and propulsion, navigation, and communications systems personnel are involved in evaluating and planning maneuvers over several days and must do so even if the ultimate decision is to “fly through” a close approach. Since most existing systems have small numbers of vehicles and the number of conjunctions any given operator experiences is relatively small, COLA remains a manual process. For systems not designed with automated maneuver planning, a COLA assessment that progresses all the way to a maneuver plan can consume considerable effort, whether or not the maneuver is executed. If a large constellation is deployed next to an existing resident system, the existing system may experience many conjunctions and alerts due to its close proximity of the dense new constellation. A sufficiently large constellation will, in effect, form a “shell” where frequent opportunities for conjunctions will be created. For example, Fig. 3 depicts a fictional scenario where 1225 “New” satellites are distributed in 35 planes in circular orbits at 1000 km altitude, at 98° inclination. These are placed near a hypothetical “Old” six-satellite constellation operating in a nearly circular orbit at the same altitude and 63° inclination. Following a common operations practice, we assume that the Old satellite operators flag a conjunction at Pc> 10−7, start COLA assessment with additional tracking at Pc> 10−6, and plan a COLA maneuver when the Pc> 10−5. A conjunction with Pc > 10−4 would typically be considered a significant risk leading most operators to maneuver. Fig 3 Download : Download full-size image Fig. 3. “New” large LEO constellation at same average altitude as “Old” existing constellation. Currently, the Old system in this example would typically see a warning (Pc > 10−6) a few times a month at this altitude, and of those, a few per year might cross the maneuver threshold. For the operations center, this would be multiplied by the number of satellites in the constellation. When the New system parks nearby, the number of COLA alerts jumps substantially. But the number of alerts depends entirely on the error bubble, (covariance) used. If the typical errors of the public external tracking data and the orbit propagation methods that are widely available (General Perturbations, or GP) are used for both constellations, over a 30-day period we see 129 conjunctions that cross the threshold for COLA assessment (Pc> 10−6), and 53 that cross the maneuver planning threshold (Pc> 10−5) (Fig. 4). This is nearly 2 per day. This could be an enormous workload for a manual process. If a high accuracy catalog (Special Perturbations, or “SP”) and a high-fidelity propagator with its typical covariances is used, the number of conjunctions goes from 129 to a more manageable 10. SP data is maintained by the Air Force, but it is not widely available. It is interesting to note that nine of those 10 crossed the maneuver-planning threshold, and of those, four crossed the Pc> 10−4 where many operators would choose to execute a maneuver. Compared to GP, the SP-quality data resulted in far fewer warnings and flagged four very close conjunctions. The operations center would have been able to concentrate on fewer “false alarms”. We also computed the case where GPS-quality owner-operator data was used for both systems, in which we assumed near-real-time owner-operator position data of very high quality was provided by both operators and used in the collision analysis. In this case, NONE of the conjunctions resulted in a warning and no COLA alerts were generated. The closest approach was 99 m, with a Pc of 3.7 × 10−7 using SP. But because of the quality of the GPS-based position data, this conjunction did not raise an alert because the fully-informed operators could be confident that a collision would not occur. Fig 4 Download : Download full-size image Fig. 4. Number of COLA alerts in 30 days for various qualities of position knowledge when a fictional new system is deployed near an existing one. In the example, an operations center for the Old constellation of six satellites could go from about one COLA assessment a week to nearly one per day per satellite, if only the published satellite catalog is available. If a new constellation operates too close to an existing system, the operator workload may become unreasonable using existing processes. But high accuracy data makes this manageable, and GPS-quality owner-operator data for both systems makes the problem vanish. Since these constellations are likely to be operated by different companies or governments, sharing high-quality position data would likely require an active space traffic management organization. Existing operators will not necessarily have large constellations parked nearby, but they will nonetheless be affected by the new activity. The new large constellations’ satellites typically will have relatively short lifetimes and will need frequent replenishment. The traffic transiting up and down will be substantial, and failures could leave stranded objects at intermediate altitudes, permanently increasing the collision risk. 5. Conjunction warning overload NewSpace operators will face a different challenge due to the vast increase in numbers of satellites. While there are likely as many operational plans as there are operators, a large constellation must consider close approaches with itself. Even if there are no neighboring systems, self-conjunctions can occur between two members of the same constellation. Depending on the configuration, a given operator could see hundreds to thousands of self-conjunctions that cross typical warning thresholds each day using current practices. This could be an issue for a space traffic management (STM) agency, even if it is not an issue for the operator. Aerospace models show that for one possible NewSpace constellation, more than 500,000 self-conjunctions each year could result that cross the typical Pc > 10−6 warning threshold. If no action were taken, we would expect 2–3 collisions per year. This is clearly unacceptable. Thus, current tracking accuracy and processes might produce millions of warnings per year for NewSpace operators to prevent half a dozen actual collisions. Under current practices operators would need to sort through an enormous haystack to find the needles, and because a handful of actual collisions will occur, the warnings cannot be ignored.

#### Risk is low – sat designs and cleanup checks.

O’Gorman 18 (John, MA thesis submitted to Rochester Institute of Technology, “The Cost of Clean Space- A Study of the Additional Fuel Costs of Launching Above Low Earth Orbit,” 5-18, <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/d703/101d657334d2e1575d08005e290578770cd1.pdf?_ga=2.70400848.1753078645.1567896134-909185996.1567896134>)

To conclude, orbital debris is a current issue and has the potential to be a serious problem in the coming decades and centuries if business as usual is conducted. Fortunately, steps are being taken now which can mitigate this disastrous scenario. The space community is still relatively small and better rocket and satellite design is helping to avoid the accidental creation of debris. Studies over the feasibility of pulling large objects from orbit have already been done and they show a large amount of promise for managing the future creation of debris very effectively. Although current international policies managing debris do not yet exist, the discussion over how space will be managed is already well underway. If sound debris policies can come out of these discussions, the utility of LEO can be preserved for future generations.

#### Kessler Syndrome false – less debris and existing guidelines solve

Lewis 15 (Hugh, Senior Lecturer in Aerospace Engineering at the University of Southampton, “Space debris, Kessler Syndrome, and the unreasonable expectation of certainty.” Room, <https://room.eu.com/article/Space_debris_Kessler_Syndrome_and_the_unreasonable_expectation_of_certainty>, Accessed 8/10/19, JMoore)

There is now widespread awareness of the space debris problem amongst policymakers, scientists, engineers and the public. Thanks to pivotal work by J.C. Liou and Nicholas Johnson in 2006 we now understand that the continued growth of the debris population is likely in the future even if all launch activity is halted. The reason for this sustained growth, and for the concern of many satellite operators who are forced to act to protect their assets, are collisions that are expected to occur between objects – satellites and rocket stages – already in orbit. In spite of several commentators warning that these collisions are just the start of a collision cascade that will render access to low Earth orbit all but impossible – a process commonly referred to as the ‘Kessler Syndrome’ after the debris scientist Donald Kessler – the reality is not likely to be on the scale of these predictions or the events depicted in the film Gravity. Indeed, results presented by the Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee (IADC) at the Sixth European Conference on Space Debris show an expected increase in the debris population of only 30% after 200 years with continued launch activity. Collisions are still predicted to occur, but this is far from the catastrophic scenario feared by some. Constraining the population increase to a modest level can be achieved, the IADC suggested, through widespread and good compliance with existing space debris mitigation guidelines, especially those relating to passivation (whereby all sources of stored energy on a satellite are depleted at the end of its mission) and post-mission disposal, such as de-orbiting the satellite or re-orbiting it to a graveyard orbit. Nevertheless, the anticipated growth of the debris population in spite of these robust efforts merits the investigation of additional measures to address the debris threat, according to the IADC.

#### Global ADR development already exists – solves.

Zachary Keck, Wohlstetter Public Affairs Fellow at the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, 6-17-2018, "Space Is Truly the Final Frontier (For the Next Great War)," National Interest, https://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/space-truly-the-final-frontier-the-next-great-war-26284

The first type of dual-use spacecraft—called active debris removal (ADR)—are designed to deal with the rapidly growing problem of space debris. One preliminary ADR example came from China in June 2016 when it launched the "Aolong-1" spacecraft, which was a demonstrator device. These ADR spacecraft—which are also being developed by the United States, European Union, and Russia— can retrieve debris floating in space. Then, the ADR spacecraft bring the debris down to re-enter the atmosphere, destroying it by the intense frictional heat. Alternatively, they can also instead place the debris in graveyard orbits to reduce the probability of colliding with operational satellites.

#### They have no evidence that the actions this modelling motivates is sufficient to solve climate change you should tie them to their evidence considering none of the highlighted portion argues that it creates

#### Sat attacks don’t cause nuke war

Zarybnisky 18 [Eric J. Zarybnisky, MA in National Security Studies from the Naval War College, PhD in Operations Research from the MIT Sloan School of Management, Lt Col, USAF. Celestial Deterrence: Deterring Aggression in the Global Commons of Space. March 28, 2018. <https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1062004.pdf>]

PREVENTING AGGRESSION IN SPACE

While deterrence and the Cold War are strongly linked in the public’s mind through the nuclear standoff between the United States and the Soviet Union, the fundamentals of deterrence date back millennia and deterrence remains relevant. Thucydides alludes to the concept of deterrence in his telling of the Peloponnesian War when he describes rivals seeking advantages, such as recruiting allies, to dissuade an adversary from starting or expanding a conflict.6F 6 Aggression in space was successfully avoided during the Cold War because both sides viewed an attack on military satellites as highly escalatory, and such an action would likely result in general nuclear war.7F 7 In today’s more nuanced world, attacking satellites, including military satellites, does not necessarily result in nuclear war. For instance, foreign countries have used highpowered lasers against American intelligence-gathering satellites8F 8 and the United States has been reluctant to respond, let alone retaliate with nuclear weapons. This shift in policy is a result of the broader use of gray zone operations, to which countries struggle to respond while limiting escalation. Beginning with the fundamentals of deterrence illuminates how it applies to prevention of aggression in space.

#### Solar flares are an alt cause

Wild 15 (Jim Wild, Professor of Space Physics at Lancaster University, “With So Much Vested In Satellites, Solar Storms Could Bring Life To A Standstill,” July 30, 2015, https://theconversation.com/with-so-much-vested-in-satellites-solar-storms-could-bring-life-to-a-standstill-45204)

These can disrupt satellite operations by depositing electrical charge within the on-board electronics, triggering phantom commands or overloading and damaging sensitive components. The effects of space weather on the Earth’s upper atmosphere disrupts radio signals transmitted by navigation satellites, potentially introducing positioning errors or, in more severe cases, rendering them unusable.

These are not theoretical hazards: in recent decades, solar storms have caused outages for a number of satellites services – and a handful of satellites have been lost altogether. These were costly events – satellite operator losses have run into hundreds of millions of dollars. The wider social and economic impact was relatively limited, but even so it’s unclear how our growing amount of space infrastructure would fare against the more extreme space weather that we might face.

#### escalation relies on militarization that they cant solve for – their card is about the space force and ASATS already in development