**NEG**

**I negate the resolution that the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.**

**1] The affirmative has the burden to prove that appropriation of outer space by private entities directly violates already standing protected property rights of a person or nation.**

#### **2] Habitation in outer space is inevitable**

**Pettit 21** [(Harry, Senior Digital Technology and Science Reporter, a science and technology reporter at MailOnline, Harry Pettit joined The Sun in December 2018. He holds an undergrad degree in Physiology from the University of Manchester and a Master’s degree in Science Communication from Imperial College London.), “Humans could move to ‘floating asteroid belt colony’ within 15 years,” NYPost, 1/20/2021, <https://nypost.com/2021/01/20/humans-could-move-to-floating-asteroid-belt-colony-within-15-years/>] TDI

**Humans could live on giant orbs floating in the asteroid belt between Mars and Jupiter within the next 15 years.** That’s the bonkers claim made by top scientist Dr. Pekka Janhunen, who says **millions of people could inhabit a megacity in space by 2026.** Janhunen, an astrophysicist at the Finnish Meteorological Institute in Helsinki, described his vision in a research paper published this month. He laid out the blueprint for floating “mega-satellites” around the dwarf planet Ceres, which lies roughly 325 million miles from Earth. “**The motivation is to have a settlement with artificial gravity that allows growth beyond Earth’s living area,**” Janhunen wrote.The vast majority of plots to settle distant worlds revolve around the moon or Mars. This is largely due to their proximity to Earth. Janhunen’s proposal, on the other hand, looks a little farther afield.His disk-shaped habitat would boast thousands of cylindrical structures, each home to more than 50,000 people. Those pods would be linked by powerful magnets and generate artificial gravity by slowly rotating. Residents would mine resources from Ceres 600 miles below the settlement and haul them back up using “space elevators,” Janhunen said. “Lifting the materials from Ceres is energetically cheap compared to processing them into habitats, if a space elevator is used,” he wrote. “**Because Ceres has low gravity and rotates relatively fast, the space elevator is feasible.**” Ceres — the largest object in the asteroid belt — is the best destination for off-world settlements due to its nitrogen-rich atmosphere, Janhunen added.This would allow settlers to more easily create Earth-like conditions than those colonizing the harsher, carbon dioxide-rich environment of Mars. That doesn’t solve the threats of rogue asteroids or space radiation, though Janhunen, who worked with a number of Finnish researchers on the paper, has thought of that, too. He proposed that giant, cylindrical mirrors placed around the mega-satellite could protect it from bombardment of all kinds. Those mirrors would also focus sunlight onto the habitat for the growth of crops and other plant life.

**I contend that property rights do not exist in outer space such that the use of outer space by a private entity would violate someone’s rights. If there is no rights violation, then there is no injustice.**

**Stephen 69**

Gorove, Stephen. Professor of space law and director of space studies and policy, 1991-1998, University of Mississippi “Interpreting Article II of the Outer Space Treaty.” 37 Fordham L. Rev. 349, 1969. https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr/vol37/iss3/2 Space Law Professor Stephen Gorove defines “appropriation of outer space” as: With respect to the concept of appropriation the basic question is what constitutes "appropriation," as used in the Treaty, especially in contradistinction to casual or temporary use. **The term "appropriation" is used most frequently to denote the taking of property for one's own or exclusive use with a sense of permanence.** Under such interpretation, the establishment of a permanent settlement or the carrying out of commercial activities by nationals of a country on a celestial body may constitute national appropriation if the activities take place under the supreme authority (sovereignty) of the state**.** Short of this, if the state wields no exclusive authority or jurisdiction in relation to the area in question, the answer would seem to be in the negative, unless, the nationals also use their individual appropriations as cover-ups for their state's activities.5 In this connection, **it should be emphasized that the word "appropriation" indicates a taking that involves something more than just casual use. Thus a temporary occupation of a landing site or other area, just like the temporary or nonexclusive use of property, would not constitute appropriation.** By the same token, any use involving consumption or taking with intention of keeping for one's own exclusive use would amount to appropriation.

**The lack of clarity in the affirmative’s definition of appropriation does not establish a standard for evaluation; however, my definition actually addresses temporary use of a property or non-exclusive use of the property is not appropriation.**

**(Unjust-not morally right; not fair (Cambridge dictionary))**

**I reserve the right to clarify.**

**I value Global Justice as the resolution impacts the world, and not just a particular region or group of people.**

In Guo, Sujian & Lin, Xi & Coicaud, Jean-Marc & Gu, Su & Gu, Yanfeng & Liu, Qingping & Qin, Xuan & Sun, Guodong & Wang, Zhongyuan & Zhang, Chunman. (2019).Conceptualizing and Measuring Global Justice: Theories, Concepts, Principles and Indicators. Fudan Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences. Guo et al 2019 1 states that

Global justice is composed of multi-level and multidimensional aspects belonging to both normative and empirical realities. A coherent and integrated theoretical framework that covers the normative basis and various empirical dimensions is therefore much needed in order to address some of the basic and important questions under study. The paper seeks to synthesize the multiple theories and conceptions of global justice that exist in the academic discourse and literature into [there are] three main theoretical approaches to global justice—rights based, good based, and virtue based. These three approaches are a good sample of and reflect well the strengths of the different theoretical, intellectual and cultural traditions at play in the study of global justice. From this perspective, the synthesis of the three approaches is meant to provide[s] us with a coherent theoretical framework that serves as the normative basis and justifies the selection of indicators for measurement.

**Recognition of human rights is a side constraint on all ethical theories because these rights are inviolable. This means ethical theories like utilitarianism will always fail because the rights of the minorities will be violated when a policy is implemented which promotes the greatest good for the greatest number.**

**Guo et al 2019 2 states**

**1 Rights‐Based Conceptualization of Global Justice**

**1.1 The Conception of Justice**

**Our conception of justice is mainly based on social justice. As Rawls points out: “For us the primary subject is the basic structure of society, or more exactly, the way in which the major social institutions distribute fundamental rights and duties and determine the division of advantages from social cooperation.”** (Rawls 1999, p. 6) The study of **justice** **has been concerned with what we owe one another, and what obligations we might have to treat each other fairly** in a range of domains, including over distributive and recognitional matters.

Thus, the standard is respecting the human rights of all persons. Prefer this standard **Guo et al 2019 3**

1. **The protection of the rights of every person is a duty for any political institution.**
2. **Human rights belong to all individuals regardless of their citizenship, nationality, culture and other forms of associative membership.**
3. **The global community has an obligation to protect human rights- Guo et al ‘19**

**As a universal ideal, the protection and securing of the human rights of individuals is not solely the purview of their respective states. States may well be the primary moral agents tasked with securing and protecting the human rights of their own citizens, but human rights are ultimately a matter of international concern. When a state fails to live up to its human rights duties, the international community has the responsibility to respond appropriately. The universality of human rights, therefore, has important practical implications** (Tan 2017, p. 60).

**It is only through innovation and technological advances that we can solve existential risks to citizens. By protecting earth’s citizens and their human rights, justice is applied to all persons and not just a select few.**

#### **Contention 1**

#### **Innovation and technology supports global justice.**

**Kay 20** — Award-winning editor, versatile storyteller, and the founder of Hong Kong-based creative content agency Perfect Ink Media. Proven track record for creating and directing multi-platform content that balances commercial imperatives with editorial verve for media outlets and international brands. Effective team-builder and experienced trainer. [Paul Kay; Published: December 7, 2020; "When disaster strikes, innovation **strikes back**"; National Geographic; Accessed: April 26, 2021; <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/science/article/partner-content-when-disaster-strikes-innovation-strikes-back>]//KL

The course of **human history has been shaped by** many different forces, from kings and empires, to wars and treaties, to **science and technology**. **Frequently**, however, **the world has been** changed—or, better yet, **improved**—**by a single idea**.

**Over the past 150 years alone**, the invention of **toilets**, **synthetic fertilizers**, **blood transfusions**, **and vaccines are** all **credited with saving more than a billion lives each**1, while **countless other innovations**—from pasteurization to water chlorination to bifurcated needles—**have saved tens of millions** more. **In most cases, these breakthroughs have been the result of meticulous, single-minded research** to solve a specific problem, but many of the world’s most important life-saving inventions have been stumbled upon by accident, or developed for a completely different purpose than that which they would ultimately fulfill.

The laminated safety glass most commonly used in car windshields, for example, was invented when French scientist Edouard Benedictus carelessly dropped a glass flask containing cellulose nitrate, a liquid plastic that not only stopped the glass from shattering but enabled it to retain its original shape. Penicillin, meanwhile, was discovered when Scottish researcher Alexander Fleming accidentally contaminated a petri dish of bacteria he was working on, and noticed that the mold that formed prevented the bacteria culture from growing. And X-rays were a fortuitous byproduct of German physics professor Wilhelm Röntgen’s experiments with cathode ray tubes.

As science and technology have grown more sophisticated, world-changing discoveries—both deliberate and inadvertent—have become more and more frequent, with new innovations that enhance, protect or even save people’s lives appearing at astoundingly regular intervals. But just **as our ability to advance or safeguard our species has grown and evolved, so too have the problems we face**. For all our ingenuity, Covid-19 brought the world to a virtual standstill in the past year, **highlighting the need for innovative solutions** that can respond quickly **to emergenc**y situation**s**, while the challenges posed by **climate change, dwindling resources, and natural disaster events** continue to **loom** large.

**Contention 2**

#### **Space activities solve resource shortages, boost international cooperation, and eliminate existential risk.**

**Green 21** [Brian Patrick Green, director of technology ethics at the Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, Santa Clara University, “Space Ethics,” 2021, Rowman, pp. 4-5]

In favor of going into space are such basics as gaining scientific knowledge and developing beneficial new technologies, both of which **space exploration and** use have already begun to accomplish with dramatic and sometimes unexpected effects for humankind. Scientific advancements include astronomical and cosmological knowledge from various orbiting experiments and telescopes that have let us gain unprecedented understanding about our universe. But **space activities have** also **contributed to a great deal of scientific knowledge about our Earth,** including measurements of **environmental status, habitat conversion and destruction, detailed** **knowledge of anthropogenic climate change, and much about Earth’s chemistry** and geology. We have also learned a great deal about our local planets, for example, that a runaway “greenhouse effect” in the atmosphere of Venus makes the surface scorchingly hot, while too little greenhouse effect on Mars leaves the surface quite cold. There have also been **significant contributions made to medical science**, especially concerning the behavior of the human body when subjected to radiation, microgravity, nutritional restrictions, and so on.

On the technological side, everything with American global positioning system (GPS), Russian Glonass, or other global navigation systems—from smartphones to military vehicles—relies on a network of satellites above us, placed there by rocketry and painstakingly tracked with instruments developed for the task. **So many technologies have been pioneered by space exploration and use that it is hard to list them all**, but some of the more important ones include weather satellites (which are not only convenient but also allow preparation for and evacuation from severe weather), communication satellites, solar photovoltaic (PV) cells, advances in electronics and computers, advances in materials science, and so on. Space is also an important location for the contention of national interests in a geopolitical and military sense. As the ultimate “high ground” in battle, space allows certain asset classes such as spy satellites to exist in a position unassailable by many or most opponents. While permanent weapons stations and weapons of mass destruction are banned from space by the United Nations Outer Space Treaty (OST), 6 that has not stopped the development of weapons that are impermanent (such as missiles, missile interceptors, and antisatellite weapons) or the research and development of possible space-based weapons platforms, such as were envisioned by U.S. president Ronald Reagan’s Strategic Defense Initiative, nicknamed “Star Wars.” While military and political interests may ultimately seem to be a less noble reason to explore and use space, relative power, safety, and security certainly are very human interests and are valuable to those who feel they are being protected by them. **Space activities are** also **a key way of promoting international cooperation** and global awareness. While the international competition of the “space race” fueled one nation all the way to the Moon, shortly afterward, the Apollo-Soyuz program announced a thawing of this competition and commenced a period of cooperation between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Currently the International Space Station continues this cross-national cooperation in space, with five space agencies (representing Canada, the European Space Agency nations, Japan, Russia, and the United States) participating. In addition to cooperation in space exploration itself, the perspective given from space has itself helped to produce some feelings of unity on Earth, with the famous “Blue Marble” and “Earthrise” pictures showing Earth’s oneness and scientific discoveries supported by space science, such as those related to climate change, helping to promote international cooperation to address these problems.

Gaining access to **new critical resources** may be another reason to go into space. Earth is a finite planet, and certain elements on Earth are very rare in the planetary crust, particularly platinum group metals that are very dense and siderophilic (iron-loving) and so have tended to sink toward the core over the natural history of the planet. However, **asteroids** and other objects in space (for example, planets, comets, and moons) can sometimes have these elements in abundance and in more available locations, making them potentially excellent sources for these valuable materials. Now-defunct asteroid-mining startup Planetary Resources once estimated that one “platinum-rich 500 meter wide asteroid contains . . . **1.5 times the** known **world-reserves** of platinum group metals (ruthenium, rhodium, palladium, osmium, iridium, and platinum).” 7 In addition to returning elements to a resource-hungry Earth, further exploration and development of space will require access to resources that are not purely sourced from Earth. In particular, it will be necessary to gain access to water, which is relatively rare in the inner solar system and which would be far too costly to transport in any significant amounts from the Earth’s surface.

Another reason that **humans** may want to **explore space** would be **to create a “backup Earth” to** **hedge against** global catastrophic and **existential risks** (risks that may cause widespread disaster or human extinction, respectively) on our home planet. 8 Earth has always been a dangerous place for humans, with **asteroid impacts, supervolcanic eruptions,** pandemic **disease**, and other natural hazards threatening civilization. Now, in addition to these natural threats, human-made hazards such as **nuclear weapons, climate change, biotech**nology, **nanotech**nology, **and a**rtificial **i**ntelligence may **threaten** not only the viability of technological civilization but perhaps the survival of human **life itself.** A serious global-scale catastrophe could set back civilization many decades or centuries, and the worst disasters could cause human extinction. In one scenario, in which 100 percent of humanity dies, all of human effort for all of history would be for nothing. However, were the same global catastrophe to happen to Earth, yet humans were a multiplanetary species with **just one self-sustaining settlement off-Earth**, it would not result in the end of human civilization or human extinction. Instead while the same unimaginable fate would befall the Earth (certainly no mere triviality, with perhaps the deaths of 99.999 percent of all humans and possibly the destruction of the ecosphere and everything in it), at least all of human and planetory history would not be for nothing. Human life and culture would go on elsewhere, as well as other Earth species. This is a dire fate, but less terrible than the first.

**Appropriation spurs private growth**

**Feder 19**

**[Toni Feder, 2019 https://physicstoday.scitation.org/doi/10.1063/PT.3.4290]**

An apparent confluence of political will and technological readiness has fans of humankind’s expansion beyond Earth hopeful that their dreams may soon become reality. **Alongside a rise in missions to the Moon by agencies and private companies in the US, Europe, China, Japan, India, and Russia, commercial sectors are buzzing with related activities.** And various governmental and nongovernmental bodies are strategizing about environmental, ethical, legal, sociological, and other issues of space utilization and colonization. With interest in space travel growing—spurred in part by billionaire entrepreneurs such as Jeff Bezos and Elon Musk—enthusiasts say the time is right to figure out how to use space resources, including water, solar power, and lunar regolith. Doing so would expand space exploration, increase commercial activities in space, and lead to technological advances for humanity, says Angel Abbud-Madrid, director of the first graduate degree program in space resources, which he and colleagues launched last year at the Colorado School of Mines. The only space resource exploited to date is the view of Earth from orbit for such applications as global positioning systems, weather prediction, communications, and science missions. **A few years ago the prospect of mining asteroids for platinum and other metals to use on Earth was “the rage,” says George Sowers of the Colorado School of Mines. But the business case didn’t hold up. One exception might be rare-earth elements, but in the near to mid term, he says, “bringing stuff back to Earth is not economically viable.”** For now, the focus has shifted to using space resources in situ. Water is a primary target resource in space. Electrolyzed into hydrogen and oxygen, it becomes fuel that could replenish satellites in orbit and propel rockets for exploring the solar system and returning to Earth. Astronauts and space tourists could drink water, use it for gardening and hygiene, and shield themselves from ionizing radiation with meter-thick sheaths of it around habitats or spacecraft. In 2016 rocket manufacturer United Launch Alliance announced that the company would buy liquid oxygen and hydrogen propellants in low-Earth orbit for $3000/kg. Sowers made that offer in his previous job as ULA chief scientist

….

“We either destroy the environment, limit the amount of computing, or we move off the planet,” he says. Data is the easiest thing to move, “so we can create server farms in space and send the data back to Earth.” By moving a large portion of the industrial footprint to the Moon, “we clean up our planet.” Matthew Weinzierl, a Harvard Business School professor who studies the public and private space sectors, says that for new space-based activities to develop to any sizeable scale would require “a spectacular breakthrough along the lines of manufacturing or solar energy from space.” **Space tourism could lead to a “virtuous cycle of space services development,”** he says. But many uncertainties remain. “It’s hard for me to see meaningful [lunar] settlement over the next several decades,” he says, adding that **a limited station, such as those on Antarctica, seems more likely.** Ian Lange, an economist at the Colorado School of Mines, doubts that the space resources and travel industries could maintain funding through an economic downturn. Still, he says, if launch costs continue to drop, “it will be a game changer as it will become cheap to start putting infrastructure in space.” When technical revolutions lead to economic revolutions, social upheaval often results, says Metzger. “It takes time to find justice. The same will happen when we get industry off the planet.” It’s not too soon to be “intentional” about expanding to space, he says, both to benefit humankind and to avoid war.

**Private space development allows NASA to prioritize its limited resources on the most important projects that protect basic human rights.**

**Sharma 21**

[Sharma, Maanas. “The Privatized Frontier: The Ethical Implications And Role Of Private Companies In Space Exploration.” The Space Review. September 07, 2021. Web. December 11, 2021.]

Another key matter to note is restricted capitalism in space “could also be our salvation.”[11] Private space exploration could reap increased access to resources and other benefits that can be used to solve the very problems on Earth that critics of capitalism identify. **Since governments offset some of their projects to private companies, government agencies can focus on altruistic projects that otherwise would not fit in the budget before and do not have the immediate commercial use that private companies look for.** Scott Hubbard, an adjunct professor of aeronautics and astronautics at Stanford University, discusses how “this strategy allows the space agency to continue ‘exploring the fringe where there really is no business case’” but still has important impacts on people down on Earth.[12] Indeed, this idea is a particularly powerful one when considering the ideal future of private companies in space exploration. Though there is no one set way governments will interact with companies, the consensus is that they must radically reimagine their main purpose as the role of private space exploration continues to grow. As governments utilize services from private space companies, “[i]nstead of being bogged down by the routine application of old research, NASA can prioritize their limited budget to work more on the research of other unknowns and development of new long-term space travel technologies.”[13] According to the Council on Foreign Relations, such technologies have far-reaching benefits on Earth as well. Past developments obviously include communications satellites, by themselves a massive benefit to society, but also “refinements in artificial hearts; improved mammograms; and laser eye surgery… thermoelectric coolers for microchips; high-temperature lubricants; and a means for mass-producing carbon nanotubes, a material with significant engineering potential; [and h]ousehold products.”[2] Agencies like NASA are the only actors able to pursue the next game-changing missions, “where the profit motive is not as evident and where the barriers to entry are still too high for the private sector to really make a compelling business case.”[8] These technologies have revolutionized millions, if not billions, of lives, demonstrating the remarkable benefits of space exploration. It follows then that it is net ethical to prioritize these benefits. This report concludes that the private sector, indeed, has a prominent role to play in the future of space exploration. **Further, though private space exploration does bring the potential of increased danger and the colonization of space, these concerns can be effectively mitigated. Namely, strong government frameworks— particularly international ones—will minimize possible sources of ethical violations and ensure an optimal private sector role in space.** This also allows government agencies to complete significantly more difficult, innovative projects which have transformative benefits for life on Earth

**Blocks and Turns**

**Privatization allows for rapid-acquisition, which means enforcement of laws is easy and quick**

**Schmitt 19**

[Ms. Schmitt (Candidate, BS, Georgia Institute of Technology) is a student in the Sam Nunn School of International Affairs where she is pursuing a bachelor’s degree in International Affairs and Modern Languages with a specialization in French and Arabic. https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Portals/10/ASPJ/journals/Volume-33\_Issue-2/V-Schmitt\_Bettinger.pdf]

“We must expect that war of any kind will extend into space in any future conflict, and we have to change the way we think and prepare for that eventuality,” Air Force Chief of Staff Gen David L. Goldfein told the Air Force Association in February 2018.1 Considering President Trump’s recent promotion of a military department specializing in space operations, conflict in outer space is becoming an increasingly concerning possibility for US officials.2 This conflict could be the result of a number of different scenarios: space war could occur as an isolated incident, a preliminary strike in preparation for a terrestrial conflict, or an escalation of an existing terrestrial conflict. Regardless of the means by which the US arrives at the brink of a space war, the US government (USG) and military must possess the tools necessary to create a successful deterrent against potential adversaries. Should deterrence fail, the US must retain the ability to support ground forces via the exploitation of space—the “ultimate high ground.”3 With these requirements in place, General Goldfein’s statement gains new urgency. Yet, it is possible that changing the way we think about the eventuality of space conflict could mean looking back to heritage processes to ensure military readiness. For instance, if an adversary is prepared to inhibit the functionality of “x” number of US on-orbit systems, could the US deter the adversary from attacking by rapidly doubling or even tripling its available space assets? The difficulty of producing and launching space assets precludes the possibility of rapid acquisition; however, **the temporary nationalization of existing civilian-owned assets in space for governmental and military purposes could abridge an otherwise lengthy space acquisitions process.** Although the duration of nationalization may span weeks to months—even years—an accurate assessment of the “temporary” nature of such a program is dependent on several factors. These factors include the continued presence of an adversary counterspace threat during a space war must be considered, preconflict contractual agreements, and the schedule for formal reconstitution of key on-orbit systems at the completion of a space war. The formal 62 AIR & SPACE POWER JOURNAL SUMMER 2019 Schmitt & Bettinger reconstitution may be on the order of years based on **the current space acquisitions process that typically takes 5–10 years to replace a given space system.4 This timeline may be shortened, though, with rapid-acquisitions solutions focused on commercial-off-the-shelf components and systems within a wider “responsive space” acquisitions architecture seeking to deliver stop-gap systems to mitigate short-term capability gaps.** The use of the descriptor temporary hereafter is meant to capture the finite nature of the program but is intentionally vague due to the scope of the present analysis.

#### **Extinction isn’t white paranoia and apocalyptic reps are good**

**Thompson 18** [Nicole Akoukou. Chicago-based creative writer. 4-6-2018. "Why I will not allow the fear of a nuclear attack to be white-washed." RaceBaitR. http://racebaitr.com/2018/04/06/2087/#]

**I couldn’t spare empathy for a white** woman **whose biggest fear was something that hadn’t happened yet and might not. Meanwhile, my most significant fears were in motion**: **women and men dying in cells** after being wrongly imprisoned, **choked out for peddling cigarettes, or shot to death** during ‘routine’ traffic stops. I twitch when my partner is late, worried that a cantankerous cop has brutalized or shot him because he wouldn’t prostrate himself. **As a woman of color, I am aware of** the **multiple types of violence that threaten me currently—not theoretically. Street harassment**, excessively affecting me as a Black woman, has blindsided me since I was eleven. A premature body meant **being** **catcalled** before I’d discussed the birds and the bees. It meant being **followed, whistled at, or groped**. As an adult, while navigating through neighborhoods with extinguished street lights, I noticed the correlation between women’s safety and street lighting—as well as the fact that Black and brown neighborhoods were never as brightly lit as those with a more significant white population. I move quickly through those unlit spaces, never comforted by the inevitable whirl of red and blue sirens. In fact, it’s always been the contrary. Ever so often, cops approach me in their vehicle’s encouraging me to “Hurry along,” “Stay on the sidewalk,” or “Have a good night.” My spine stiffening, I never believed they endorsed my safety. Instead, I worried that I’d be accused of an unnamed accusation, corned by a cop who preys on Black women, or worse. A majority of my 50-minute bus ride from the southside of Chicago to the north to join these women for the birthday celebration was spent reading articles about citywide shootings. I began with a Chicago Tribute piece titled “33 people shot, seven fatally, in 13 hours,” then toppled into a barrage of RIP posts on Facebook and ended with angry posts about police brutality on Tumblr. You might guess, by the time I arrived to dinner I wasn’t in the mood for the “I can’t believe we’re all going to die because Trump is an idiot” shit. I shook my head, willing the meal to be over, and was grateful when the check arrived just as someone was asking me about my hair. My thinking wasn’t all too different from Michael Harriot’s ‘Why Black America Isn’t Worried About the Upcoming Nuclear Holocaust.” While the meal was partly pleasant, **I departed thinking, “fear of nuclear demolition is just some white shit**.” Sadly, that thought would not last long. **I still vibe with Harriot’s statement, “Black people have lived under the specter of having our existence erased on a white man’s whim since we stepped on**to the **shore** at Jamestown Landing.” **However**, a friend—a Black friend—ignited my nuclear paranoia by sharing theories about when it might happen and who faced the greatest threat. In an attempt to ease my friend’s fear, I leaned in to listen but accidentally toppled down the rabbit hole too. I forked through curated news feeds. I sifted through “fake news,” “actual news,” and foreign news sources. Suddenly, an idea took root: **nuclear strike would disproportionately impact Black people, brown people, and low-income individuals. North Korea won’t target the plain sight racists of Portland**, Oregon, **the violently microaggressive liberals of the rural Northwest, or the white-hooded klansmen** **of** Diamondhead, **Mississippi. No, under the instruction of the supreme leader Kim Jong-un, North Korea will likely strike densely populated urban areas**, such as Los Angeles, Chicago, Washington D.C., and New York City. **These locations stand-out as targets for a nuclear strike because they are densely populated** U.S. population centers. **Attacking the heart of the nation or populous cities would translate to more casualties**. With that in mind, it’s not lost on me that **the most populous cities in the United States boast sizeable diverse populations, or more plainly put: Black populations.** This shit stresses me out! There’s a creeping chill that follows me, a silent alarm that rings each time my Google alert chimes letting me know that Donald Trump has yet again provoked Kim Jong-Un, a man who allegedly killed his very own uncle. I’ve grown so pressed by the idea of nuclear holocaust that my partner and I started gathering non-perishables, candlesticks, a hand-crank radio, and other must-buy items that can be banked in a shopping cart. **The practice of preparing for a nuclear holocaust sometimes feels comical, particularly when acknowledging that there has long been a war on Black people in this country**. Blackness is bittersweet in flavor. We are blessed with the melanized skin, the MacGyver-like inventiveness of our foremothers, and our blinding brightness—but the anti-blackness that we experience is also blinding as well as stifling. We are stuck by rigged systems, punished with the prison industrial complex, housing discrimination, pay discrimination, and worse. We get side-eyes from strangers when we’re “loitering,” and the police will pull us over for driving “too fast” in a residential neighborhood. We get murdered for holding cell phones while standing in our grandmother’s backyard. The racism that strung up our ancestors, kept them sequestered to the back of the bus and kept them in separate and unequal schools still lives. It lives, and it’s more palpable than dormant. To me, this means one thing: Trump’s America isn’t an unfortunate circumstance, it’s a homecoming event that’s hundreds of years in the making, no matter how many times my white friends’ say, “He’s not my president.” **In light of this homecoming, we now flirt with a new, larger fear of a Black genocide**. **America has always worked towards Black eradication through a steady stream of life-threatening inequality, but nuclear war on American soil would be swift**. And **for this reason I’ve grown tired of whiteness** **being at the center of the nuclear conversation. The race-neutral approach to the dialogue, and a tendency to continue to promote the idea that missiles will land in suburban and rural backyards, instead of inner-city playgrounds, is false.** “The Day After,” the iconic, highest-rated television film in history, aired November 20, 1983. More than 100 million people tuned in to watch a film postulating a war between the Soviet Union and the United States. The film, which would go on to affect President Ronald Reagan and policymakers’ nuclear intentions, shows the “true effects of nuclear war on average American citizens.” The Soviet-targeted areas featured in the film include Higginsville, Kansas City, Sedalia, Missouri, as well as El Dorado Springs, Missouri. They depict the destruction of the central United States, and viewers watch as full-scale nuclear war transforms middle America into a burned wasteland. Yet unsurprisingly, the **devastation from the attack is completely white-washed, leaving out the more likely victims which are the more densely populated (Black) areas**. **Death tolls would be high for white populations, yes, but large-scale losses of Black and brown folks would outpace that number, due to placement and poverty. That number would be pushed higher by limited access to premium health care, wealth, and resources. The effects of radiation sickness, burns, compounded injuries, and malnutrition would throttle Black and brown communities and would mark us for generations. It’s for that reason that we have to do more to foster** disaster **preparedness among Black people where we can. Black people deserve the space to explore nuclear unease, even if we have competing threats, anxieties**, and worries. Jacqui Patterson, Director of the Environmental and Climate Justice Initiative, once stated: African American communities are disproportionately vulnerable to and impacted by natural (and unnatural) catastrophes. Our socio-economic vulnerability is based on multiple factors including our lack of wealth to cushion us, our disproportionate representation in lower quality housing stock, and our relative lack of mobility, etc.

**Satellites and mining aren’t appropriation**

**Wrench 19**

[John G. Wrench, Non-Appropriation, No Problem: The Outer Space Treaty Is Ready for Asteroid Mining, 51 Case W. Res. J. Int'l L. 437 (2019) Available at: https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/jil/vol51/iss1/11]

And, ambitious they are. U.S.-based businesses like Planetary Resources and Deep Space Industries have plans to profit from space mining.34 **Scientists believe that asteroids and other celestial objects are abundant with precious metals, including those used to create a wide range of technology**.35 In January of 2018, Planetary Resources accomplished a step in its resource mining plans, by launching a satellite capable of detecting water. Because water can be used to create rocket-fuel, identifying water on asteroids would essentially create “launch pads for long distance travel.”36 Similarly, Deep Space Industries plans to launch a spacecraft capable of prospecting near- [w]e’re not going to leave flags and footprints and then come home, to not go back for another 50 years.” In response to what it deems “some misunderstanding,” the Deep Space Industries’ general counsel has reassured the international community that **the non-appropriation principle prohibits ownership—not the “use”38—of celestial bodies. Luxembourg interprets the OST similarly. In 2017, it passed a law granting businesses operating within its jurisdiction rights in resources extracted in outer space.**39 Through the law, Luxembourg plans to invest at least $230 million to encourage businesses to establish offices within its jurisdiction.40 The plan seems to be working: Planetary Resources applauded the law as a step towards “stability and predictability” for asteroid mining,41 while Deep Space Industries’ prospecting spacecraft will now be co-funded by Luxembourg