Ardrey Kell RG - Laird Lewis 1NC

Framework:

Because unjust in the resolution is defined as - not based on or behaving according to what is morally right and fair. Oxford Lang My value is Morality

The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing

[1] Pleasure and pain are the starting point for moral reasoning—they're our most baseline desires and the only things that explain intrinsic value

Moen 16, Ole Martin (PhD, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo). "An Argument for Hedonism." Journal of Value Inquiry 50.2 (2016): 267.

Let us start by observing, empirically, that **a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value** and disvalue **is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable**. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues. This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for **there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels**, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. "Pleasure" and "pain" **are** here **understood inclusively**, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative. 2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values. If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store**, I might ask: "What for**?" This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: "To buy soda." This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: "What is buying the soda good for?" This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: "Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it." If I then proceed by asking "But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?" the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. **The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good**. 3 As Aristotle observes: "**We never ask** [a man] **what** his **end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself**."4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says "This is painful!" we never respond by asking: "And why is that a problem?" We take for granted that **if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad**. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that **pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value**. Although **pleasure and pain thus seem to be good candidates for intrinsic value and disvalue**, several objections have been raised against this suggestion: (1) that pleasure and pain have instrumental but not intrinsic value/disvalue; (2) that pleasure and pain gain their value/disvalue derivatively, in virtue of satisfying/frustrating our desires; (3) that there is a subset of pleasures that are not intrinsically valuable (so-called "evil pleasures") and a subset of pains that are not intrinsically disvaluable (so-called "noble pains"), and (4) that pain asymbolia, masochism, and practices such as wiggling a loose tooth render it implausible that pain is intrinsically disvaluable. I shall argue that these objections fail. Though it is, of course, an open question whether other objections to P1 might be more successful, I shall assume that if (1)–(4) fail, we are justified in believing that P1 is true itself a paragon of freedom—there will always be some agents able to interfere substantially with one's choices. The effective level of protection one enjoys, and hence one's actual degree of freedom, will vary according to multiple factors: how powerful one is, how powerful individuals in one's vicinity are, how frequent police patrols are, and so on. Now, we saw above that what makes a slave unfree on Pettit's view is the fact that his master has the power to interfere arbitrarily with his choices; in other words, what makes the slave unfree is the power relation that obtains between his master and him. The difficulty is that, in light of the facts I just mentioned, there is no reason to think that this power relation will be unique. A similar relation could obtain between the master and someone other than the slave: absent perfect state control, the master may very well have enough power to interfere in the lives of countless individuals. Yet it would be wrong to infer that these individuals lack freedom in the way the slave does; if they lack anything, it seems to be security. A problematic power relation can also obtain between the slave and someone other than the master, since there may be citizens who are more powerful than the master and who can therefore interfere with the slave's choices at their discretion. Once again, it would be wrong to infer that these individuals make the slave unfree in the same way that the master does. Something appears to be missing from Pettit's view. If I live in a particularly nasty part of town, then it may turn out that, when all the relevant factors are taken into account, I am

just as vulnerable to outside interference as are the slaves in the royal palace, yet it does not follow that our conditions are equivalent from the point of view of freedom. As a matter of fact, we may be equally vulnerable to outside interference, but as a matter of right, our standings could not be more different. I have legal recourse against anyone who interferes with my freedom; the recourse may not be very effective—presumably it is not, if my overall vulnerability to outside interference is comparable to that of a slave— but I still have full legal standing.68 By contrast, the slave lacks legal recourse against the interventions of one specific individual: his master. It is that fact, on a Kantian view—a fact about the legal relation in which a slave stands to his master—that sets slaves apart from freemen. The point may appear trivial, but it does get something right: whereas one cannot identify a power relation that obtains uniquely between a slave and his master, the legal relation between them is undeniably unique. A master's right to interfere with respect to his slave does not extend to freemen, regardless of how vulnerable they might be as a matter of fact, and citizens other than the master do not have the right to order the slave around, regardless of how powerful they might be. This suggests that Kant is correct in thinking that the ideal of freedom is essentially linked to a person's having full legal standing. More specifically, he is correct in holding that the importance of rights is not exhausted by their contribution to the level of protection that an individual enjoys, as it must be on an instrumental view like Pettit's. Although it does matter that rights be enforced with reasonable effectiveness, the sheer fact that one has adequate legal rights is essential to one's standing as a free citizen. In this respect, Kant stays faithful to the idea that freedom is primarily a matter of standing—a standing that the freeman has and that the slave lacks. Pettit himself frequently insists on the idea, but he fails to do it justice when he claims that freedom is simply a matter of being adequately (and reliably) shielded against the strength of others. As Kant recognizes, the standing of a free citizen is a more complex matter than that. One could perhaps worry that the idea of legal standing is something of a red herring here—that it must ultimately be reducible to a complex network of power relations and, hence, that the position I attribute to Kant differs only nominally from Pettit's. That seems to me doubtful. Viewing legal standing as essential to freedom makes sense only if our conception of the former includes conceptions of what constitutes a fully adequate scheme of legal rights, appropriate legal recourse, justified punishment, and so on. Only if one believes that these notions all boil down to power relations will Kant's position appear similar to Pettit's. On any other view—and certainly that includes most views recently defended by philosophers—the notion of legal standing will outstrip the power relations that ground Pettit's theory.

[2] Extinction is the most important impact to prioritize - without a human race nothing else matters

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

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

the expected value of which is 4×(10^13). That is, in expected value terms, **the cost of waiting** for a few hundred years **is** vanishingly **small compared with** the benefit of **keeping** one's **options open** while one gains new information.

OST adds by defining appropriation as occupation, use, or any other means
https://www.space.com/33440-space-law.html#:~:text=Space%20is%20free%20for%20all,in%20other%20outer%2Dspace%20locations.

"Appropriation" includes claims to natural resources, not just real property.

Amanda M. **Leon**, Associate*, Caplin & Drysdale, Chtd., **'18**, Virginia Law Review ["MINING FOR MEANING: AN EXAMINATION OF THE LEGALITY OF PROPERTY RIGHTS IN SPACE RESOURCES" Vol. 104:497 2018] TDI

Appropriation. The term "appropriation" also remains ambiguous. Webster's defines the verb "appropriate" as "to take to oneself in exclusion of others; to claim or use as by an exclusive or pre-eminent right; as, let no man appropriate a common benefit."165 Similarly, **Black's Law Dictionary describes "appropriate" as an act "[t]o make a thing one's own;** to make a thing the subject of property; to exercise dominion over an object to the extent, and for the purpose, of making it subserve one's own proper use or pleasure."166 Oftentimes, appropriation refers to the setting aside of government funds, the taking of land for public purposes, or a tort of wrongfully taking another's property as one's own. The term **appropriation is often used not only with respect to real property but also with water**. **According to U.S. case law, a person completes an appropriation of water by diversion of the water and an application of the water to beneficial use**.167 **This common use of the term "appropriation" with respect to water illustrate**s two key points: **(1) the term applies to natural resources**—e.g., water or minerals—**not just real property**, **and (2) mining space resources and putting them to beneficial use**—**e.g., selling or manufacturing the mined resources**— **could reasonably be interpreted as an "appropriation" of outer space.** While the ordinary meaning of "appropriation" reasonably includes the taking of natural resources as well as land, whether the drafters and parties to the OST envisioned such a broad meaning of the term remains difficult to determine with any certainty. **The prohibition against appropriation "by any other means" supports such a reading**, though, by expanding the prohibition to other types not explicitly described.168 As illustrated by this analysis, **considerable ambiguity remains after this ordinary-meaning analysis and thus, the question of Treaty obligations and property rights remains unresolved**. In order to resolve these ambiguities, an analysis of preparatory materials, historical context, and state practice follows.

I negate the resolution: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust

Contention 1:

Space Commercialization is key to Space Deterrence – Commercial Flexibility is key to deterrence by denying aggression.

Klein 19, John J. Understanding space strategy: the art of war in space. Routledge, 2019. (a Senior Fellow and Strategist at Falcon Research, Inc. and Adjunct Professor at George Washington University's Space Policy Institute)//Elmer

Recent U.S. space policy initiatives underscore **the far-reaching benefits of commercial space activities**. The White House **revived** the National Space Council to foster **closer coordination, cooperation, and exchange of tech**nology and information among the civil, national security, and commercial space sectors.1 National Space Policy Directive 2 seeks to promote economic growth by streamlining U.S. regulations on the commercial use of space.2 While the defense community generally appreciates the value of services and capabilities derived from the commercial space sector—including space launch, Earth observation, and satellite communications—it often overlooks one area of strategic importance: deterrence. To address the current shortcoming in understanding, this paper first describes the concept of deterrence, along with how space mission assurance and resilience fit into the framework. After explaining how **commercial space capabilities may influence the decision calculus of potential adversaries**, this study presents actionable recommendations for the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) to address current problem areas. Ultimately, DoD—including the soon-to-be reestablished U.S. Space Command and possibly a new U.S. Space Force—should incorporate the benefits and capabilities of the commercial space sector into flexible deterrent options and applicable campaign and contingency plans. Deterrence, Mission Assurance, and Resilience Thomas Schelling, the dean of modern deterrence theory, held that deterrence refers to persuading a potential enemy that it is in its interest to avoid certain courses of activity.3 One component of deterrence theory lies in an understanding that the threat of credible and potentially overwhelming force or other retaliatory action against any would-be adversary is sufficient to deter most potential aggressors from conducting hostile actions. This idea is also referred to as deterrence by punishment.4 **The second salient component of deterrence theory is denial. According to Glenn Snyder's definition, deterrence by denial is "the capability to deny the other party any gains from the move which is to be deterred.**"5 The 2018 U.S. National Defense Strategy (NDS) highlights deterrence, and specifically deterrence by denial, as a vital component of national security. The NDS notes that the primary objectives of the United States include deterring adversaries from pursuing aggression and preventing hostile actions against vital U.S. interests.6 The strategy also observes that deterring conflict necessitates preparing for war during peacetime.7 **For** the **space** domain, the peacetime **preparedness needed for deterrence by denial occurs in** the context of space mission assurance and resilience. **Mission assurance** entails "a **process to protect** or ensure the continued function and **resilience of capabilities and assets—including personnel, equipment, facilities, networks, information and information systems, infrastructure, and supply chains**—critical to the performance of DoD mission essential functions in any operating environment or condition."8 Similar to mission assurance but with a different focus, **resilience is** an architecture's **ability to support mission success** with higher probability; shorter periods of reduced capability; and across a wider range of scenarios, conditions, and threats, despite hostile action or adverse conditions.9 Resilience may leverage cross-domain solutions, along with commercial and international capabilities.10 Space mission assurance and resilience can prevent a potential adversary from achieving its objectives or realizing any benefit from its aggressive action. These facets of U.S. preparedness help convey the futility of conducting a hostile act. Consequently, they **enhance deterrence by denial**. Commercial Space Enables Deterrence The **commercial space** sector directly **promotes mission assurance and resilience efforts**. This is in part **due to the distributed and diversified nature of commercial space launch and satellites services**. Distribution refers to the use of a number of nodes, working together, to perform the same mission or

functions as a single node; diversification describes contributing to the same mission in multiple ways, using different platforms, orbits, or systems and capabilities.11 The 2017 U.S. National Security Strategy, in noting the benefits derived from the commercial space industry, states that DoD partners with the commercial sector's capabilities to improve the U.S. space architecture's resilience.12 Although U.S. policy and joint doctrine frequently acknowledge the role of the commercial space sector in space mission assurance and resilience, there is little recognition that day-to-day contributions from the commercial industry assists in deterring would-be adversaries. The commercial space sector contributes to **deterrence by denial through multi-domain solutions** that are **distributed and diversified**. These can **deter** potential **adversaries from pursuing offensive actions against space-related systems**. Commercial launch providers enhance deterrence by providing options for getting payloads into orbit. These include diverse space launch capabilities such as small and responsive launch vehicles, along with larger, reusable launch vehicles; launch rideshares for secondary payloads; and government payloads on commercial satellites. Various on-orbit systems also promote deterrence. For example, if an aggressor damages a commercial remote sensing satellite during hostilities, similar **commercial satellites** in a different orbital regime, or those of the same constellation, may **provide** the **needed imagery. If satellite communications** are **jammed** or degraded, **commercial service providers can reroute satellite communications** through their own networks, or potentially through the networks of another company using a different portion of the frequency spectrum. Regarding deterrence by punishment efforts, the commercial space sector can play a role, albeit an indirect one, through improved space situational awareness (SSA) and space forensics (including digital forensics and multispectral imagery). The commercial industry may support the attribution process following a hostile or illegal act in space through its increasingly proliferating network of SSA ground telescopes and other terrestrial tracking systems. The DoD may also leverage the commercial space sector's cyber expertise to support digital forensic efforts to help determine the source of an attack. **By supporting** a **credible** and transparent **attribution** process, **commercial partners may cause a would-be adversary to act differently if** it perceives that its aggressive, illegal, or otherwise nefarious actions will be disclosed. Doing so can help bolster the perceived ability to conduct a legitimate response following a hostile attack, which may **improve deterrence by punishment** efforts. Commercial space capabilities may also facilitate the application of force to punish a potential aggressor. In addition to traditional military space systems, commercial satellite imagery and communication capabilities may be used in cueing and targeting for punitive strikes against an aggressor. Although the commercial space sector is not expected to be involved directly in the use of retaliatory force following a hostile act, commercial partners may help in providing the information used to identify those responsible and to facilitate any consequent targeting efforts.

Space Deterrence Breakdowns cause\\s War and Extinction.

Parker 17 Clifton Parker 1-24-2017 "Deterrence in space key to U.S. security" https://cisac.fsi.stanford.edu/news/deterrence-space-key-us-security (Policy Analyst at the Stanford Center for International Security and Cooperation)//Elmer

Space is more important than ever for the security of the United **S**tates, but it's almost like the Wild West in terms of behavior, a top general said today. Air Force Gen. John Hyten, commander of the U.S. Strategic Command, spoke Jan. 24 at Stanford's Center for International Security and Cooperation. His talk was titled, "U.S. Strategic Command Perspectives on Deterrence and Assurance." Hyten said, "Space is **fundamental to every single military operation that occurs on the planet** today." He added that "there is no such thing as **a war in space**," because it **would affect all** realms of **human existence**, **due to** the **satellite systems**. Hyten **advocates "strategic deterrence**" and "norms of behavior" across space as well as land, water and cyberspace. **Otherwise**, **rivals like China and Russia will** only threaten U.S. interests in space and **wreak havoc for humanity** below, he said. **Most** of contemporary **life depends on systems connected to space**. Hyten also addressed other topics, including recent proposals by some to upgrade the country's missile defense systems. "You just don't snap your fingers and build a state-of-the-art anything overnight," Hyten said, adding that he has not yet spoken to Trump administration officials about the issue. "We need a powerful military," but a severe budget crunch makes "reasonable solutions" more likely than expensive and

unrealistic ones. On the upgrade front, Hyten said he favors a long-range strike missile system to replace existing cruise missiles; a better air-to-air missile for the Air Force; and an improved missile defense ground base interceptor. 'Critically dependent' From satellites to global-positioning systems GPS, space has transformed human life – and the military – in the 21st century, Hyten said. In terms of defining "space," the U.S. designates people who travel above an altitude of 50 miles as astronauts. As the commander of the U.S. Strategic Command, Hyten oversees the control of U.S. strategic forces, providing options for the president and secretary of defense. In particular, this command is charged with space operations (such as military satellites), information operations (such as information warfare), missile defense, global command and control, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, global strike and strategic deterrence (the U.S. nuclear arsenal), and combating weapons of mass destruction. Hyten explained that every drone, fighter jet, bomber, ship and soldier is critically dependent on space to conduct their own operations. All cell phones use space, and the GPS command systems overall are managed at Strategic Command, he said. "No soldier has to worry about what's over the next hill," he said, describing GPS capabilities, which have fundamentally transformed humanity's way of life. Space needs to be available for exploration, he said. "I watch what goes on in space, and I worry about us destroying that environment for future generations." He said that too many drifting objects and debris exist – about 22,000 right now. A recent Chinese satellite interception created a couple thousand more debris objects that now circle about the Earth at various altitudes and pose the risk of striking satellites. "We track every object in space" now, Hyten said, urging "international norms of behavior in space." He added, "We have to deter bad behavior on space. We have to deter war in space. It's bad for everybody. We could trash that forever." But now rivals like China and Russia are building weapons to deploy in the lower levels of space. "How do we prevent this? It's bigger than a space problem," he said. Deterring conflict in the cyber, nuclear and space realms is the strategic deterrence goal of the 21st century, Hyten said. "The best way to prevent war is to be prepared for war," he said. Hyten believes the U.S. needs a fundamentally different debate about deterrence. And it all starts with nuclear weapons. "In my deepest heart, I wish I didn't have to worry about nuclear weapons," he said. Hyten described his job as "pretty sobering, it's not easy." But he also noted the mass violence of the world prior to 1945 when the first atomic bomb was used. Roughly 80 million people died from 1939 to 1945 during World War II. Consider that in the 10-plus years of the Vietnam War, 58,000 Americans were killed. That's equivalent to two days of deaths in WWII, he said. In a world without nuclear weapons, a rise in conventional warfare would produce great numbers of mass casualties, Hyten said. About war, he said, "Once you see it up close, no human will ever want to experience it." Though America has "crazy enemies" right now, in many ways the world is more safe than during WWII, Hyten said. The irony is that nuclear weapons deterrence has kept us from the type of mass killings known in events like WWII. But the U.S. must know how to use its nuclear deterrence effectively. Looking ahead, Hyten said the U.S. needs to think about space as a potential war environment. An attack in space might not mean a response in space, but on the Earth. Hyten describes space as the domain that people look up at it and still dream about. "I love to look at the stars," but said he wants to make sure he's not looking up at junk orbiting in the atmosphere.

Contention 2:

Private companies are set to mine in space – new tech and profit motives make space lucrative

Gilbert 21, (Alex Gilbert is a complex systems researcher and PhD student in Space Resources at the Colorado School of Mines, "Mining in Space is Coming"), 4-26-21, Milken Institute Review, https://www.milkenreview.org/articles/mining-in-space-is-coming // MNHS NL

Space exploration is back. after decades of disappointment, a combination of better technology, falling costs and a rush of competitive energy from the private sector has put space travel front and center. indeed, many analysts (even some with their feet on the ground) **believe that commercial developments in the space industry may be on the cusp of starting the largest resource rush in history: mining on the Moon, Mars and asteroids.** While this may sound fantastical, some baby steps toward the goal have already been taken. **Last year, NASA awarded contracts to four companies to extract small amounts of lunar regolith by 2024, effectively beginning the era of commercial space mining. Whether this proves to be the dawn of a gigantic adjunct to mining on earth — and more immediately, a key to unlocking cost-effective space travel — will turn on the answers to a host of questions ranging from what resources can be efficiently.** As every fan of science fiction knows, the resources of the solar system appear virtually unlimited compared to those on Earth. There are whole other planets, dozens of moons, thousands of massive asteroids and millions of small ones that doubtless contain humungous quantities of materials that are scarce and very valuable (back on Earth). **Visionaries including Jeff Bezos imagine heavy industry moving to space and Earth becoming a residential area. However, as entrepreneurs look to harness the riches beyond the atmosphere, access to space resources remains tangled in the realities of economics and governance. Start with the fact that space belongs to no country, complicating traditional methods of resource allocation, property rights and trade. With limited demand for materials in space itself and the need for huge amounts of energy to return materials to Earth, creating a viable industry will turn on major advances in technology, finance and business models.** That said, there's no grass growing under potential pioneers' feet. **Potential economic, scientific and even security benefits underlie an emerging geopolitical competition to pursue space mining.** The United States is rapidly emerging as a front-runner, in part due to its ambitious Artemis Program to lead a multinational consortium back to the Moon. But it is also a leader in creating a legal infrastructure for mineral exploitation. **The United States has adopted the world's first spaceresources law, recognizing the property rights of private companies and individuals to materials gathered in space.** However, the United States is hardly alone. Luxembourg and the United Arab Emirates (you read those right) are racing to codify space-resources laws of their own, hoping to attract investment to their entrepot nations with business-friendly legal frameworks. China reportedly views space-resource development as a national priority, part of a strategy to challenge U.S. economic and security primacy in space. Meanwhile, Russia, Japan, India and the European Space Agency all harbor space-mining ambitions of their own. Governing these emerging interests is an outdated treaty framework from the Cold War. Sooner rather than later, we'll need new agreements to facilitate private investment and ensure international cooperation.

Back up for a moment. For the record**, space is already being heavily exploited**, because space resources include non-material assets such as orbital locations and abundant sunlight that enable satellites to provide services to Earth. Indeed, satellite-based telecommunications and global positioning systems have become indispensable infrastructure underpinning the modern economy. Mining space for materials, of course, is another matter. In the past several decades, planetary science has confirmed what has long been suspected: **celestial bodies are potential sources for dozens of natural materials that, in the right time and place, are incredibly valuable.** Of these, water may be the most attractive in the near-term, because — with assistance from solar energy or nuclear fission — H2O can be split into hydrogen and oxygen to make rocket propellant, facilitating in-space refueling. **So-called "rare earth" metals are also potential targets of asteroid miners intending to service Earth markets.** Consisting of 17 elements, including lanthanum, neodymium, and yttrium, these critical materials (most of which are today mined in China at great environmental cost) are required for electronics. And they loom as bottlenecks in making the transition

from fossil fuels to renewables backed up by battery storage. **The Moon is a prime space mining target. Boosted by NASA's mining solicitation, it is likely the first location for commercial mining.** The Moon has several advantages. It is relatively close, requiring a journey of only several days by rocket and creating communication lags of only a couple seconds — a delay small enough to allow remote operation of robots from Earth. Its low gravity implies that relatively little energy expenditure will be needed to deliver mined resources to Earth orbit. The Moon may look parched — and by comparison to Earth, it is. But **recent probes have confirmed substantial amounts of water ice lurking in permanently shadowed craters at the lunar poles**. Further, it seems that solar winds have implanted significant deposits of helium-3 (a light stable isotope of helium) across the equatorial regions of the Moon. Helium-3 is a potential fuel source for second and third-generation fusion reactors that one hopes will be in service later in the century. The isotope is packed with energy (admittedly hard to unleash in a controlled manner) that might augment sunlight as a source of clean, safe energy on Earth or to power fast spaceships in this century. **Between its water and helium-3 deposits, the Moon could be the resource stepping-stone for further solar system exploration. Asteroids are another near-term mining target.** There are all sorts of space rocks hurtling through the solar system, with varying amounts of water, rare earth metals and other materials on board. The asteroid belt between the orbits of Mars and Jupiter contains most of them, many of which are greater than a kilometer in diameter. Although the potential water and mineral wealth of the asteroid belt is vast, the long distance from Earth and requisite travel times and energy consumption rule them out as targets in the near term. T**he prospects for space mining are being driven by technological advances across the space industry. The rise of reusable rocket components and the now-widespread use of off-the-shelf parts are lowering both launch and operations costs. Once limited to government contract missions and the delivery of telecom satellites to orbit, private firms are now emerging as leaders in developing "NewSpace" activities** — a catch-all term for endeavors including orbital tourism, orbital manufacturing and mini-satellites providing **specialized services. The space sector, with a market capitalization of $400 billion, could grow to as much as $1 trillion by 2040 as private investment soars.**

Squo private companies are willing to invest, but without the ability to generate returns, investments will fall out

Shaw 13 - Lauren E, J.D. from Chapman University School of Law, "Asteroids, the New Western Frontier: Applying Principles of the General Mining Law of 1872 to Incentive Asteroid Mining", JOURNAL OF AIR LAW AND COMMERCE, Volume 78, Issue 1, Article 2, https://scholar.smu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1307&context=jalc // recut MNHS NL

To some, **the mining of asteroids** might sound like the premise of a science fiction novel' or the solution to the heartwrenching, fictional scenario depicted in the film Armageddon.2 To others, it **evokes a fantastical idea that may come to fruition** in a distant reality. **However impressively funded companies have plans to send spacecraft to begin prospecting on asteroids** within the next two years.' **The issues associated with the mining of asteroids should be addressed before these plans are set in motion**. Much has been written about the issues that might arise from allowing nations to own these space bodies and the minerals they contain; one such issue is the impact on international treaties.4 However, little has been written about the applicability of preexisting mining laws-which provide a basic property right scheme for the private sector-such as the General Mining Law of 1872 (Mining Law) to the management of asteroid mining.' The literature to date on how to legally address asteroid mining is minimal.' The **articles** that do address it **propose** the creation of different systems, such as a "property rights-based system that relies on the doctrine of first possession"7 or **an international authority that would regulate mining operations**.' **Implementing a scheme that offers ownership of extracted resources** without bestowing complete sovereignty **is necessary to avoid an impending legal limbo-that is, an outer space "Wild West" equivalent where there is neither certainty nor security in who owns what**.9 **If private sector miners of asteroids know this right** already **exists, they will have more incentive to extract resources**.' 0 **This**, in turn, **would increase the chances of successful missions, resulting in numerous scientific and explorative benefits, along with the potential replenishment of key elements that are becoming**

increasingly depleted on Earth yet are still needed for modern industry. Scientists speculate that **key elements needed for modern industry, including platinum, zinc, copper, phosphorus, lead, gold, and indium, could become depleted on Earth within the next fifty to sixty years**.[11] **Many of these** metals, such as platinum, are chemical elements that, unlike oil or diamonds, **have no synthetic alternative**.[12] Once the reserves on Earth are mined to complete depletion, **industries will be forced to recycle the existing supply of minerals, which will result in increased costs due to increased scarcity**.[13] However, evidence is accumulating that **asteroids only a few hundred thousand miles away from Earth may be composed of an abundance of natural resources-including many of the minerals being mined to depletion on Earth-that could lead to vast profits**.[14] Most of the minerals being mined on Earth, including gold, iron, platinum, and palladium, originally came from the many asteroids that hit the Earth after the crust cooled during the planet's formation.'

Space mining is the only way to solve climate change

Duran 21, (Paloma Duran is a journalist and industry analyst at Mexico Business News, "Is Space Mining the Best Option to Face Climate Change?"), 11-03-21, Mexico Business News, **https://mexicobusiness.news/mining/news/space-mining-best-option-face-climate-change // MNHS NL**

Going to net zero means that more mining is needed. Experts have said that the current supply cannot support the necessary metals demand for the green transition. As a result, new mining alternatives have gained greater relevance, among them is space mining. Several countries, including Mexico, have shown their interest in this alternative, creating a new space race. "**The solar system can support a billion times greater industry than we have on Earth. When you go to vastly larger scales of civilization, beyond the scale that a planet can support, then the types of things that civilization can do are incomprehensible to us … We would be able to promote healthy societies all over the world at the same time that we would be reducing the environmental burden on the Earth,**" said Dr. Phil Metzger, Planetary Scientist at the University of Central Florida. **Currently, there are several attempts to address global warming and transition to a net zero carbon economy. There has been an increasing interest in renewable energy and infrastructure, which has increased demand for various minerals, especially lithium, cobalt, nickel, copper and rare earth elements.** However, according to experts, **the world is close to entering a metals supercycle, where demand will exceed available supply, causing prices to skyrocket. Consequently, the mining industry has sought alternatives to achieve the required supply**. Options include recycling and improved mine waste management, sea mining and **space mining**. The latter **is considered** one of **the alternatives with the greatest potential.** However, a regulatory framework is still lacking and there is almost no experience in this regard. Despite the lack of knowledge regarding **space mining, it has become a very attractive option since the planet is running out of resources. While some people believe that land-based mining is cheaper than space mining, experts believe this may change in the long term. Furthermore, within the solar system there are countless bodies rich in minerals, ores and elements that will accelerate the fight against climate change. "There will come a point when there is nothing left to mine on the surface, prompting mines to reach even further below. But even those resources are destined to run out and so we will aim toward ocean mining, which already has specific technologies that are being developed.** Nevertheless, even those mines are limited as well. The mine of the future, which today may seem unlikely, will no longer be on our planet. **There will be a time when space mining will be as common as an open leach mine,**" Eder Lugo, Minerals Head at

Siemens, told MBN. More than 150 million asteroids measuring approximately 100m are believed to be in the inner solar system alone. **In addition, astronomers have also identified abundant minerals near the Earth's space and the Main Asteroid Belt.** There are three main groups into which asteroids are divided: C- type, S- type, and M- type. **The last two groups are the most abundant in minerals such as gold, platinum, cobalt, zinc, tin, lead, indium, silver, copper and rare earth metals. "Energy is limited here.** Within just a few hundred years, you will have to cover all of the landmass of Earth in solar cells. So, what are you going to do? Well, what I think you are going to do is you are going to move out in space … all of our heavy industry will be moved off-planet and Earth will be zoned residential and light-industrial," said Jeff Bezos, Founder of Amazon and the Space Launch Provider Blue Origin.

Warming causes extinction

Krosofsky '21 [Andrew, Green Matters Journalist, "How Global Warming May Eventually Lead to Global Extinction", Green Matters, 03-11-2021, https://www.greenmatters.com/p/will-global-warming-cause-extinction]//pranav

Eventually, yes. **Global warming will invariably result in the mass extinction of millions of different species,** humankind included. In fact, **the Center for Biological Diversity says that global warming is currently the greatest threat to life on this planet**. **Global warming causes a number of detrimental effects on the environment that many species won't be able to handle long-term**. Extreme weather patterns are shifting climates across the globe, eliminating habitats and altering the landscape. **As a result, food and fresh water sources are being drastically reduced**. Then, of course, **there are the rising global temperatures themselves, which many species are physically unable to contend with**. Formerly frozen arctic and antarctic regions are melting, increasing sea levels and temperatures. Eventually, **these effects will create a perfect storm of extinction conditions**. The melting glaciers of the arctic and the searing, **unmanageable heat indexes being seen along the Equator are just the tip of the iceberg, so to speak. The species that live in these climate zones have already been affected by the changes caused by global warming.** Take polar bears for example, whose habitats and food sources have been so greatly diminished that they have been forced to range further and further south. **Increased carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere and oceans have already led to ocean acidification**. **This has caused many species of crustaceans to either adapt or perish and has led to the mass bleaching of more than 50 percent of Australia's Great Barrier Reef**, according to National Geographic. According to the Center for Biological Diversity, the current trajectory of global warming predicts that more than 30 percent of Earth's plant and animal species will face extinction by 2050. By the end of the century, that number could be as high as 70 percent. We won't try and sugarcoat things, humanity's own prospects aren't looking that great either. According to The Conversation, **our species has just under a decade left to get our CO_2 emissions under control. If we don't cut those emissions by half before 2030, temperatures will rise to potentially catastrophic levels. It may only seem like a degree or so, but the worldwide ramifications are immense.** The human species is resilient. We will survive for a while longer, even if these grim global warming predictions come to pass, **but it will mean less food, less water, and increased hardship across the world — especially in low-income areas and developing countries. This increase will also mean more pandemics, devastating storms, and uncontrollable wildfires.**

Debris Removal:

Debris removal is necessary and only private entities have the incentive and capability to do it. Affirming forecloses the possibility.

Giordano 21 (David Giordano is the Vice President of Mentorship for CBLA. Elsewhere at Columbia Law School, he serves on the Columbia Journal of Transnational Law, and is the Treasurer of Columbia OutLaws. During his 1L Summer, David was an intern at the Securities and Exchange Commission's Division of Corporation Finance. Prior to law school, David worked as a Corporate Paralegal at the New York office of Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP. David attended The George Washington University where he obtained a B.A. in psychology. "Space Debris: Another Frontier in the Commercialization of Space". October 31, 2021.)

As **satellites** and other projectiles blast into orbit, upon collision they **can disintegrate into** shards, sometimes just centimeters wide, that remain in orbit, risking further collision. Hollywood captured the potential perils of **fairly large pieces of space debris** in the opening minutes of the 2013 film *Gravity*, where space junk threatens the lives of astronauts on a mission. Outside the realms of fictional space-thrillers, **even the smallest pieces of space junk can present real danger**. In 2016, a tiny piece of **space junk**, believed to be a paint chip or a piece of metal no more than a few thousandths of a millimeter across, cracked the window of the International Space Station. In May 2021, a piece of space **debris** punctured **the robotic arm of the I**nternational **S**pace **S**tation. This is seriously concerning, as, according to the European Space Agency, there are 670,000 pieces of space debris larger than 1cm and 170,000,000 between 1mm and 1cm in width. Unfortunately, **public action and policy struggles to keep up with these risks**. International law affords little clarity on the problem, as its control is a novel, emerging field with many technical tracking and removal challenges. **None of the existing space treaties** directly tackle the issue, rendering responsibility for it ambiguous. Absent such responsibility, legal incentives are non-existent. Guidelines are occasionally issued by international governing bodies, but provide little legal significance and are more targeted at the practicalities of tracking and removal. The nation best positioned to notify space actors of collision risks is the United States, and the burden of that task currently falls on the Department of Defense. However, the Trump administration issued a directive in 2018, shifting the responsibility from the DoD to the Department of Commerce, and the transition has yet to materialize, leaving DoD struggling to keep pace with increasing commercial activity. **In the face of public paralysis, addressing the problem through industry looks more and more attractive.** This has led some to call for a new legal order that still leaves room for government, but reframes who the rules exist to serve. Rather than our current, rudimentary treaty regime designed to prevent international conflict, commentators have called for an additional regime resembling maritime law that preserves the interests of a more diverse set of stakeholders, including those in the future that can bring technology and interests to space that may not yet exist. These commentators shun the common conception that space regulation should resemble air-traffic control, which is suited to a narrower set of uses (transport). Under such a "maritime" regime, the light touch of central regulatory bodies, and perhaps their non-existence, is preferred, just as it has been on the seas. This way, individual nations have a degree of flexibility in instituting controls they see fit while leaving room for industry to address problems and introduce new uses for space. Furthermore, **governments seem ready and willing to construct the legal and incentive framework in concert with such private action.** In a joint statement this summer, **G7 members expressed openness to resolving** the technical aspects of the **debris** problem **with private institutions, and there is** some **promising progress**. Apple co-founder Steve Wozniak signaled his plans to address the problem through a new company with a telling name: Privateer Space. **Astroscale**, a UK-based company, successfully **launched a pair of satellites** in the Spring of 2021 that will remove certain space debris from orbit. Astroscale also stated their desire to work with governments and international governing bodies to craft policy with private efforts to control the problem top of mind. In light of public policy's silence on space debris, the initiative of actors like Astroscale involving themselves in policy may be advised, as it could promote further private investment in technology for space **debris removal**. A popular policy recommendation among experts is the establishment of public-private partnerships, and Astroscale has entered several such agreements including with Japan and the European Space Agency. Other **actors include** ClearSpace, OneWeb, **and** D-Orbit. Some may want to push back against further private involvement. The congestion of space is, in part, industry's fault, and if we conceptualize orbital space as a common resource, it might be right to fear the effects of the Tragedy of the Commons. Critics may seek to bolster international treaties, give legal teeth to the guidelines occasionally issued by the UN, and preserve the public posture of the heavens. These may be welcome adjustments, but unlike a pond that industry overfishes or a well that industry dries up, here industry is working to add more fish and water. Moreover, governments stand to benefit from this private decluttering, as well, as they are expected to be major customers of some of these private actors. As for the public posture, space has long been a commercial place. Telecommunications companies and government contractors historically depend on space. As the number of commercial satellites set to launch skyrockets, it seems natural to craft policies that are responsive to their interests and provide incentives to remedy issues created in the course

of spacefaring, such as space debris. **In light of the** long silence of international law on such issues and the demonstrated **motivation by private actors**, **space debris represents the latest frontier in the abdication of space from the public concern to the private.**

Increased space debris makes future space exploration impossible- quick removal is key

Webb 18 [(Amy Webb is a professor at the NYU Stern School of Business and is the chief executive of the Future Today Institute, a strategic foresight and research group in Washington, D.C.), "Space Oddities: We Need a Plan to Stop Polluting Space Before It's Too Late" WIRED Science April 12, 2018 https://www.wired.com/story/we-need-a-plan-to-stop-polluting-space-before-its-too-late/] TDI

Space is our next dumping ground. As many as **170 million fragments of metal and astro debris necklace Earth.** That includes 20,000 pieces larger than a softball, and 500,000 about the size of a marble, according to NASA. Old satellites, like Tiangong-1, are the biggest and highest-profile lumps of rubbish, but most of it comes from rocket parts and even lost astronaut tools. **Size doesn't always matter—a fleck of paint, orbiting at a high velocity, cracked the Space Shuttle's windshield.** This **debris will pose a navigation hazard for many centuries to come**. At least 200 objects roar back into the atmosphere each year, including pieces of solar panels and antennas and **fragments** of metal. All of them **pose dangers for** future **astronauts**: **One plum-sized piece of gnarled space trash traveling faster than a speeding bullet could rip a five-foot hole into a spacecraft.** And that collision, then, would hatch its own spectacle of shrapnel, which would join the rushing river of junk already circling the planet. It's not just Americans doing the dumping. China and Russia each have dozens of decommissioned satellites overhead, though the US certainly does it with style. Like everyone, I marveled at the successful launch of SpaceX's Falcon Heavy rocket, whose cargo included Elon Musk's Tesla Roaster and a mannequin driver named Starman. I'll admit, I teared up listening to David Bowie as the rockets separated from the payload. It was an incredible technological achievement, one proving that the system could someday transport people and goods—perhaps real cars, and real people—into space. Now that Tesla and its driver are overhead, in America's junkyard in the sky. To be sure, space is big. Really big. Most debris soars about 1,250 miles above the Earth's surface, so you have better odds scoring a seat on Virgin Galactic's maiden voyage than witnessing Starman crash into your next door neighbor's house. But it's our behavior back here on Earth—our insistence on sending things up, without really thinking how to safely contain or send them back down—that should concern you. We weren't always so short-sighted. Ancient Native Americans lived by the Seventh Generation Principal, a way of long-term thinking that considered how every decision would affect their descendants seven generations into the future. In Japan, Buddhist monks devoted part of their daily rituals and work to ensuring the longevity of their communities, even planting and tending to bamboo forests, which would eventually be harvested, treated and used to repair temple roofs many decades hence. With each new generation, we live life faster than our ancestors. As a result, we spend less time thinking about the farther future of humanity. **We now have our sights set on colonizing** Mars, mining asteroids for research and commerce, **and venturing out to the furthest reaches of our galaxy. Space is no longer the final frontier; we're already exploring it. Our current approach is about getting there**, rather than considering what "getting there" could mean for future generations of humans, not to mention other life in the universe. Where all that junk winds up isn't something we can predict accurately. We could be unintentionally wreaking havoc on civilizations far away from Earth, catalyzing future intergalactic wars. Or, we might cause far less scintillating problems. Space junk could start to behave in unpredictable ways, reflecting sunlight the wrong direction, or changing our atmosphere, or impacting the universe in ways that don't fit into our current understanding of physics. Last week—30 years after my friends and I created an imaginary net to capture space debris—SpaceX launched RemoveDEBRIS, its own prototype, an experimental net to collect junk in orbit. It's a neat idea, but even as middle schoolers, we knew it was an impractical one. Individual nets can't possibly scale to address the hundreds of millions of particles of debris already in orbit. The challenge is that all of our space agencies are inextricably tied to national governments and militaries. Seeking a global agreement on how to mitigate debris would involve each country divulging exactly what it was launching and when—an unlikely scenario. **The private sector could collaborate to build grand-scale orbital cleaners**, but their commercial interests are driven by immediate launches. Given all the planned launches in our near future, we don't have much time to wait. We must learn to be better stewards of our own planet—and commit to very long-term thinking—before we try to colonize any others.

Removing debris is a prerequisite to all space travel since its presence presents a massive occupational hazard.

Case:

Clean Space Travel is possible, but only private entities are leading the innovative charge.

https://astronomy.com/news/2019/10/nasa-paying-four-companies-to-learn-how-to-make-fuel-on-the-moon
NASA is paying companies to get clean liquid Oxygen fuel from Lunar Regolith, but it relies on mining

https://www.space.com/biofuel-powered-rockets-reduce-spaceflight-carbon-footprint
British Startups Skyrora and Orbex are working on making biofuels to make spaceflight green. Their prototype reduced emissions by 86%

https://hothardware.com/news/australian-space--junk-recycling-start-up-aims-to-make-rocket-fuel-cleaning-up-earths-orbit
Australian startup Newmann is working on renewable, electric propulsion systems, while simultaneously cleaning the orbit of space junk and dead sats.

https://www.forbes.com/sites/afdhelaziz/2020/10/27/from-vodka-to-space-flight-air-co-launches-sustainable-rocket-fuel-to-help-us-get-to-marsand-beyond/?sh=335d20232e4c
American company AirCompany has won multiple awards from NASA for their renewable rocket fuel conversions

Link Turn: Only Private Companies are interested in making their fuel green, Russia and China prove they still burn.

2] No risk of a debris impact---
Stuff blows up in space all the time, and almost none of it involves objects we care about---robust modeling found a .001% chance of collisions---that's Wein
Probability – 0.1% chance of a collision.
Salter 15 – Assistant Professor of Economics & Comparative Economics Research Fellow at Texas Tech University

Alexander W. Salter, Space Debris: A Law and Economics Analysis of the Orbital Commons, Mercatus Working Paper, Mercatus Center at George Mason University, 19 STAN. TECH. L. REV. 221 (2016), https://law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/19-2-2-salter-final_0.pdf

*numbers replaced with English words

The probability of a collision is currently **low**. Bradley and Wein estimate that the **maximum probability** in LEO of a collision over the lifetime of a spacecraft remains **below one in one thousand**, conditional on continued compliance with NASA's deorbiting guidelines.3 However, the possibility of a future "snowballing" effect, whereby debris collides with other objects, further congesting orbit space, remains a significant concern.4 Levin and Carroll estimate the average immediate destruction of wealth created by a collision to be approximately $30 million, with an additional $200 million in damages to all currently existing space assets from the debris created by the initial collision.5 The expected value of destroyed wealth because of collisions, currently small because of the low probability of a collision, can quickly become significant if future collisions result in runaway debris growth.

3] Space is huge---nothing will collide

Albrecht 16 – Chairman of the board of USSpace LLC & fmr. head of the National Space Council

Mark Albrecht, chairman of the board of USSpace LLC, head of the White House National Space Council from 1989 to 1992, and Paul Graziani, CEO and founder of Analytical Graphics, a company that develops software and provides mission assurance through the Commercial Space Operations Center (ComSpOC), Congested space is a serious problem solved by hard work, not hysteria, 2016, https://spacenews.com/op-ed-congested-space-is-a-serious-problem-solved-by-hard-work-not-hysteria/

There are over a half million pieces of human-made material in orbit around our planet. Some are the size of school buses, some the size of BB gun pellets. They all had a function at some point, but now most are simply space debris littered from 100 to 22,000 miles above the Earth. Yet, all behave perfectly according to the laws of physics. Many in the space community have called the collision hazard caused by space debris a crisis. Popular culture has embraced the risks of collisions in space in films like Gravity. Some participants have dramatized the issue by producing graphics of Earth and its satellites, which make our planet look like a fuzzy marble, almost obscured by a dense cloud of white pellets meant to conceptualize space congestion. Unfortunately, for the sake of a good visual, satellites are depicted as if they were hundreds of miles wide, like the state of Pennsylvania (for the record, there are no space objects the size of Pennsylvania in orbit). Unfortunately, this is the rule, not the exception, and almost all of these articles, movies, graphics, and simulations are **exaggerated and misleading**. Space debris and collision risk is real, but it **certainly** is **not a crisis.** So what are **the facts?** On the positive side, space is **empty** and it is **vast**. At the altitude of the **International Space Station**, **one half a degree** of Earth longitude is almost **40 miles long**. That same **one half a degree at geo**stationary orbit, some 22,000 miles up is **over 230 miles long**. Generally, **we don't** intentionally **put satellites closer together than one-half degree**.

4] Tracking debris exists now and solves collisions.

Mosher ’19 [Dave; September 3rd; Journalist with more than a decade of experience reporting and writing stories about space, science, and technology; Business Insider, “Satellite collisions may trigger a space-junk disaster that could end human access to orbit. Here’s How,” https://www.usafa.edu/app/uploads/Space_and_Defense_2_3.pdf; GR]

The **Kessler syndrome** plays center-stage in the movie "Gravity," in which an accidental **space collision** endangers a crew aboard a large space station. But Gossner said that type of a runaway **space-junk catastrophe** is **unlikely**. "Right now I don't think we're **close to that**," he said. "I'm not saying we couldn't get there, and I'm not saying we don't need to be smart and manage the problem. But I don't see it **ever** becoming, anytime soon, an unmanageable problem." There is no current system to remove old satellites or sweep up bits of debris in order to prevent a Kessler event. Instead, space debris is monitored from Earth, and new rules require satellites in low-Earth orbit be deorbited after 25 years so they don't wind up adding more space junk. "Our current plan is to manage the problem and not let it get that far," Gossner said. "I don't think that we're even close to needing to **actively remove** stuff. There's lots of research being done on that, and maybe some day that will happen, but I think that — at this point, and in my humble opinion — an unnecessary expense." A major part of the effort to prevent a Kessler event is the **S**pace **S**urveillance **N**etwork (SSN). The project, led by the **US military**, uses **30** different systems around the **world** to **identify**, **track**, and share **info**rmation about **objects** in space. Many objects are tracked **day and night** via a network of radar observatories around the globe. Optical telescopes on the ground also keep an eye out, but they aren't always run by the government. "The commercial sector is actually putting up lots and lots of telescopes," Gossner said. The government pays for their debris-tracking services. Gossner said one major debris-tracking company is called **Exoanalytic**. It uses about 150 small telescopes set up around the globe to **detect**, **track**, and **report** space debris to the SSN. Telescopes in space track debris, too. Far less is known about them because they're likely top-secret military satellites. Objects detected by the government and companies get added to a **catalog** of space debris and **checked** against the orbits of other known bits of **space junk**. New orbits are calculated with **supercomputers** to see if there's a **chance** of **any collisions**. Diana McKissock, a flight lead with the US Air Force's 18th Space Control Squadron, helps track space debris for the SSN. She said the surveillance network issues warnings to NASA, satellite companies, and other groups with spacecraft, based on two levels of emergency: basic and advanced. The SSN issues a basic emergency report to the **public three days ahead** of a 1-in-10,000 chance of a **collision**. It then provides **multiple updates** per day until the risk of a collision **passes**. To qualify for such reporting, a rogue object must come within a certain distance of another object. In low-Earth orbit, that distance must be less than 1 kilometer (0.62 mile); farther out in deep space, where the precision of orbits is less reliable, the distance is less than 5 kilometers (3.1 miles). Advanced emergency reports help satellite providers see possible collisions much more than **three days ahead**. "In **2017**, we provided **data** for **308,984 events**, of which only **655** were **emergency**-reportable," McKissock told Business Insider in an email. Of those, 579 events were in low-Earth orbit (where it's relatively crowded with satellites).