### DA – Asteroid Mining

#### Asteroid mining is coming

MacWhorter 16, Kevin [J.D. Candidate at William & Mary Law School]. “Sustainable Mining: Incentivizing Asteroid Mining in the Name of Environmentalism”; February 2016; *William and Mary Environmental Law and Policy Review* [https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1653&context=wmelpr]

Although companies likely are not able to send mining ventures to asteroids immediately, as the preceding section suggested, asteroid mining is a possibility in the near future.70 First of all, two companies are developing the technology needed to mine asteroids.71Planetary Resources is creating cheaper prospecting spacecraft small enough to hitch a ride into space with larger, primary payloads. 72 Another company, Deep Space Industries (DSI), is developing a four-stage system for mining in space: Prospecting, Processing, Harvesting, and Manufacturing.73 It has already invented one spacecraft to be used for the Prospecting stage: a tiny probe, called FireFly, designed to scout asteroids and study their size, shape, spin and composition . . . . 74 For the Processing phase, DSI is creating technology required to transform regolith to raw materials for manufacture.75 The company is currently developing another spacecraft, called a Harvestor, for the third stage to collect and transport resources.76Finally, the company is creating technology to manufacture finished products in space

#### The plan prevents asteroid mining because it prohibits appropriation.

Leon 18, Amanda M. [J.D., University of Virginia School of Law, 2017]. “Mining for Meaning: An Examination of the Legality of Property Rights in Space Resources”; May 15, 2018; *Virginia Law Review* [https://www.caplindrysdale.com/files/24323\_leon\_final\_note.pdf]

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 illustrates 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.16

#### Asteroid mining replaces terrestrial mining.

Ross 01, Shane D. [Control and Dynamical Systems Caltech]. “Near-Earth Asteroid Mining”; December 14, 2001; *Space Industry Report* [http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.614.9343&rep=rep1&type=pdf]

Many terrestrial resources, such as precious metals and fossil fuels, are running out. As new terrestrial sources are sought, materials are obtained at increasing economic and environmental cost. Society pays for this depletion of resources in the form of higher prices for manufactured goods, would-be technologies that are not developed for lack of raw materials, global and regional conflicts spurred by competition for remaining resources, and environmental damage caused by development of poorer and more problematic deposits. Utilization of asteroid resources may provide a partial solution to the problem, as they hold the potential for becoming the main sources of some metals and other materials. Precious metals and semiconducting elements in iron meteorites, which form the metallic cores of asteroids, are found in relatively large concentrations compared to Earth sources. In such sources, it may be possible to extract up to 187 parts per million (ppm) of precious metals, which includes Au, the Pt-group metals (Pt, Ru, Rh, Pd, Os, and It), Re, and Ge. More than 1000 ppm of other metals, semiconductors, and nonmetals may may one day be extracted and imported by Earth from asteroids, such as Ag, In, Co, Ga, and As

#### Asteroid mining prevents extinction in two ways.

#### 1] Only asteroid mining can provide us with the research and understanding to prevent extinction

Elvis 21 [Martin Elvis is a senior astrophysicist at the Center for Astrophysics | Harvard & Smithsonian. He is the author of Asteroids: How Love, Fear, and Greed Will Determine Our Future in Space (2021). “Riches in space.” Aeon. July 2, 2021. <https://aeon.co/essays/asteroid-mining-could-pay-for-space-exploration-and-adventure>] HW AL

If knowledge or greed isn’t motivation enough to set your sights on the asteroids, then the one thing virtually all people agree on is that having humanity wiped off the face of Earth would be bad, at least for us. Of all the multiple threats to humanity’s existence, the only one that we can definitely eliminate is that of a large asteroid slamming into our home planet and killing us off, together with most other species, following the lead of the dinosaurs who were made extinct by an asteroid slamming into the ocean. There’s a T-shirt popular among space cadets that has the slogan ‘Asteroids are nature’s way of saying “How’s that space programme coming along?”’ If we can find all the killer asteroids, then we can divert them to render them harmless. Best to play it safe. There are several searches underway for undiscovered, potentially dangerous asteroids. Thanks to the first big survey, Spaceguard, 90 per cent of the dinosaur-killer-sized asteroids out there have already been found. None of them pose any danger for the next century at least. That still leaves an uneasily large number of about 100 extinction-event-sized rocks out there that we haven’t found yet. Smaller, city-killer asteroids are much less well-surveyed for. To remedy this concern, two new surveys will begin in the next few years, and they will both be more or less done by 2030. They are the Vera C Rubin Observatory ‘Legacy Survey of Space and Time’, which will start scanning the whole sky every few nights from 2023 onwards. Its mission has been complicated by the mushrooming constellations of thousands of internet satellites now being launched by several companies, with SpaceX being the most visible. Hopefully a solution will be found. The Vera C Rubin Observatory, on a mountain in Chile, will record its image using normal visible light. For asteroids, that light is reflected sunlight. But many asteroids are pitch black, reflecting only a few percent of the sunlight pouring on to their surfaces. How do you find those dark asteroids? The answer is to use the long wavelength – infrared – light they emit because they’re warm: their ‘black body radiation’. NASA is building a special mission just for this purpose. Developed by a team lead by Amy Mainzer, now of the University of Arizona, Tucson, it’s called the Near-Earth Object Surveillance Mission. Starting around 2025, it will scan the sky repeatedly for five years looking for moving objects that are bright in infrared light, and has wavelengths some 10 to 20 times longer than we can see with our eyes. The team’s tagline is ‘Finding Asteroids Before They Find Us.’ Good idea! This will be the first time that humanity has deliberately changed the orbit of any celestial body An advantage of using the black body radiation is that it also tells us quite accurately how big each asteroid is. That helps in assessing their threat, as well giving us a first guess at how much they might yield in resources. Combining the two surveys will indicate how much sunlight each asteroid reflects – its ‘albedo’ – and that’s a clue to what they’re made of. We want to know that because a metal asteroid of a given size is more dangerous than one made of rock, and is more difficult to push out of the way. The composition also helps us explore all two dozen types of asteroid out there, the better to decipher the history of our solar system. As a side product, the surveys will pin down their potential value. By 2030, we’ll have better rockets than we have today. Several are set to fly within five years. They’ll let us reach many more asteroids with more massive payloads to deflect them, study them or mine them. Also by 2030, several more asteroids will have been visited by our exploration spacecraft. JAXA, the Japanese space agency, and NASA each had recent missions to return samples from carbonaceous asteroids. The Japanese Hayabusa2 went to the spinning-top-shaped asteroid named Ryugu, and NASA’s OSIRIS-REx went to the asteroid called Bennu. Such carbonaceous asteroids are the least changed, we believe, from the time of their formation at the beginning of the solar system’s formation. They are called carbonaceous because they are chockfull of organic (carbon-containing) molecules; many of them also contain quite a lot of water. There are more missions planned to more distant asteroids such as Psyche, a metal asteroid in the Main Belt, and to the Trojan asteroids trailing Jupiter’s orbit. OSIRIS-REx samples and leaves asteroid Bennu. Courtesy of NASA **Every time we visit an asteroid, it surprises us.** Bennu was found to be throwing rocks off its surface as it spun around its axis, and when OSIRIS-REx put down its outstretched arm to grab a sample off the surface, the arm sank half a metre into the asteroid; it stopped going deeper only when the retrorockets fired to stop it. That’s really not how rubble behaves on Earth! The more we know about asteroids, the more confident we can be that we can deflect their path away from Earth. A NASA mission called DART will make a high-speed impact on the small moon of the asteroid Didymos in late 2022 to see if we can slow down a dangerous asteroid to stop it causing devastation on Earth. (Don’t worry: the target was chosen to be a safe one for us.) This will be the first time that humanity has deliberately changed the orbit of any celestial body. It isn’t likely to be the last. Once all the good-sized accessible asteroids have been found, their orbits mapped, their sizes known, and at least a good clue found as to what they’re made of, the barriers to mining them will be much lower. **After visiting a half dozen asteroids up close, we’ll have learned a great deal about their origins, how to deflect them should one be headed our way, and how to handle them.** That will put us in a good place to begin to extract their resources. I predict this will happen right around 2030, when demand for in-space materials should be picking up. **The stars seem to be aligning for mining the asteroids. Mining will expand our capabilities in space, especially making it easier to deflect a dangerous asteroid.** In a virtuous cycle, those new capabilities will lead us on to greater exploration of the many worlds in our solar system and, with bigger, better telescopes, to the Universe beyond. It should be fun.

#### 2] Provides the resources for a space solar array

Taylor 19, Chris [Veteran journalist and the author of 'How Star Wars Conquered the Universe.']. “The Asteroid Boom”; 2019; *Mashable* [https://mashable.com/feature/asteroid-mining-space-economy]

Secondly, there’s the climate change fix. Suarez sees asteroid mining as the only way we’re going to build solar power satellites. Which, as you probably know, is a form of uninterrupted solar power collection that is theoretically more effective, inch for inch, than any solar panels on Earth at high noon, but operating 24/7. (In space, basically, it’s always double high noon). The power collected is beamed back to large receptors on Earth with large, low-power microwaves, which researchers think will be harmless enough to let humans and animals pass through the beam. A space solar power array like the one China is said to be working on could reliably supply 2,000 gigawatts — or over 1,000 times more power than the largest solar farm currently in existence. “We're looking at a 20-year window to completely replace human civilization's power infrastructure,” Suarez told me, citing the report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change on the coming catastrophe. Solar satellite technology “has existed since the 1970s. What we were missing is millions of tons of construction materials in orbit. Asteroid mining can place it there.”

#### Climate change causes global extinction

Schultz 16, Robert A. [Received a Ph.D. in philosophy from Harvard University]. “Modern Technology and Human Extinction”; 2016; *Proceedings of Informing Science & IT Education Conference* [http://proceedings.informingscience.org/InSITE2016/InSITE16p131-145Schultz2307.pdf]

There is consensus that there is a relatively short window to reduce carbon emissions before drastic effects occur. Recent credible projections of the result of lack of rapid drastic action is an average temperature increase of about 10o F by 2050. This change alone will be incredibly disruptive to all life, but will also cause great weather and climate change. For comparison purposes, a 10 degree (Fahrenheit) decrease was enough to cause an ice layer 4000 feet thick over Wisconsin (Co2gether, 2012). Recently relevant information has surfaced about a massive previous extinction. This is the Permian extinction, which happened 252 million years ago, during which 95% of all species on earth, both terrestrial and aquatic, vanished. The ocean temperature after almost all life had disappeared was 15 degrees (Fahrenheit) above current ocean temperatures. Recent information about the Permian extinction indicates it was caused by a rapid increase in land and ocean temperatures, caused by the sudden appearance of stupendous amounts of carbon in the form of greenhouse gases (Kolbert, 2014, pp. 102-144). The origin of the carbon in these enormous quantities is not yet known, but one possibility is the sudden release of methane gases stored in permafrost. This is also a possibility in our current situation. If so, extinction would be a natural side effect of human processes. There is also a real but smaller possibility of what is called “runaway greenhouse,” in which the earth’s temperature becomes like Venus’ surface temperature of 800o The threat of extinction here is not entirely sudden. The threat is, if anything, worse. Changes in the atmosphere--mainly increases in the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere-- can start processes that can’t be reversed but which take long periods of time to manifest. “Runaway greenhouse” may be the worst. Once again, suggestions of technological solutions to this situation should be treated with some skepticism. These proposals are often made by technophiles ignoring all the evidence that technology is very much subject to unanticipated side effects and unanticipated failures. What has happened concerning the depletion of the ozone layer should be a clear warning against the facile uses of technology through geoengineering to alter the makeup of the entire planet and its atmosphere. The complicating factor in assessing extinction likelihood from climate change is corporations, especially American fossil fuel corporations such as Exxon-Mobil and Shell. Through their contributions, they have been able to delay legislation ameliorating global warming and climate change. As mentioned before, recently released papers from Exxon-Mobil show that the corporation did accept the scientific findings about global warming and climate change. But they concluded that maintaining their profits was more important than acting to ameliorate climate change. Modern Technology and Human Extinction 140 Since it is not a matter of getting corporations to appreciate scientific facts, the chances of extinction from climate change are good. To ameliorate climate change, it is important to leave a high percentage of fossil fuel reserves in the ground. But this is exactly what a profit-seeking fossil fuel corporation cannot do. One can still hope that because fossil fuel corporations are made up of individuals, increasingly bad consequences of global warming and climate change will change their minds about profits. But because of the lag in effects, this mind change will probably be too late. So I conclude we will probably see something like the effects of the Permian extinction perhaps some time around 2050. (The Permian extinction was 95% extinction of all species.) This assumes the release of methane from the arctic will take place around then.

## Case

### AT: Space Debris

#### 1] No space debris impact

CNN ‘2 (“Scientist: Space weapons pose debris threat” http://www.cnn.com/2002/TECH/space/05/03/orbit.debris/)

That scenario would likely never succeed or even happen in the first place, other space experts said. Military satellites are hardened to resist impacts from debris already in space and future orbiters will likely become even more protected as the technology improves, said Michael Kucharek, spokesperson for the U.S. Air Force Space Command. The Colorado-based outpost tracks almost 10,000 thousands of pieces of space junk four inches (10 cm) in diameter or larger. Moreover, such an attack would be technologically and economically daunting. "Very few nations could do that today. Even If you were to put tens of thousands of particles out there, it would pale in comparison to what is already out there," said Nick Johnson of NASA's Orbital Debris Program Office, which monitors the threat of small space debris to spacecraft. "We've looked at so-called chain reaction scenarios and it would require an exceptionally large number of particles," Johnson said.

#### 2] Tracking systems solves space dust.

**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 Space Surveillance Network (SSN). The project, led by the US military, uses 30 different systems around the world to identify, track, and share information about objects in space. Many objects are tracked day and night via a networkof 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).

#### 3] Modeling proves no kessler

Drmola 18 [Jakub Drmola, Division of Security and Strategic Studies, Department of Political Science at the Faculty of Social Sciences of Masaryk University. Tomas Hubik, Department of Theoretical Computer Science and Mathematical Logic, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University. Kessler Syndrome: System Dynamics Model. Space Policy Volumes 44–45, August 2018, Pages 29-39. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964617300966?via%3Dihub]

The probabilities and rates of collisions of objects from different groups were calculated using a coefficient converting the rate of collisions between objects from one group to the rate of collisions between objects from another group. The initial base rate was estimated using iterative simulations and comparison of the resulting runs with real data and outputs from other models. Detailed model built by a group of researchers from the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory was used as a base for the calibration [see 9]. As the major factor influencing collision probability is size, the probability increases with square of the diameter representing bigger area for possible impact. Speed would be another factor influencing the probability of impacts, but the speed depends on the distance from the Earth and is not influenced by debris size. It means that it will not vary between different debris groups and thus will not influence the collision probability conversion parameters in our model.

One the most important limitations and simplifications of the model is the uncertainty of size, structure, and composition of the satellites—i.e. what debris the satellite will disintegrate into in case of a collision. Perhaps even more crucially, the rate of orbital decay changes significantly with the altitude and eccentricity of the trajectory. The lower the orbital altitude is or the more eccentric it is, the more drag the object experiences as it passes through the last vestiges of our atmosphere. Therefore, objects in the lower or more eccentric orbit will decay significantly faster. Thus, the actual lifetime of a piece of debris can easily vary from days to centuries. It also needs to be noted that while it may take many decades for a satellite to decay (especially from the popular orbits between 500 km and 800 km), we cannot assume the same about debris. That is because while satellite orbits typically have very low eccentricity, collisions result in fragments with velocities and trajectories that vary and differ from the original intact satellite (i.e. are more eccentric and decay faster). This makes estimating rate of orbital decay of debris quite difficult, especially when combined with the ongoing laudable efforts by Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee (IADC) to shorten the lifetime of satellites after they cease planned operations [14], [15]. Therefore, both the orbital and structural parameters used here are (and must be) overall averages designed to represent a “general LEO satellite” and are based on previous fragmentations, of which there are but few. Furthermore, this is getting increasingly more difficult as satellites are getting progressively more diverse, especially with the ongoing boom of the miniaturized CubeSats [16]. This leads to a relatively wide and heterogeneous population of real satellites being represented by a single, homogenized stock of simulated satellites in the model. It is also uncertain and difficult to predict how exactly is this going to evolve in the far future, what proportion of launched satellites will be of which size, and into which orbit they will be placed. Lacking precise information, we simply extrapolate current and expected trends. 5. Scenarios and simulation results 5.1. Business as usual and beyond The baseline scenario represents a continuation of the current trends, which are simply extended into the future. An average 1% growth rate of yearly launches of new satellites (starting at 89) is assumed, together with constant success rate in satellites’ ability to actively avoid collisions with debris and other satellites, constant lifetime, and failure rate. This basic model lacks any sudden events or major policy changes that would markedly influence the debris propagation. However, it serves both as a foundation for all the following scenarios and as a basis of comparison to see what the impact would be. Given high uncertainty regarding future state of the satellite industry (how many satellites will be launched per year, of what type and size, etc.), we elected to limit our simulations to 50 years. The model can certainly continue beyond this point, but the associated unknowns make the simulations progressively less useful. Running this model for its full 50 years (2016–2066) yields the expected result of perpetually growing amount of debris in the LEO. One can observe nearly 2-fold increase in the large debris (over 10 cm) and 3-fold increase in small debris (less than 1 cm) quantities (Fig. 5). The oscillations visible in the graph are caused by the aforementioned solar cycles which influence the rate of reentry for all simulated populations except the still active (i.e. powered) satellites. Also please note that throughout the article, the graphs use quite different scales for debris populations because of the considerable variations between scenarios. Using any single scale for all graphs would render some of them unintelligible. We can see that this increase in numbers still does not result in realization of the Kessler syndrome as most of the satellites being launched remain intact for their full expected service life. However, it comes with a considerable increase in risk to satellites, which is manifested by their higher yearly losses, making satellites operations riskier and more expensive for governments and private companies alike. This increased amount of debris in LEO combined with the larger number of active satellites makes it approximately twice as likely that an active satellite will suffer a disabling hit or a total disintegration during its lifetime. It should be noted that this risk might possibly be offset by future improvements in satellite reliability, debris tracking, and navigation [17].

#### 4] Their argument isn’t unique to appropriation, private activity leads to debris, so its non-unique

#### 5] No link between satellites collapsing and power grids being shut down

### AT: Russia

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

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

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

#### 2] Solving one issue doesn’t spillover to broader Russia relations

Beebe **19** 8/12/19 [George Beebe is a former chief of CIA’s Russia analysis who served on Vice President Cheney’s staff from 2002-2004. How Trump Can Avoid War with Russia. August 12, 2019. https://nationalinterest.org/feature/how-trump-can-avoid-war-russia-73031]

Broaden our focus. One **common** cause of **failure** in dealing with a wicked problem is to treat it as if it were a **narrow linear problem**, rooted in a single or primary cause that can be resolved through a focused and determined effort. The **U**nited **S**tates has **repeatedly crashed** into this shoal in its **attempts** to **deal with Russia** since the Cold War’s end. We have habitually sought to **compartmentalize** issues, preferring to focus on disputes that are salient to U.S. domestic politics and on **selective opportunities** that we hope will advance American goals. We have tended to look for primary causes of bilateral maladies, recently attributing the growing dangers in the U.S.-Russian relationship to the nature of Putinism and Russia’s endemic expansionism, believing resolute counter-pressure will quell Russian appetites for aggression. We have attempted to seek progress through **incremental steps**, in the **hope** that making **headway** on such issues as counter-terrorism can build **momentum** toward larger U.S.-Russian success. This incremental and compartmentalized approach makes abundant sense intuitively. Why complicate things, when one can break the problem down into its component parts and focus on what is most salient or easily achievable? It is also driven by the bureaucratic silo effect, which encourages narrow specialization while discouraging cross-organizational integration. But **it has not worked** in practice. Despite our best efforts, the U.S.-Russian relationship has **spiraled** ever deeper into **dysfunction and distrust** from administration to administration since the end of the Cold War. As planning expert Russell Ackoff has observed about “messes,” his term for wicked problems, “if we do the usual thing and break up a mess into its component problems and then try to solve each one separately, we will **not solve the mess**.’’

#### 3] Turn – increasing private activities solves space war and ASAT restraint.

Cobb 21 [Wendy N. Whitman Cobb, Associate Professor of Strategy and Security Studies at the School of Advanced Air and Space Studies, “Privatizing Peace: How Commerce Can Reduce Conflict in Space,” 2021, Routledge, pp. 68-69, EA]

Finally, given the involvement of an ever-larger number of private actors in space, states also need to consider the lost opportunity costs if private actors choose to forego research, development, and deployment of new technologies because the danger in space is too high. As space becomes more commercialized, these private actors can exert pressure on states to behave peacefully in order to promote further economic development. Gartzke and Quan Li argue that this can happen through the movement of capital from conflict-prone states or areas to non-conflictual states.50 This is not necessarily applicable to space because there is no area in space which is formally protected, but commercial space actors may choose not to engage in new economic investment which can in turn affect a state’s economic performance. To date, the size of the space sector is comparatively small, so, arguably, the potential economic loss would not be that great. Where the harm comes from is state reliance on private actors for military and national security space services. As states contract out space services to a greater extent, private actors exert an even greater influence over the state by having a capability they do not.

Why might private companies want a more conflict-free space? If there is weaponized conflict in space, they could potentially benefit through new launches to send up replacement satellites; this is similar to an argument that war can actually be beneficial to an economy because companies are needed to create materiel and weapons.51 But, in a debris filled environment, sending replacements is more difficult and dangerous. Some private companies want to engage in human spaceflight; a conflictual or more dangerous orbital environment would likely prevent those activities or increase their costs to such an extent that it becomes economically infeasible. James Clay Moltz argues specifically that “the growing presence of space tourists in low-Earth orbit would greatly increase the incentives for restraint in any future [ASAT] test programs.”52 Those foregone development costs and commercial activities can have a similar cost to states simply by discouraging private actors from participating in the market.