### 1. Disclosure

#### A. Interpretation: The AFF has to have contact info and disclose case at least 30 minutes before the round

#### B. Violation – No disclosure, no wikki account w/ contact info

Graphical user interface, table

Description automatically generated

#### C. Standards

1. Predictability: Absent disclosure I have no way to tell what they’re running; They can discuss any type of position and there aren’t any limits to this, which kills substantive engagement because I can’t know what they’re running

2. Clash: My interp ensures both sides can discuss the method in depth. Absent disclosure, I might not know the method and be able to make strong answers in round. I might just resort to theory which is worse, killing substantive clash because we aren’t truly debating. Contact info is essential to clarify positions and meet interps.

3. Evdience ethics: I have no way to check the cards even if I use all minutes of prep before the NC, so they could be using miscut cards

4. Accessiblity: it justified small schools who don’t have the comparatively enough research, falling behind on the literature and popular argumentation, they’ll say people will steal cards but that’s good because it fosters a community, and forces people to research more

5. vote neg to deter future abuse

#### Net Benefit: Argument Quality

1] Disclosure prevents the **element of surprise**. A world without disclosure rewards debaters for running arguments not because they are good, but because their opponents won't know how to respond. Disclosure forces debaters to commit to quality; under my interpretation, debaters would have to write cases knowing that their opponents will have the opportunity for thoughtful preparation.

#### D. Voter:

#### Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### The voter is substantive engagement, which exists when debaters directly answer each other’s content instead of just avoiding it.

#### Counterplan:

#### Property rights for asteroids should be governed by the doctrine of appropriation. Private appropriation of non-asteroid celestial bodies should be prohibited

**the legal framework that strikes the best balance of providing economic incentives for mining while preventing unbeneficial land claims requires a doctrine of appropriation – AFF prevents that**

#### No link turns -- rules of appropriation solve waste and abstract claims and alternative approaches don’t

Myers 16 -- Ross Myers (J.D. candidate at the University of Oregon Law School.), The Doctrine of Appropriation and Asteroid Mining: Incentivizing the Private Exploration and Development of Outer Space, 2016, Oregon Review of International Law, https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1794/19850/Meyers.pdf?sequence=1 WJ

Like water during the expansion of the American West, the exploration of space can be financed and incentivized by granting rights in resources to those who secure new resources and put them to beneficial use. Some legal scholars have suggested the traditional rule of capture be applied to asteroids,69 or that rights to asteroids be purchased directly from an international agency and owned as chattel.70 However, like water during America’s westward expansion, asteroids are not easily classified under traditional property regimes. Thus, a doctrine of appropriation would be more appropriate for asteroids than a traditional rule of capture or a chattel system, because a system based on the traditional rule of capture or chattel would result in waste, abstract claims, and complicated legal issues.

First, asteroid claims cannot be adjudicated under the traditional rule of capture, or as chattel, because such systems would be incredibly wasteful. As of now, scientists have observed approximately 450,000 asteroids in our solar system.71

But only a fraction of the observable bodies will be cost effective to mine. While it might one day be possible for a single entity to finance several mining missions at once, current costs associated with such a venture would limit almost any space-mining program to one or two asteroids, at least initially.72 The traditional rule of capture could allow an entity to quickly claim multiple asteroids merely by landing on them and planting a flag, without requiring the entity to show it can reasonably use the resources they have claimed.

Even worse would be a system where the same corporation could claim asteroids simply by discovering their existence and registering the claim. Allowing this type of unregulated claim would incentivize larger corporations capable of space travel to quickly claim reachable asteroids, but the claims could easily outpace those entities’ realistic expectations on what they could use. Under a traditional rule of capture system, the solar system could be divvied up long before the resources could conceivably be mined. A rule similar to the doctrine of appropriation used for water claims in the United States would alleviate this concern by limiting claims to those where a claimant can show a reasonable beneficial use for the resource.

Another concern posed by the traditional rule of capture or chattel system would be the creation of abstract claims. Some legal scholars have advocated for a system where asteroids would be categorized as chattel, and rights in asteroids would be granted to an entity that could identify an asteroid and register ownership of it with an international agency.73 The advantage of such a system would be that it would allow an international agency to keep track of asteroids, and it would allow for the mapping of the reachable solar system. The problem with this approach, however, is that it would result in abstract claims. If an entity could claim the rights to an asteroid without actual possession, there is nothing to prevent that company from claiming ownership long in advance of any real possibility of landing on it. One of the reasons for creating the doctrine of appropriation was to limit abstract claims over resources that were not being used in any reasonable way. Just as the plaintiffs in Hague had no recourse against the third party who wasted the natural gas reserve, there would be no cause of action against an entity that has the rights to an asteroid, but chooses not to exercise them.74 This may be particularly harmful to society because asteroids contain volatiles that may be essential to creating rocket fuel in space, which, in turn, may be crucial to deep space exploration.

Using asteroid-bound volatiles to make rocket fuel would reduce the cost and increase the range of space exploratory missions, possibly improving the human race’s ability to explore and develop space. Under a system were entities could claim asteroids without actual possession, those entities could exclude others from landing on the asteroids and using such resources, even when such resources are languishing unused in space. To prevent the creation of such abstract claims over asteroids, the doctrine of appropriation could be modified as to only grant rights only to entities who are able to demonstrate both actual possession and beneficial use. This would ensure that asteroids claims are limited to those where the resources are actually being used, thus, maximizing the utility of such celestial bodies to society.

Finally, asteroids cannot be adjudicated under the traditional rule of capture or a chattel system because their unique propensity to collide with other celestial bodies would result in vexing legal issues. Pop culture has popularized the notion of an asteroid crashing into the surface of Earth in movies and books, but interspace collisions may be a real concern. Asteroids are constantly moving through space, and they often crash into other asteroids or space debris, and sometimes onto the surface of planets. So real is the concern that space agencies regularly keep track of NEOs, or Near Earth Objects, which include around 10,000 asteroids large enough to be tracked in space.75 Imagine the scenario in the popular movie Armageddon, where society wrestles with the mechanics of destroying a huge asteroid that is headed straight for Earth.76 It would be strange, indeed, if the situation were further complicated by an entity owning the asteroid. Would the Earth have to compensate the company for the loss of resources, or would the company be forced to assume liability for the damage caused by the collision? What if the asteroid, rather than crashing into Earth, crashed instead into another asteroid owned by different entity? It makes sense that a company with actual possession of an asteroid should have a claim for actual mining equipment destroyed, but it seems unreasonable to treat the entire rock as the entity’s chattel. By limiting asteroid claims under a doctrine of appropriation-like system, society will be saved the headache of attempting to adjudicate such absurd situations.

Because the traditional rule of capture or a chattel system for the ownership of asteroids would result in waste, abstract claims, and absurd legal dilemmas, a modified doctrine of appropriation should replace existing outdated international space law relating to asteroids.’

**plan solves- it preserves international mechanisms for dispute management and coop- AND- incentivizes asteroid mining**

**Heise, 18** -- Managing Notes Editor, Michigan Journal of International Law

[Jack, "Space, the Final Frontier of Enterprise: Incentivizing Asteroid Mining Under a Revised International Framework, 40 Mich. J. Int'l L. 189, 2018, <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mjil/vol40/iss1/5>, accessed 6-24-21]

III. A New International Framework to Govern the Space Economy

Asteroid mining creates tension within the OST as an activity that is prohibited by the treaty’s terms but largely in line with the treaty’s purpose. As such, the OST should be modified to allow for greater certainty and predictability with respect to asteroid mining. The possibility that asteroid mining could be illegal under international law likely disincentivizes entry into this new endeavor by adding risk and uncertainty. This section outlines what a revised framework should look like. First, the law governing space should remain international in nature to further the interests of peaceful cooperation and facilitate dispute resolution. Second, this framework should present minimal regulatory barriers for entry given the benefits that asteroid mining could bring to all mankind. The development of whaling law provides a use-ful historical example of how norms and rules for the asteroid mining industry could evolve in a way that facilitates efficient governance of this endeavor.

A. The Desirability of an International Framework

The preservation of space as a zone **governed by international law**, in contrast to a system predicated on national jurisdiction, is desirable in that it **promotes peace**, **facilitates dispute resolution**, and allows for more **coordinated efforts** in addressing issues relevant to all entities operating in space.98 As illustrated by the recent legislative activity in the United States and Luxembourg, the risk of inaction is the resultant domination of the extraterrestrial environment by individual nations rather than by international agreement.99 It would take only minor changes to the OST to resolve some of the ambiguities in the status quo and help bring the benefits of asteroid mining to humanity as a whole. A revision of this treaty rather than a wholesale abandonment of the agreement—whether that abandonment is in fact or merely in practice—would better maintain the international character of space.

The OST reflects Cold War era concerns about the militarization of space.100 Private companies, now ascendant in the growing space economy, simply do not have the military capacity or intention of sovereign governments. In short, the factual backdrop for the signing of the OST has changed. One straightforward means of authorizing private companies to extract space resources would be to revise the OST to **clarify** that the language in Article II prohibiting national appropriation **does not apply to private companies**. This could be achieved by simply **adding a sentence to the end of Article VI**: Under the revised treaty, companies shall remain under the supervision of the countries in which they are based but are not capable of national appropriation by use or occupation. This revision would create something of a line-drawing problem given the partnerships between sovereign space agencies and private companies,101 as well as a possible loophole by which unscrupulous nations could take advantage of the corporate form. Additional safeguards might be necessary to prevent this possibility. This revision could, however, promote peaceful coexistence and uniformity in space law, as well as create certainty as to the legality of asteroid mining by private companies.

Another possibility is to create a new set of international rules for extraction of space resources. Assignment of such property rights could take the form of a first-come, first-served system102 or it could depend on an Earth-side registration process.103 Arguably, extraction is different than the forbidden uses enumerated in the OST in that it is a temporary occupation and not inherently an exercise of military might or the flexing of sovereign muscle.104 While the United States and Luxembourg both interpret asteroid mining to be legal under the existing treaty,105 the promulgation of rules governing the endeavor would add clarity as to the legality of the enterprise. This approach would have the advantage of treating sovereign actors and private companies alike, but would require more substantial revision of the OST, or a new international agreement altogether.

An amended OST or a new treaty governing the extraction of space resources would have the benefit of **maintaining the peaceful order of space**. While admittedly the product of a different era, the post-national and peaceable foundation of the OST is still desirable in an international environment where many nations are armed to the proverbial nuclear teeth. Peaceful use of outer space is a laudable objective and one served most effectively by international agreement rather than by competing national claims of sovereignty.106

An international system would also facilitate dispute resolution. In a borderless and extra-jurisdictional realm like outer space, a system predicated on national sovereignty and ownership is not instructive as to whose laws—or whose choice of law rules—would control in the event of disputed title of an asteroid or the commission of a tort between two actors from different nations.107 The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (the “UNCLOS”) established the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (the “ITLOS”) as a means of providing a venue in which similar disputes could be adjudicated between actors with conflicting legal regimes.108 Outer space has a great deal of similarity to the high seas: both are vast, both are easily treated as a non-appropriable international commons, and both are an in-between space in the sense of existing between bodies of terra firma. 109 An international mechanism like ITLOS ought to be established for resolving space disputes such that parties can seek a neutral arbiter to resolve conflict and laws can be uniformly applied to all entities irrespective of their country of origin.110

Finally, an international system could more easily **allow for cooperation** between nations and private entities in addressing issues that affect the spacefaring community as a whole. The emergence of **space debris** and the use of **nuclear power** sources in space are examples of developing issues that bear on the ease and safety of space travel for all.111 Left to national governments or individual corporations, it seems plausible that lack of oversight could result in a tragedy of the commons.112 By contrast, an international framework is well-suited to consider the problems of the space ecosystem in a way that transcends national boundaries. The UNCLOS Preamble, for example, demonstrates an awareness that “problems of ocean space are closely interrelated and need to be considered as a whole.”113 The compelling interests of peace, uniformity, and cooperation in outer space illustrate the desirability of an international framework to govern asteroid mining; to tweak rather than jettison the existing law. The resulting clarity and predictability would incentivize asteroid mining through reducing legal risk and uncertainty.

A counterproposal to an international framework is a system in which nations assign property rights according to domestic law. It would be possible to take a terra nullius approach to property rights relating to celestial bodies.114 In the Western Sahara advisory opinion, the International Court of Justice defined terra nullius as “a legal term of art employed in connection with ‘occupation’ as one of the accepted legal methods of acquiring sovereignty over territory.”115 For a nation to peaceably acquire sovereignty through occupation, the land must be “terra nullius—a territory belonging to no-one—at the time of the act alleged to constitute the ‘occupation[.]’ ”116 This legal approach was prevalent during the colonial era: explorers and emigrants acting in the name of European sovereigns declared ownership of territory by right of discovery and occupation.117 By authorizing U.S. citizens to extract materials from asteroids through the Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act, the United States has started down a path in which property rights in space flow from the jurisdiction of individual sovereign nations.118 Luxembourg has taken a similar approach through its own legislation.119

There are some notable advantages to this approach. The absence of an international policing or enforcement mechanism in space arguably points in favor of regulation by nations with spaceflight capacity. Given the generally acknowledged challenges of enforcing international law,120 one might wonder whether domestic governments might be better positioned to monitor and control private entities based within their borders. A nation-centric approach would also likely incentivize investment in asteroid mining, prompting countries and private actors to invest more aggressively so as not to lose the new space race.121 Assuming, as this Note does, that the development of the asteroid mining industry is in the interest of humanity as a whole, this approach has some appeal.

However, a nation-centric, first possession framework has drawbacks that highlight the desirability of an international governance regime for asteroid mining. First, the experience of colonization was one that prompted conflict between colonizers.122 The peaceful character of space is one of the great achievements of the OST, and it should not be jettisoned. Second, a regime characterized by national actors could spark a race to the bottom with respect to domestic regulation, leading to the same “flags of convenience” problem present in the maritime context as asteroid mining and spaceflight companies relocate to avoid taxes, labor and safety standards, and tort liability.123 An international framework, by contrast, could more easily prevent this problem by facilitating the creation of uniform standards for labor, safety, and liability, making relocation to under-regulated states a less attractive prospect. The drawbacks of a system governed by individual nations, in conjunction with the advantages of a global system illustrated above, point to the desirability of a revised framework governing asteroid mining that is international in character.

B. A System with Minimal Regulatory Barriers to Entry

Whatever approach is chosen to resolve the ambiguities in the OST ought not to be overly restrictive or create burdensome regulatory obstacles for private asteroid mining companies. Substantial regulation could discourage investment and hamper the development of an already capital-intensive and high-risk industry.124 The ideal regulatory system for asteroid mining should maintain an international character for the reasons described in the previous section but should not impose cumbersome regulation on asteroid mining companies at this stage in their development. Rather, allowing norms to **develop over time** through the resolution of disputes between asteroid mining companies would likely result in the **most efficient regulatory system** and would be more attractive to companies and nations that might be tempted to disregard the treaty.

The development of whaling custom offers insight into the extent to which “property rights may arise anarchically out of social custom.”125 The analogy to asteroid mining is strong in that both are extractive, high-risk, and capital-intensive industries that take place in what is effectively mare liberum (free sea).126 Herman Melville in Moby-Dick suggests the whaling industry was not governed by a “formal whaling code,” but rather that the “fishermen have been their own legislators and lawyers in this matter.”127 Over time, the custom developed that “I. A Fast-Fish belongs to the party fast to it [and] II. A Loose-Fish is fair game for anybody who can soonest catch it.”128 While Melville concedes that “the commentaries of the whalemen themselves sometimes consist in hard words and harder knocks—the Coke-upon-Littleton of the fist,”129 he also notes that this code is “universal, undisputed law applicable to all cases”130 that prevents “vexatious and violent disputes [arising] between the fishermen.”131 By and large, whalers were able to govern themselves by crafting norms over time that suited their needs.

Robert Ellickson, in his Hypothesis of Wealth-Maximizing Norms, cited the development of whaling norms as supporting the idea that, “when people are situated in a close-knit group, they will tend to develop for the ordinary run of problems norms that are wealth-maximizing.”132 Ellickson defines wealth-maximizing norms as those that minimize the sum of transaction costs and deadweight losses that the members of a group objectively incur.133 Those involved in the group activity are likely to develop rules in a utilitarian manner, preferring “bright-line rules that would eliminate arguments to fuzzy rules that would prolong disputes.”134 The few asteroid mining companies currently in existence are not only a close-knit group under Ellickson’s definition,135 but are best positioned to create rules that will give rise to greater clarity and reduce transaction costs due to their proximity to and soon-to-be-developed experience with the business of asteroid mining. Rules like these would incentivize asteroid mining through greater legal clarity and predictability, thus facilitating the delivery of asteroid mining’s benefits to all mankind.

The UNCLOS ratification debate helps illustrate why a more substantial regulatory regime might prove counterproductive for the international community. One of the primary reasons cited by American opponents of ratification is that accession to the treaty would subject American mining companies “to the whims of an unelected and unaccountable bureaucracy and would force them to pay excessive fees to the International Seabed Authority for redistribution to developing countries.”136 While other commentators have dismissed these concerns as “pure nonsense,” noting that these same companies favor accession to the treaty for the sake of having a clear legal claim to mined minerals,137 it is easy to imagine that a similar scheme of bureaucratic redistribution in the context of asteroid mining might be disregarded by the United States. A decision by nations leading the way on asteroid mining to opt out of a treaty would for all practical purposes cripple future treaty efforts. A key advantage of the proposed regulatory framework described in this Note is a practical one: it would offer the attractive prospect of legal clarity without an international bureaucratic bogeyman, making it more likely that key national stakeholders like the United States would sign on.

Conclusion

Maintaining the international character of outer space while allowing private companies to develop their own governing norms under a slightly revised OST would preempt the outbreak of a new race by sovereign governments to colonize space; create **greater certainty** for those undertaking the enterprise of **asteroid mining**; and permit the development of an efficient system tailored to maximize returns on celestial investment. The asteroid mining industry has the potential to confer benefits on all mankind as a means of facilitating space travel, spurring the development of science and technology, mitigating the potential for a calamitous asteroid impact, and facilitating climate change mitigation efforts. As such, it is in the interest of all nations to revise the OST to allow greater certainty in this endeavor. While the “entire unimaginable infinity of creation”138 is still out of reach based on our existing physics and engineering capabilities, asteroid mining is a critical step in beginning to harness celestial resources and more fully explore the intricacies of the universe around us.

**Even pricing in the costs of mining, the economic benefits outweigh- the counterplan jumpstarts a space economy that spills over to tech innovation, planetary defense, and climate change**

**Heise, 18** -- Managing Notes Editor, Michigan Journal of International Law

[Jack, "Space, the Final Frontier of Enterprise: Incentivizing Asteroid Mining Under a Revised International Framework, 40 Mich. J. Int'l L. 189, 2018, <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mjil/vol40/iss1/5>, accessed 6-24-21]

A casual Internet search for asteroid mining is likely to turn up **sky-high dollar value estimates of asteroids**. From Neil deGrasse Tyson saying that asteroid mining will make the first trillionaire,12 to a Goldman Sachs note stating that a single asteroid could contain **$25–$50 billion** worth of platinum relative to a $2.6 billion cost of an asteroid-grabbing spacecraft,13 to reports that NASA is sending a probe to an asteroid worth **$10,000 quadrillion**, the profit element of this enterprise is not lost on observers.14 However, these estimates depend on the extraction of metals like platinum, their return to Earth, and sale at the current market price, which, as the aforementioned Goldman Sachs note concedes, would “crater the global price of platinum . . . .”15

Instead of attempting to mine metals, the initial step in asteroid mining proposed by Planetary Resources, the most prominent asteroid mining company in existence today, is to **mine asteroids for water**.16 By making propellant available in space, asteroid mining “increases the payload capacity of rockets, enables the creation of a space highway with fuel depots located at various points of need throughout the Solar System, and allows spacecraft to **travel much farther**.”17 In other words, the business of asteroid mining, at least in its infancy, is not about harvesting valuable metals and returning them to Earth,18 but rather about **providing raw materials** to enable the **growth of the space economy**.

The impetus to provide in-space materials to the space economy is a matter of physics. Launching an object into space is expensive: SpaceX’s Falcon 9—with the capacity to carry just over 50,000 pounds of payload into low Earth orbit19—costs an estimated $36.7 million to launch and uses between $200,000 and $300,000 in fuel each trip.20 If asteroid mining companies were able to provide some of the **propellant in space**, that would **not only reduce fuel costs**, but would **reduce the overall launch weight**, **freeing up more space for payload**.21

In sum, should asteroid mining companies be able to provide fuel in space, it could **dramatically reduce the costs** of transporting rockets and cargo into space—both into **low Earth orbit** and to **more distant targets**, like Mars. Having this infrastructure in place could also **reduce the long-term costs** of the asteroid mining business itself, given that the business model involves launching objects into space. While a 2012 study estimated the total cost of an asteroid retrieval mission at $2.6 billion,22 a substantial reduction in launch costs would result in meaningful savings.23 This model of asteroid mining as a provider of in-space resources, then, can facilitate the growth of the space economy: future forays into space would have their costs greatly reduced by a “space highway with fuel depots.”24

B. Public and Private Actors in the Asteroid Mining Space

Both private companies and the space agencies of sovereign governments bear mentioning in a full discussion of asteroid mining. The role of the private sector in space has expanded substantially in the past decade, leading some commentators to suggest that the private sector has eclipsed the public sector in this arena.25 The asteroid mining industry, as detailed above, both depends upon and tends to facilitate this development. Sovereign space agencies, by contrast, conduct a waning share of activity in space and increasingly operate by way of public-private partnerships as an investor in the space economy.26 This marks an important shift from the factual backdrop of the original OST in that private, independent companies are increasingly taking the wheel.

As explored above, the asteroid mining business facilitates the **growth of the space economy** by reducing launch costs. However, the future of asteroid mining as a **lucrative industry** also depends upon the existence and growth of a **robust space economy**. The **symbiotic relationships** that could develop between private companies deserves emphasis. The viability of asteroid mining depends on a space economy to which asteroid mining companies can **sell fuel and metals**: the lack of a current market in asteroid resources should **resolve itself** “when the space population hits critical mass, demanding infrastructure.”27 For spaceflight companies,28 a crucial component to reduce costs is access to propellant in space.29

Sovereign governments continue to play a significant, albeit declining, role in the space economy. NASA’s share of the national budget decreased from 4.4% in 1966 to 0.5% in 2014.30 Its current strategy centers on partnership with the private space economy: “NASA helps mitigate financial risk, while the private sector conducts research and innovation more efficiently than NASA can . . . .”31 Similarly Luxembourg, which lacks its own space agency,32 opened a 200 million Euro fund in 2016 to bring asteroid mining companies to the country.33 Planetary Resources has availed itself of opportunities offered by both NASA and Luxembourg, performing contract work with the former and securing funding from the latter.34

While sovereign governments do hold some of the purse strings relevant to asteroid mining companies and the space economy as a whole, private companies are increasingly displacing national space agencies.35 A private space economy that is **increasingly independent from sovereign governments** tends to undermine the factual framework upon which the original OST relied.36 Specifically, Article VI assigns responsibility for nongovernmental entities to national governments, the implicit assumption likely being that private entities would be acting at the behest of a sovereign.37 This concern is increasingly unsubstantiated in an environment in which private, independent companies are ascendant.38

C. Global Benefits of Asteroid Mining Asteroid mining has the potential to facilitate space travel, an outcome the OST holds to be in the interest of **humanity as a whole**.39 The potential of asteroid mining to **reduce the cost of spaceflight**, moreover, could **facilitate the growth of the space economy**. Asteroid mining thus aligns with another stated purposes of the OST in the sense that an expanded space economy could provide **substantial benefits to all mankind**.40 **First**, in seeking to face the challenges posed by space travel, the public sector space race gave rise to **numerous technological innovations**, ranging from LEDs to emergency blankets to memory foam.41 It seems likely that the private space race would result in a **similar degree of innovation**, the products of which could **benefit people across the globe**.

**Second**, a successful mission to Mars could provide benefits beyond a mere sense of interplanetary accomplishment. NASA suggests that, given the parallels between the formation and evolution of Mars and Earth, a voyage there could help “us learn more about our own planet’s history and future.”42 The scientific advancements from such a mission cannot currently be anticipated and are **difficult to predict**, but “expand[ing] the frontiers of knowledge” in this manner could well bring **benefits to all mankind**.43

**Third**, the development of asteroid mining technology could also help **advance asteroid diversion tactics**. The **development of the technology** required to conduct successful asteroid mining operations could “help us to divert any incoming asteroids.”44 This is of **great importance** since NASA recently eliminated its Asteroid Redirect Mission due to funding cuts;45 NASA’s project was hailed by some scientists as a “critical step in demonstrating we can protect our planet from a future asteroid impact . . . .”46 Asteroid mining could step in and **fill an important void**. While the probability of an Armageddon-causing impact is low, the effects of an **impact** would be **extremely severe**.47 Even **some mitigation** of this risk as a byproduct of asteroid mining would be a **benefit to humanity as a whole**.

**Finally**, reduced launch costs could facilitate measures to **combat global climate change**. One proposed solution for canceling out predicted increases in average worldwide temperature is to “prevent[] . . . about **1%** of incoming solar radiation—insolation—from reaching the Earth. This could be done by **scattering into space** from the vicinity of Earth an appropriately small fraction of total insolation.”48 Asteroid mining could facilitate such measures in that “[t]echnologies that could **greatly decrease the cost of space-launch** could make a telling difference in the practicality of all types of **spacedeployed scattering systems of scales** appropriate to insolation modulation.”49 There are certainly intermediate measures to combat climate change that ought to be taken first, but asteroid mining would **facilitate this expedited solution**. While some of the benefits of asteroid mining would doubtless accrue primarily to those nations with asteroid mining companies within their borders, the benefits noted in this section—space exploration as a **general proposition**, **technological and scientific development**, improvement of **asteroid diversion technology**, and facilitated means of **swiftly countering climate change**—would **inure substantially to the benefit of all mankind**.

**Asteroids cause extinction- causes famines and economic decline**

**Higgins, 18** -- correspondent at Vox

[Abigail, covers international development, global health, poverty, and gender. Before Vox she was a foreign correspondent and researcher in East Africa writing for The Washington Post, The Guardian, and Foreign Policy, among others, "10 ways the world is most likely to end, explained by scientists", 10-18-18, Vox, https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/18/17957162/nuclear-war-asteroid-volcano-science-climate-change, accessed 12-4-19]

Asteroids are rocks that revolve around the sun and that occasionally collide with the Earth. An asteroid large enough to **cause a global catastrophe** hits Earth **every 120,000 years**, scientists estimate. It’s likely what **killed the dinosaurs**, and if an asteroid even **one-tenth the size** of the one that **caused their extinction** hit Earth today, the results would be **devastating**. Scientists estimate it could **release enough particles** to **block the sun for months** and cause a **famine** **killing hundreds of millions**.

NASA announced in 2011 that it had mapped more than 90 percent of objects in space larger than 1 kilometer in diameter, and that none of them are likely to hit Earth. But there’s **still a lot we don’t know** about smaller objects that, while unlikely to cause a global catastrophe, could have a **big enough local impact** to **disrupt social and economic systems**.