Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

# **1AR**

#### **Private Entity:**

Cornell Law (Cornell Law, ) Definition: private entity from 6 USC § 1501(15)(A) xx-xx-xxxx No Publication https://www.law.cornell.edu/definitions/uscode.php?width=840&amp;height=800&amp;iframe=true&amp;def\_id=6-USC-625312480-168358316&amp;term\_occur=999&amp;term\_src=title:6:chapter:6:subchapter:I:section:1501 //DebateDrills TJ

In general Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term “private entity” means any person or private group, organization, proprietorship, partnership, trust, cooperative, corporation, or other commercial or nonprofit entity, including an officer, employee, or agent thereof.

#### Asteroid Mining solves for quality of life and the economy.

Dr. Daniel Sutter 20 (Dr. Daniel Sutter, Charles G. Koch Professor of Economics with the Manuel H. Johnson Center for Political Economy at Troy University) Could an asteroid destroy our economy? 1-26-2020 Yellowhammer News https://yellowhammernews.com/could-an-asteroid-destroy-our-economy/ //DebateDrills TJ

An asteroid could wipe out all life on Earth, so yes. But what if we mined and brought an asteroid’s valuable metals to Earth? NASA’s plan to send a probe to an asteroid generated some out-of-this-world economic claims.

The asteroid belt between Mars and Jupiter may be the remnants of a proto-planet that broke up long ago. NASA plans to visit 16 Psyche, a heavy metal asteroid, which astronomers believe is mostly nickel and iron, but may contain precious metals like gold and platinum. The reported $10 quintillion (a 1 with eighteen zeros behind it) market value for Psyche’s metals seems to have been pulled out of thin air, or the vacuum of space.

Would the metals in 16 Psyche make everyone on Earth become a billionaire? Or would metals markets crash and somehow destroy the world economy? Economics suggests neither extreme.

We live in a world of scarcity, meaning that our desire for goods and services exceeds our ability to produce them. Production requires raw materials and, more importantly, know-how. Knowledge lies behind technology, from agriculture to supercomputers; discovering productive uses for nature’s bounty creates natural resources. The heavy metal asteroids have existed since before the first humans but will only become resources if we learn how to make space mining a reality.

Resource availability frequently constrains production. We cannot make metals or petroleum out of nothing. The harder we must toil to acquire resources, the greater their cost because everyone must be compensated for their hard work.

If technologically and economically feasible, space mining will increase the supply of metals and lower their prices. This will enable production of more goods at lower prices. Our standard of living will unambiguously rise.

But might a collapse of gold and precious metals prices bankrupt investors and cause a depression? Gold prices would likely tank, making investors holding gold suffer losses. At a price of $1,500 an ounce, all of the gold ever been mined is worth about $10 trillion. This is a lot of money, but Credit Suisse Research Institute estimates total world wealth at $360 trillion. Even a 90% drop in gold prices will not impoverish investors as a group.

The minerals from 16 Psyche would make some people wealthy, particularly the owners of Psyche’s minerals. Lower prices for cars, buildings, spaceships and other goods will increase investors’ effective wealth. The world’s economy will be more productive and investors (overall) more prosperous.

Furthermore, a decline in gold prices should not surprise investors. Expectations about demand and supply in the future influence commodity prices today. Market prices would fall as space mining becomes a reality.

Resource price adjustments also explain why 16 Psyche will not make everyone a billionaire. The news stories have a sliver of truth: $10 quintillion is over $1 billion for each of the world’s 7.5 billion persons. Yet if 16 Psyche has ten times more gold than currently in the world, gold’s price will be far below $1500 per ounce. As another way of considering this, no one has $10 quintillion to pay for Psyche’s resources.

Will space mining prove feasible? The scientific and engineering questions are well beyond my expertise. Two recently founded space mining companies, Planetary Resources and Deep Space Industries, have some highly respected scientists and smart investors involved. If Google’s Larry Page and Erich Schmidt are investing in a venture, it probably has some chance of success.

Perhaps space mining’s biggest contribution is illustrating the innumerable possibilities of the future. The potential that we will run out of resources remains highly persuasive, even though objective measures like the Cato Institute’s Simon Abundance Index demonstrate otherwise. Ultimately knowledge and discovery create the resources we use and new inventions which improve our lives. Undiscovered discoveries, however, are inherently hard to foresee. To envision the enormous potential for future innovation, just remember asteroids and space mining.

# Framework

**The standard is maximizing societal welfare.**

**Utilitarianism respects the moral equality of individuals.**

Philosopher Eric Rakowski explains. “Taking and Saving Lives.” Columbia Law Review. June 1993.

On one side**, it presses toward the consequentialist view that** **individuals' status as moral equals requires that the number of people kept alive be maximized.** Only in this way, the thought runs, can we give due weight to the fundamental equality of persons; **to allow more deaths when we can ensure fewer** is to **treat[s] some** people **as less valuable[.]** than others. Further,killing some to save others, or letting some die for that purpose**,** **does not entail that those who are killed** or left to their fate **are being used** merely **as means to** the well-being of **others, as would be true if they were slain** or left to drown merely **to please [other] people[.]** who would live anyway. They do, of course, in some cases serve as means. But they do not act merely as means. Those who die are no less ends than those who live**. It is because they are also no more ends than others whose lives are in the balance that an impartial decision-maker must choose to save the more numerous group[.], even if she must kill to do so.**

**This means that whoever maximizes societal well-being wins the round.**

# Contention 1: Asteroid Mining

How is this relevant to appropriation?

Is there space mining happening now?

\*\*You might want to start with the problem, not the solution – this means say “We are running out of precious metals now” and then “Space mining solves these concerns” rather than the other way around

#### Mining Industry destroying itself.

David Oni, Space analyst at Space in Africa, writes in 2019:

David Oni 19 (David Oni, Space industry and technology analyst at Space in Africa, Graduate of Mining Engineering from the Federal University of Technology Akure.) The Effect of Asteroid Mining On Mining Activities in Africa 9-24-2019 Space in Africa https://africanews.space/the-effect-of-asteroid-mining-on-mining-activities-in-africa/ //DebateDrills TJ

The earth, as we have come to know, is enriched with a vast array of mineral resources. But these resources are nonrenewable and hence, constant growing consumption in developing and developed countries, with the rising need for more resources to keep driving the fourth industrial revolution, will ultimately lead to a depletion in a couple of years to come. Experts say that elements needed for modern industry and food production could be exhausted on Earth within 50–60 years.

In terms of mineral resources, Africa has the most abundant of reserves. Currently, Africa hosts 30% of the world’s mineral reserve, 55% of the world’s diamond comes from Botswana and Congo, 60% of the mining in Africa is gold mining but to mention a few.

Given that the mining industry is consistently rising across sub-Saharan Africa, it is good news for the African mining sector as mining companies are beginning to expand operations, countries are already looking into improving regulatory frameworks that will enhance activities and also attract more investors.

But recent breakthroughs in space technology have led to many space scientists and engineers looking to explore alternatives to sustaining the earth while generating massive revenue and improving life generally. Currently, there are various comprehensive research documents on the Space Mining market, with detailed insights on growth factors and strategies. With the current advances and cutting edge technologies developed in preparation for the first stages of asteroid mining, one might want to ask if it is indeed good news for the African continent.

Apart from the environmental impacts, major mining activities are largely hindered in Africa by a handful of other factors such as access to energy, health and safety volatility of commodity prices, etc. Other issues such as political uncertainty, economic instability, religious and tribal wars, industrial unrest, and the fickle nature of regulatory bodies have also rendered foreign direct investment increasingly unattractive to global investors. Furthermore, most African countries have a relatively undeveloped infrastructure for exploiting resources effectively.

At the moment, Asteroid mining poses no threat to terrestrial mining; however, this will not hold for long. The space industry is progressing at such a rapid pace, and the prospects are unequivocally mouth-watering. The big question is, will asteroid mining lure away investors in Africa? The planetary resources company estimates that a single 30-m asteroid may contain 30 billion dollars in platinum alone and a 500m rock could contain half the entire world resources of PGM. Considering the abundance of minerals in asteroids, once asteroid mining materialises, it will severely affect the precious metals market, usurp the prices of rare earth minerals, and a whole lot more because minerals that are usually somewhat scarce on earth will be easily accessible on asteroids.

While foreign investors run the majority of the large-scale mining activities in the region, reports say that many African countries are dangerously dependent on mining activities. For some African countries, despite massive mineral wealth, their mining sectors are underdeveloped, and this is as a result of much focus on oil resources and a couple of other challenges. The million-dollar question is, what will become of the mining activities in Africa?

#### Dwindling precious metals are key to innovation.

Jeremy Hsu, Author in Popular Science and Scientific American mind, writes in 2012:

Jeremy Hsu 12 (Jeremy Hsu, Masters in Science Journalism from NYU, written in publications such as Popular Science, Scientific American Mind and Reader's Digest Asia.) Shortage of Rare Metals Could Threaten High-Tech Innovation 1-30-2012 livescience https://www.livescience.com/18167-shortage-rare-metals-threaten-high-tech-innovation-hitchhiker-metals-clean-technologies.html //DebateDrills TJ

A world in need of faster computers, smarter phones and more energy-efficient light bulbs threatens to strain the small supply of rare metals used by the global electronics industry. But limits on the production of such rare metals mean the supply can't easily expand to meet the demand for innovation in both consumer electronics and clean technologies.

Scarce metals such as gallium, indium and selenium — known as "hitchhiker" metals — come only as byproducts of mining major industrial metals such as aluminum, copper and zinc. That makes it hard to simply boost production of hitchhiker metals whenever industries face a shortage, even if the metals have become critical components of everything from high-performance computers to solar panels.

"With respect to metals that are hitchhikers, a higher price isn't going to lead to much more production," said Robert Ayres, a physicist and economist based at the international business school INSEAD in France. "And therefore it's much more important to think in terms of conservation, recycling and substitution."

That sobering message was delivered by Ayres at a Royal Society discussion meeting held in London Jan. 30. He wants both governments and industries to come up with a standard recycling process that could reuse rare metals.

"You produce something, you use it, but you don't just toss it in a landfill; it goes to another stage and another, and eventually the rare materials are recovered," Ayres told InnovationNewsDaily. "At present, hardly any are recovered."

Take gallium as an example. Gallium is a small byproduct of mining bauxite and zinc, but it has become a critical component for technologies such as lasers, energy-efficient LED lighting and solar panels. The metal has also become a replacement for silicon in faster microchips powering the latest generation of smartphones.

U.S. demand for gallium relied upon $66 million of overseas imports in 2011, according to the U.S. Geological Survey. And just one company, in Utah, recovered and refined gallium from scrap metal and impure gallium metal.

Indium has become a crucial ingredient in the liquid crystal displays for smartphones and in some types of solar panels. A third hitchhiker metal, selenium, also forms part of the solar panels containing both gallium and indium.

Ayres worries in particular about rare metal shortages crippling innovation in clean energy technologies such as solar power.

"Tellurium, part of the lowest-cost photovoltaic material, is only available from copper refineries," Ayres pointed out. "And so the quantity available in the world isn't anywhere near enough to satisfy the potential demand for thin-film photovoltaic surfaces (solar panels)."

#### Asteroid mining provides the necessary precious metals for innovation.

Matthew Williams, Journalist with articles in Universe Today and Business Insider, writes in 2020:

Matthew S. Williams 20 (Matthew S. Williams, writer for Universe Today, and the curator of their Guide to Space section, Articles have been featured in Phys.org, HeroX, Popular Mechanics, Business Insider, Gizmodo, and IO9, ScienceAlert, Knowridge Science Report, and Real Clear Science,) Asteroid Mining to Shape the Future of Our Wealth 11-6-2020 No Publication https://interestingengineering.com/asteroid-mining-to-shape-the-future-of-our-wealth //DebateDrills TJ

The argument in favor of asteroid mining is simple: within the Solar System, there are countless bodies that could contain a wealth of minerals, ores, and volatile elements that are essential to Earth's economy.

Asteroids, as we saw above, are believed to be the material left over from the formation of the Solar System. As such, many asteroids are thought to have compositions that are similar to that of Earth and the other rocky planets (Mercury, Venus, and Mars).

All told, there are thought to be more than 150 million asteroids in the inner Solar System alone, and that's only the ones that measure 100 meters (330 ft) or more in diameter.

These can be divided into three main groups: C-type, S-type, and M-type, which correspond to asteroids composed, respectively, largely of clay and silicates, silicates and nickel-iron, and metals. About 75% fall into the category of C-type; S-types account for 17%; while M-type and other types make up the remainder.

These latter two groups are thought to contain abundant minerals, including gold, platinum, cobalt, zinc, tin, lead, indium, silver, copper, iron, and various rare-Earth metals. For millennia, these metals have been mined from the Earth's crust and have been essential to economic and technological progress.

In addition, there are thought to be many asteroids and comets that contain water ice and other volatiles (ammonia, methane, etc.). Water ice could be harvested to satisfy a growing demand for freshwater on Earth, for everything from drinking to irrigation and sanitation.

Volatile materials could also be used as a source of chemical propellant like hydrazine, thus facilitating further exploration and mining ventures. In fact, Planetary Resources indicates that there are roughly 2.2 trillion US tons (2 trillion metric tons) of water ice in the Solar System.

Of course, this raises the obvious question: wouldn't it be really expensive to do all this mining? Why not simply continue to rely on Earth for sources of precious metals and resources and simply learn to use them better?

To put it simply, we are running out of resources. To be clear, learning to use our resources better and more sustainably is always the most important idea. And while it is certainly true that Earth-based mining is far cheaper than going to space would be, that may not be the case indefinitely.

#### Space Research is key to solving climate change.

Greg Autry, Professor of Space Leadership at Thunderbird School of Global Management, writes in 2019:

Greg Autry 19 (Greg Autry, Clinical Professor of Space Leadership, Policy and Business at Thunderbird School of Global Management, Tech startup founder, Researcher on entrepreneurship, commercial space and economics. Former NASA Presidential Appointee. Writer & regular Forbes contributor, 2021 Space Advocate of the Year.) Space Research Can Save the Planet—Again 7-20-2019 Foreign Policy https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/07/20/space-research-can-save-the-planet-again-climate-change-environment/ //DebateDrills TJ

Indeed, understanding the evolution of other planets’ climates is essential for modeling possible outcomes on Earth. NASA probes revealed how, roughly 4 billion years ago, a runaway greenhouse gas syndrome turned Venus into a hot, hellish, and uninhabitable planet of acid rain. Orbiters, landers, and rovers continue to unravel the processes that transformed a once warm and wet Mars into a frigid, dry dust ball—and scientists even to conceive of future scenarios that might terraform it back into a livable planet. Discovering other worlds’ history and imagining their future offers important visions for climate change mitigation strategies on Earth, such as mining helium from the moon itself for future clean energy.

Spinoff technologies from space research, from GPS to semiconductor solar cells, are already helping to reduce emissions; the efficiency gains of GPS-guided navigation shrink fuel expenditures on sea, land, and air by between 15 and 21 percent—a greater reduction than better engines or fuel changes have so far provided. Modern solar photovoltaic power also owes its existence to space. The first real customer for solar energy was the U.S. space program; applications such as the giant solar wings that power the International Space Station have continually driven improvements in solar cell performance, and NASA first demonstrated the value of the sun for powering communities on Earth by using solar in its own facilities.

Promisingly, space-based solar power stations could overcome the inconvenient truth that wind and solar will never get us anywhere near zero emissions because their output is inherently intermittent and there is, so far, no environmentally acceptable way to store their power at a global scale, even for one night. Orbital solar power stations, on the other hand, would continually face the sun, beaming clean power back through targeted radiation to Earth day or night, regardless of weather. They would also be free from clouds and atmospheric interference and therefore operate with many times the efficiency of current solar technology. Moving solar power generation away from Earth—already possible but held back by the current steep costs of lifting the materials into space—would preserve land and cultural resources from the blight of huge panel farms and save landfills from the growing problem of discarded old solar panels.

Sustainable energy advocates in the U.S. military and the Chinese government are actively pursuing space-based solar power, but just making solar cells damages the environment due to the caustic chemicals employed. Space technology offers the possibility of freeing the Earth’s fragile biosphere and culturally important sites from the otherwise unavoidable damage caused by manufacturing and mining.

The U.S. start-up Made in Space is currently taking the first steps toward manufacturing in orbit. The company’s fiber-optic cable, produced by machinery on the International Space Station, is orders of magnitude more efficient than anything made on Earth, where the heavy gravity creates tiny flaws in the material. Made in Space and others are eventually planning to build large structures, such as solar power stations, in space. As these technologies develop, they will augment each other, bringing costs down dramatically; space manufacturing, for instance, slashes the cost of solar installations in space.

# Contention 2: Safety Zones

What is a keep out zone?

What is a space war? Why is it likely? Who would fight a space war? Why are satellites valuable?

#### Keep-out zones are crucial to preventing space wars

James Acton, Co-director of the Nuclear Policy Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, writes in 2021:

James M. Acton et al. 21 (James M. Acton, Thomas Macdonald, Pranay Vaddi, Acton holds the Jessica T. Mathews Chair and is co-director of the Nuclear Policy Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.) Reimagining Nuclear Arms Control: A Comprehensive Approach 12-16-2021 Carnegie Endowment for International Peace https://carnegieendowment.org/2021/12/16/reimagining-nuclear-arms-control-comprehensive-approach-pub-85938 //DebateDrills TJ

Establishing keep-out zones around high-altitude satellites could help reduce the vulnerability of key nuclear C3I capabilities. Specifically, China, Russia, and the United States should commit not to maneuver their satellites within an agreed minimum distance—700 kilometers (430 miles) in any direction—of another participant’s high-altitude satellites (with the exception of repositioning maneuvers conducted one at a time and declared in advance). This agreement would apply only to satellites nationally owned by China, Russia, and the United States and not to privately owned satellites or to satellites owned by other states (so would not contravene the 1967 Outer Space Treaty’s prohibition on “national appropriation”).

Currently, the regulation of high-altitude satellite orbits is minimal. The International Telecommunication Union (ITU), a United Nations agency, allocates slots to geostationary broadcast and communication satellites in order to prevent interference—though these slots can overlap if satellites operate on different frequencies or broadcast to non-contiguous regions on the ground. Participation in the ITU is voluntary and is designed only to minimize broadcast interference.

Establishing keep-out zones would go further than the ITU rules by applying to all Chinese, Russian, and U.S. satellites in both geostationary and Molniya orbits—not just geostationary satellites broadcasting at a particular frequency band—without permitting any overlap. It would begin to establish rules of the road for good behavior in space and help break the deadlock in improving space governance. Even recognizing that keep-out zones could not physically prevent one participant state from attacking another’s satellites in conflict—although the proposed agreement would still apply then—they would still help to reduce escalation risks in three ways.

First, keep-out zones would mitigate the danger that repositioning operations could lead one state to wrongly conclude that one or more of its satellites were under attack—that is, the zones would help to define the difference between innocuous and aggressive actions in space. Even (or perhaps especially) in a conflict, a state that did not intend to attack a nuclear C3I satellite belonging to its adversary would have a clear incentive to abide by rules designed to prevent such threats from arising inadvertently.

Second, even if one participant decided to attack another’s satellites—for whatever reason—keep-out zones could buy time. An attacking satellite would typically have to close in on a target before launching an attack (how close it would need to come would depend on its capabilities).14 This process would not be instantaneous. If the target state detected a violation of its keep-out zones before the attacking satellites were able to execute the attack, it could take preventative action (by, for example, maneuvering its satellites away from the attacking ones). Increasing the warning time of an intentional attack would also reduce the likelihood of escalation resulting from time pressure.

The margin of warning afforded by keep-out zones would depend, in part, on their size. Fuel-efficient maneuvers in geostationary orbit to cross from the edge to the center of a 700-kilometer keep-out zone would require about one day (see appendix B for more details). Faster crossing would be possible by using larger amounts of fuel. For example, the same keep-out zone could be crossed in six hours by expending the same amount of fuel that a communication satellite typically uses each year for station keeping (that is, making minor adjustments so the satellite remains in its correct orbit during day-to-day operations). Larger keep-out zones would buy more warning time and further complicate attacks—but they would be more disruptive to satellite operations. The keep-out distance of 700 kilometers proposed here aims to strike a balance between increasing warning and reducing disruption.

Third, each state could use negotiations to underscore to the others the dangers of attacking its high-altitude satellites. Such messaging could reduce the likelihood of one participant’s deliberately attacking another’s dual-use satellites in an effort to win (or at least not lose) a conventional war because it had underestimated the consequent risk of nuclear escalation.

#### Space wars destroys satellites which hinders innovation and deters private companies.

Thomas Roberts, space security researcher at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, writes in 2017:

Thomas GonzáLez Roberts 17 (Thomas GonzáLez Roberts, Space security researcher at the Center for Strategic and International Studies) Why We Should Be Worried about a War in Space 12-15-2017 Atlantic https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2017/12/why-we-should-be-worried-about-a-war-in-space/548507/ //DebateDrills TJ

One hundred miles above the Earth’s surface, orbiting the planet at thousands of miles per hour, the six people aboard the International Space Station enjoy a perfect isolation from the chaos of earthly conflict. Outer space has never been a military battleground. But that may not last forever. The debate in Congress over whether to create a Space Corps comes at a time when governments around the world are engaged in a bigger international struggle over how militaries should operate in space. Fundamental changes are already underway. No longer confined to the fiction shelf, space warfare is likely on the horizon.

While agreements for how to operate in other international domains, like the open sea, airspace, and even cyberspace, have already been established, the major space powers—the United States, Russia, and China—have not agreed upon a rulebook outlining what constitutes bad behavior in space. It’s presumed that International Humanitarian Law would apply in outer space—protecting the civilian astronauts aboard the International Space Station—but it’s unclear whether damaging civilian satellites or the space environment itself is covered under the agreement. With only a limited history of dangerous behavior to study, and few, outdated guidelines in place, a war in space would be a war with potentially more consequences, but far fewer rules, than one on Earth.

Although there has never been a military conflict in space, the history of human activity above our atmosphere is not entirely benign. In 1962, the United States detonated a 1.4 megaton nuclear weapon 250 miles above the Earth’s surface. The blast destroyed approximately one third of satellites in orbit and poisoned the most used region of space with radiation that lasted for years. Although the United States, Russia, and others soon agreed to a treaty to prevent another nuclear test in space, China and North Korea never signed it. In 2007, China tested an anti-satellite weapon, a conventionally-armed missile designed to target and destroy a satellite in orbit. In the process, it annihilated an old Chinese weather satellite and created high-velocity shrapnel that still threatens other satellites. Even though demonstrations like this have consequences for everyone, countries are free to carry them out as they see fit. No treaties address this kind of test, the creation of space debris, or the endangerment of other satellites.

The U.S. has the most to lose in a space-based conflict

With by far the most satellites in orbit, the U.S. has the most to gain by establishing norms, but also the most to lose. Almost half of all operational satellites are owned and operated by the United States government or American commercial companies. That’s twice as many as Russia and China, combined. Space may seem distant, but what happens there affects our everyday lives on the ground. When we use our phones to plan a trip, we depend on American GPS satellites to guide us. When the U.S. military deploys troops overseas, satellite communications connect forces on the ground to control centers. When North Korea launches an intercontinental ballistic missile, the U.S. and its allies depend on early-warning satellites to detect it.

#### **Recall the Greg Autry Evidence. It explains that space research solves climate change because it allows for efficient solar panels in space and spinoff technologies that reduce fuel emissions.**

# Case

### Space Wars

#### Space wars are impossible and can’t escalate --- debris, high monetary costs, and lack of lift capabilities

Handberg, 17 – Faculty and Research, School of Politics, Security, and International Affairs, UCF Roger Handberg, “Is space war imminent? Exploring the possibility,” Comparative Strategy. 2017. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/01495933.2017.1379832?needAccess=true>

--Space wars were discounted in 1960s – things haven’t changed now – environment still hostile – moreso now bc debris is worse

--Costs a ton to send stuff up there

--Lift capabilities are weak which means war can’t be sustained

--Replacements are slow so war has to be ended

Why now?

Recently, there has been an ongoing resurgence of interest in the possibilities for actual combat in outer space, effectively war in a new domain. Why this would become plausible now is interesting, since the physical realities present in the early days of space activity have not changed. Spacecraft remain vulnerable to attack from the ground by anti-satellite (ASAT) weapons, while the debris issue grows exponentially worse now, given the proliferation of such objects in space as part of the normal operations in outer space: used boosters, dead satellites, pieces of broken spacecraft and satellites, and small particles with deadly impact on other spacecraft. The space shuttles routinely returned to Earth with dings and scars from space debris, while the International Space Station (ISS) several times has been lifted out of harm’s way due to oncoming debris. More critically for assessing space-war possibilities, the sheer cost of conducting such operations remains extremely high, while the possibilities for sustaining combat in space are suspect due to lack of lift capability. The difficulty in orbiting replacement satellites to restore functionality remains, assuming the environment is not too hostile due to expanding debris fields. Replacement satellites or other space hardware are still slow-production items, although that in principle could be placed on more of an assembly-line basis, as was done with the Iridium satellite flotilla of 66 comsats plus multiple spares.19 Or, smaller cube satellites with more limited functionality could be orbited as gap fillers while larger, more functional satellites are built and flown if time exists to do so.

#### Kinetic space targeting requires huge resources that make it infeasible, but cyber attacks are an alt cause they don’t solve

Handberg, 17 – Faculty and Research, School of Politics, Security, and International Affairs, UCF Roger Handberg, “Is space war imminent? Exploring the possibility,” Comparative Strategy. 2017. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/01495933.2017.1379832?needAccess=true>

Third, the most obvious initial attack of space-based assets will most likely come from cyber attacks, given that such actions do not necessarily require the scale of resources necessary for other modalities such as kinetic weapons, or even lasers or other energy-type weapons. One will have to position the weapons plus the infrastructure to permit rapid recycling of the weapons for the next attack. Firing off interceptors will likely be a one-off, meaning extremely precise targeting will be required if the attack is to be successful. Note that none of these systems require that individuals be placed in Earth orbit, despite the imagery describing such operations in fictional universes.

#### Deterrence in space solves even if we’re more vulnerable ---

#### 1] No shot of a disarming strike --- we’d maintain BMD and be able to retaliate --- that makes our threats credible

Harrison, 9 – Director, Eisenhower Center for Space and Defense Studies Ambassador Roger G. Harrison, “Space Deterrence: The Delicate Balance of Risk,” Space and Defense, Volume 3, No. 1. Summer 2009. <http://www.usafa.edu/app/uploads/Space_and_Defense_3_1.pdf>

The second mitigating factor is that even in the absence of dedicated ASAT systems, a potential attacker is not likely to perceive the U.S. lacks capability to retaliate against the space assets of an adversary. Many nations perceive existing U.S. ballistic missile defense systems as having a dual-use nature, including potential anti-satellite capability. The U.S. reportedly has an active and acknowledged program of “negation” designed to deny an adversary the use of his space assets as force multipliers in the case of hostilities within the atmosphere. We may safely assume that other nations are pursuing similar programs. In our judgment, the most likely scenario for future space conflict is a “war of negation,” i.e. an attempt by each side to preserve the product of its space assets while denying those space services to the opponent. To win such a contest requires technological superiority, which the U.S. should make every effort to maintain and which, in this area as in others, is a vital element in maintaining space deterrence.

We conclude that the threat of retaliation can remain a credible element of our overall space deterrence. The attribution of attack is not an insuperable obstacle, and that questions of resolve will ultimately depend on the perceptions of a potential attacker in the circumstances existing when his decision to attack is being considered. A credible threat of retaliation may require willingness to escalate into other domains. It could include fielding ASAT systems if such systems are deployed by others, but the resulting arms race would not be in the interests of the United States. The U.S. should not be the first to deploy such systems and the U.S. use the full extent of its influence internationally to avoid that outcome. Ultimately, a threat of retaliation is never more credible than the leader and the government that issues it. No declaratory policy can compensate for an irresolute commander in chief, one who is misinformed or badly served by his subordinates. An opponent will tend to judge the likelihood of retaliation not according to proclamations made months or years earlier, but according to the situation pertaining at the time – as Hitler did in Europe and Saddam did in the Middle East. What a President does in the run up to and conduct of a crisis will have far more to do with an adversaries decisions than libraries full of ultimatums and guarantees. Subordinates who doubt the resolution of a commander will try to limit his or her flexibility to respond other than in ways the subordinates think appropriate. A wise commander in chief, on the other hand, will strive to maintain flexibility, to approach a particular conflict in the context of wider responsibilities, to take account of factors which were unforeseen when the doctrine or battle plan was devised – in short, to balance one risk off against others. No bureaucratic arrangement, declaratory doctrine or weapon capability will compensate when such leadership is not present.

### Cooperation

#### Unfeasible, Russo-US relations suck—we’re on the brink of Putin bombing all our space tech to oblivion.

Koffler 11-17[Rebekah Koffler is a former Defense Intelligence Agency officer and author of “Putin’s Playbook: Russia’s Secret Plan to Defeat America.”, Opinion, 11-17 2021,WSJ,https://www.wsj.com/articles/space-armageddon-and-putins-threats-to-ukraine-russia-antisatellite-weapon-11637183651, 12-15-2021 amrita]

**Russia successfully conducted a test** in which a direct-ascent missile destroyed a nearly 40-year-old defunct Soviet spy satellite, U.S. Space Command announced Monday. This unsettling development is noteworthy because it coincides with Russia’s massive military buildup along the Ukrainian border. Moscow’s pre-positioning of more than 100,000 soldiers, tanks and heavy weaponry has spurred the Pentagon’s concerns about a possible Russian invasion of Ukraine. **Moscow’s posturing on what the Russians call a “space weapon” signals a rapidly escalating crisis in U.S.-Russia relations**. Washington’s foreign policy and Moscow’s view of its national interests are on a geopolitical collision course. Russia views the formerly Soviet Ukraine as part of its strategic security perimeter, on which Moscow has relied for centuries as a geographical buffer against foreign invasion. President Vladimir Putin has repeatedly said the U.S. is crossing a red line by attempting to pull Ukraine out of Russia’s orbit. In April, at his annual address to the Russian Parliament, Mr. Putin threatened a “swift, asymmetric and harsh response,” if the U.S. and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization intervene on Ukraine’s behalf. A trained intelligence operative, Mr. **Putin maintains strategic ambiguity** regarding what U.S. action precisely would constitute the crossing of Moscow’s red line with regard to former Soviet states, such as Ukraine. Ukraine’s admission into the European Union and NATO would almost certainly be unacceptable to the Kremlin. Mr. Putin is prepared to fight a war against the West to prevent this from happening. But how could Russia win a war against a much stronger adversary? That’s where Monday’s antisatellite test comes in. It’s a preview of Mr. Putin’s Space Armageddon strategy. **Russian strategists have observed** American **war fighters’ tactics in conflict zones** for nearly a quarter-century—in Kosovo, Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya and Syria. They **learned that America’s** superior **space capability is its Achilles’ heel** because of the U.S. military’s near-total dependence on it. Many civilian drivers would be lost without directions from their smartphones. **U.S. troops in war zones rely on the same constellation of 31 GPS** satellites for tasks like synchronizing operations, pinpointing targets and locating personnel. Moscow therefore seeks to deafen and blind U.S. forces in conflicts. By attacking U.S. satellites, the Russians would attempt to offset superior U.S. conventional firepower. They also hope to paralyze U.S. forces psychologically by rendering them helpless. Russian military theorists often write about the importance of targeting both the technical capabilities and the mind of an adversary, planning to disorganize its troops and weaken their will to fight. This is the essence of Mr. Putin’s asymmetric approach to warfare. Moscow believes it can win an all-out space war with America, which stands to lose a lot more since its entire society, from ATMs to home offices, is connected via satellites. Alarmingly, Washington is as unprepared for Mr. Putin’s star wars as it was for Russia’s determination to wage cyberwarfare. Monday’s test executed only a single page out of Mr. Putin’s playbook, which includes lasers, jammers and other satellite killers. Before the situation in Ukraine escalates into war, the **Pentagon** had **better develop a strategy to counter** Mr. **Putin**’s plan for Space Armageddon.