### 1

#### Interpretation: Debaters must only regulate appropriation of outer space

#### Appropiation is a term of art that doesn’t mean occupation or usage. Satellites and objects in geosynchronous orbit do not constitute appropriation – it’s not permanent nor stationary

Gorove 84 Stephen Gorove, Major Legal Issues Arising from the Use of the Geostationary Orbit, 5 MICH. J. INT'L L. 3 (1984). Available at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mjil/vol5/iss1/1> //RD Debatedrills

Crucial to a proper analysis of this issue is an understanding of the concept of "appropriation." The term "appropriation" in law is used most frequently to signify "the taking of property for one's own or exclusive use with a sense of permanence." 12 The word" thus indicates something more than just casual use. The question then becomes whether the continued exclusive occupation by a geostationary satellite of the same physical area is a violation of the ban on national appropriation. While a state may certainly exercise exclusive control over a traditional object, such as a ship, or an aircraft, or a part of airspace, it is not clear that a satellite in geostationary orbit would be able to maintain its exact position and occupy the same area over a period of time. 13 Even if a position could be accurately maintained, and thus possibly constitute an "appropriation" within the meaning of article II, the satellite would have to be kept in that orbit with a "sense of permanence" and not on a temporary basis. It has been suggested that the keeping of a solar power satellite in geostationary orbit for a period of thirty years would not constitute appropriation. 14 In point of fact, thirty years would probably satisfy the "sense of permanence" requirement, unless the geostationary orbit were considered a natural resource as characterized by the International Telecommunication Convention of 1973 (ITC) 15 and as claimed by the equatorial countries. Authority exists to support the view that the ban on national appropriation of outer space does not relate to resources. 16 In view of this and the additional fact that solar energy is an inexhaustible and unlimited resource, its utilization for transmission to earth by satellites does not appear to fall under the prohibition of article II of the 1967 Treaty.

#### If I prove that satelities in geostrationary orbit isn’t appropiation – then definetly Low earth orbit isn’t either because satelites are moving through space

Johnson 20’Johnson, Christopher D. "The legal status of megaleo constellations and concerns about appropriation of large swaths of earth orbit." *Handbook of small satellites: Technology, design, manufacture, applications, economics and regulation* (2020): 1-22

C. D. Johnson (\*) Secure World Foundation, Washington, DC, USA e-mail: cjohnson@swfound.org © Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020 J. Pelton (ed.), Handbook of Small Satellites, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20707-6\_95-1

Chris Johnson is the Space Law Advisor for Secure World Foundation and has nine years of professional experience in international space law and policy. He has authored and co-authored publications on international space law, national space legislation, international cooperation in space, human-robotic cooperative space exploration, and on the societal benefits of space technology for Africa. Prior to joining SWF, Mr. Johnson worked as an attorney in New York City and entered the space field in 2010 as an intern at the [United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs](http://www.oosa.unvienna.org/) (OOSA) in Vienna, Austria during the 53rd Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. He has also served as an intern in the [Office of International and Interagency Relations](http://oiir.hq.nasa.gov/) (OIIR) at [NASA](http://www.nasa.gov/index.html#.UtmGAtIo5ok) Headquarters in Washington, DC, and as a legal stagiaire in the International Law and EU Legal Affairs division at the [European Space Agency](http://www.esa.int/ESA)’s Legal Department at ESA Headquarters in Paris, France. As a member of the [Space Generation Advisory Council](http://spacegeneration.org/) (SGAC), Mr. Johnson co-founded the [Space Law and Policy Project Group](http://spacegeneration.org/index.php/projects/space-law) in 2012. Mr. Johnson serves as a Professor of Law (Adjunct) at the Georgetown University Law Center in Washington D.C., where he co-teaches the spring Space Law Seminar. He is also Adjunct Faculty at the International Space University (ISU) in Strasbourg, France, the Legal Advisor for the Moon Village Association (MVA); and a Core Expert and Rule Drafter in the Manual on International Law Applicable to Military Activities in Outer Space (MILAMOS) project.

This Does Not Constitute Possession, or Ownership, or Occupation The use of LEO by satellite constellations is substantially similar to the use of GSO, and therefore permissible. In each region, individual actors are given permission - either from a national administrator or from an international governing body (the ITU) via a national administer–to use precoordinated subsections of space. In a way that is overwhelmingly similar to the use of orbital slots in GSO, the placement of spacecraft into orbits in LEO or higher orbits does not constitute possession, ownership, or occupation of those orbits. This is because States (and their companies) have been occupying orbital slots in GSO for decades, and these uses of GSO have never been accused of “appropriating” GSO. The users have never claimed to be appropriating GSO, and their exercising of rights to use GSO is respected by other actors in the space domain. This is the same situation for other orbits, including LEO and other non-Geostationary orbits. And while GSO locations are relatively stable (subject to space weather and other perturbations, and require stationkeeping), spacecraft in LEO are actually moving through space and are not stationary, so it is even more difficult to see this use by constellations as occupation, much less appropriation.

#### Independently, satellite constellations are not appropiation – they are usage but not appropiation

Johnson 20’Johnson, Christopher D. "The legal status of megaleo constellations and concerns about appropriation of large swaths of earth orbit." *Handbook of small satellites: Technology, design, manufacture, applications, economics and regulation* (2020): 1-22
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Chris Johnson is the Space Law Advisor for Secure World Foundation and has nine years of professional experience in international space law and policy. He has authored and co-authored publications on international space law, national space legislation, international cooperation in space, human-robotic cooperative space exploration, and on the societal benefits of space technology for Africa. Prior to joining SWF, Mr. Johnson worked as an attorney in New York City and entered the space field in 2010 as an intern at the [United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs](http://www.oosa.unvienna.org/) (OOSA) in Vienna, Austria during the 53rd Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. He has also served as an intern in the [Office of International and Interagency Relations](http://oiir.hq.nasa.gov/) (OIIR) at [NASA](http://www.nasa.gov/index.html#.UtmGAtIo5ok) Headquarters in Washington, DC, and as a legal stagiaire in the International Law and EU Legal Affairs division at the [European Space Agency](http://www.esa.int/ESA)’s Legal Department at ESA Headquarters in Paris, France. As a member of the [Space Generation Advisory Council](http://spacegeneration.org/) (SGAC), Mr. Johnson co-founded the [Space Law and Policy Project Group](http://spacegeneration.org/index.php/projects/space-law) in 2012. Mr. Johnson serves as a Professor of Law (Adjunct) at the Georgetown University Law Center in Washington D.C., where he co-teaches the spring Space Law Seminar. He is also Adjunct Faculty at the International Space University (ISU) in Strasbourg, France, the Legal Advisor for the Moon Village Association (MVA); and a Core Expert and Rule Drafter in the Manual on International Law Applicable to Military Activities in Outer Space (MILAMOS) project.

These constellations are merely the exercise and enjoyment of the freedom of exploration and use of outer space and do not constitute any impermissible appropriation of the orbits that they transit. 18 C. D. Johnson Freedom of Access and Use Permits Constellations Rather than being a violation of other’s rights to access and explore outer space, the deployment of these constellations is more correctly viewed as the exercise and enjoyment of the right to access and use outer space. Article I of the Outer Space Treaty establishes a right to access and use space without discrimination. Not allowing an actor to deploy spacecraft, regardless of their number or destination, would be infringing with the exercise of their freedom. It would be discriminatory. Additionally, actors do not need permission from any other State, or group of States, to access and explore outer space. Aligned with the Intentions of the Outer Space Treaty This use of outer space by constellations in LEO, while not explicitly mentioned by the drafters of the Outer Space Treaty or other space law, actually is the fulfillment of their visions for the use of outer space. The preamble to the Outer Space Treaty (which contains the subject matter and purpose of the treaty and can be used for interpreting the operative articles of the treaty) speaks of the aspirations of humanity in exploring and using outer space. It is easy to see constellations that will provide Internet access to the world as fulfilling the visions of the drafters: The States Parties to this Treaty, Inspired by the great prospects opening up before mankind as a result of man’s entry into outer space, Recognizing the common interest of all mankind in the progress of the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes, Believing that the exploration and use of outer space should be carried on for the benefit of all peoples irrespective of the degree of their economic or scientific development, **Desiring to contribute to broad international cooperation in the scientific as well as the legal aspects of the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes, Believing that such cooperation will contribute to the development of mutual understanding and to the strengthening of friendly relations between States and peoples, As such, subsequent article of the Outer Space Treaty should be read in a permissive light, as permitting constellations, rather than a restrictive light which only sees potential negative aspects of constellations. Due Regard and Harmful Contamination Will be Addressed Operators in LEO are well aware of the challenges to space sustainability that their constellations will pose and will be taking efforts to mitigate the creation of debris. OneWeb is keenly focused on space sustainability and has even argued that the current norm, whereby spacecraft are not in space for longer than 25 years and are deorbited from lower orbits at the end of their lifetime (aka post mission disposal), is not sufficient** The Legal Status of MegaLEO Constellations and Concerns About Appropriation... 19 to keep outer space clean and that shorter lifespan limits should be imposed on operators, especially operators in LEO, and operators of small satellites. Additionally, these systems will be able to cooperate with emerging space safety and space traffic management plans and can operate in ways that do not restrict or impinge on other users of the space domain. Because due regard is therefore displayed for the space domain, and to the interests of others, these constellations do not prejudice or infringe upon the freedoms of use and exploration of the space domain and are therefore not occupation, or possession, much less appropriation. This Does Not Constitute Possession, or Ownership, or Occupation The use of LEO by satellite constellations is substantially similar to the use of GSO, and therefore permissible. In each region, individual actors are given permission - either from a national administrator or from an international governing body (the ITU) via a national administer–to use precoordinated subsections of space. In a way that is overwhelmingly similar to the use of orbital slots in GSO, the placement of spacecraft into orbits in LEO or higher orbits does not constitute possession, ownership, or occupation of those orbits. This is because States (and their companies) have been occupying orbital slots in GSO for decades, and these uses of GSO have never been accused of “appropriating” GSO. The users have never claimed to be appropriating GSO, and their exercising of rights to use GSO is respected by other actors in the space domain. This is the same situation for other orbits, including LEO and other non-Geostationary orbits. And while GSO locations are relatively stable (subject to space weather and other perturbations, and require stationkeeping), spacecraft in LEO are actually moving through space and are not stationary, so it is even more difficult to see this use by constellations as occupation, much less appropriation. Moreover, Space Situational Awareness (SSA) and Space Traffic Management (STM) will allow other uses to use these orbits, and nothing about the use of any one user necessarily precludes others. Lastly, there is no intention by operators of constellations to exclusively occupy, must less possess or appropriate, these orbits. Would not the appropriation of outer space be an intentional, volutional act? No such intention can be found in the operators of global constellations. Conclusion The development and deployment of constellations is certainly a unique and impressive technological development which will bring unprecedented advancements to both space activity and concerns here on Earth. It offers more benefits than risks. Rather than being multiple users which would threaten orbital safety, a single user at any altitude makes SSA and STM easier, and the actor merely has to govern their own spacecraft, rather than worry about others spacecraft. No such data sharing issues will exist with global constellations. Consequently, and in conclusion, it is in the wider public interests to permit, and not prevent, actors from planning, developing, deploying, and operating constellations in LEO. This technological advancement, of plentiful, off-the-shelf spacecraft, is the wave of the future for space exploration and utilization. It should not only be 20 C. D. Johnson permitted, it should be positively authorized, fostered, and nurtured. It is a future we want, where all can benefit from space technologies and capabilities.

#### Violation:

#### Standards:

#### 1] Precision- Their model incentivizes arbitrarily doing away with words in the resolution- outer space is a term of the art that requires a specific distinction.

#### 2] Neg Prep- Their model explodes the amount of potential affs because there’s thousands of different types of private satellites—in combination with the million of other things they can spec, neg prep becomes impossible since there’s no universal DA because each action has a different situation- limits k2 reciprocal engagement because it creates neg caselists.

#### Drop the debater – a) they have a 7-6 rebuttal advantage and the 2ar to make args I can’t respond to, b) it deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

#### Use competing interps – a) reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter, b) collapses to competing interps – we justify 2 brightlines under an offense defense paradigm just like 2 interps.

### 2

#### CP: Do the Aff except for private entities registered within The Republic of India.

#### The Republic of India should limit the Indian Space Research Organization’s market share to 7.5%

#### Private appropriation for Indian private entities is key for investor confidence.

**Sen 20** [Nilanjan Sen, who is an experienced lawyer, specialising in International Law and Arbitration, 07-26-2020,Business Insider,https://www.businessinsider.in/science/space/news/the-fault-in-our-stars-indias-bid-at-privatizing-space/articleshow/77182064.cms, 12-7-2021 amrita]

With the creation of the Indian National Committee for Space Research (now ISRO) in 1962, India has been an active patron to mankind’s space efforts. From Aryabhata to Chandrayaan-2, India has launched 113 satellites, including the first privately built and funded satellite ExceedSat-1 which was launched from USA, as a part of Elon Musk’s Space X project Falcon-9. Up **until 2016, India’**s space activities **have been the exclusive domain of the State, however, the launch of the IRNSS-1H** in 2017 was the herald of a new era in India’s Space endeavours. The IRNSS-1H **marked the** beginning of **privatisation in this area** by being the first Indian satellite, to be designed in collaboration with the private parties. In the following year, the ExseedSat-1 was to become the first privately funded and built satellite launched in collaboration with the private Space X project. Interestingly, **up until now**, all **missions have been conducted for** purposes of research, reconnaissance as well as for augmenting communication systems since there wa**s a substantial State monopoly**. With the recent announcement ofthe creation of the Indian National Space Promotion and Authorization Centre or IN-SPACeby the Government of India as part of its atma nirbhar Bharat scheme, which aims at providing a “level playing field” and a supportive regulatory regime to allow Indian private enterprises to grow and carve their own niche in the so-called “fast-growing global space sector”**, India has** in fact **shown an inclination to capitalise** on the US strategy of opening up the avidly touted space “sector” to private participation. While the initiative **sounds exhilarating** and will definitely go a long way in defining India’s image as an emerging global technology powerhouse**, it is** extremely **difficult to fathom why private players, would** be willing to readily come forward and **invest billions,** by confining their activities for research purposes alone, **without any expectation of commercial gains** or simply, return on their investment. This is so because, matters concerning space and space exploration are subject of a special branch of customary international law, that are mainly centred around five treaties and eleven agreements. The most significant of these is the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies or the Outer Space Treaty (OST) which India ratified in 1967, and which specifically lays down under Article I that outer space and space exploration including that on the moon and other celestial bodies, are to be carried out solely for, and in the interest of all countries, and that they are the province of all mankind. **Article II restricts** claims of sovereignty and national **appropriation** by any means whatsoever, Article VI **places international responsibility on all activities carried on by** governmental or by **non-governmental entities**, as well as mandates authorization and continuing supervision by the appropriate State Party. While there is considerable debate surrounding the applicability of the OST especially Article VI to private parties, since the US Supreme Court ‘s ruling in Medellin v Texas (2008) which held that Article VI is not self-executing in nature, regard must be had to the fact that these are domestic Court rulings and the fact that Space law is part of Customary International law which is affirmed by decades of State practise, cannot be denied, and neither can the fact that it is settled principle of international law that a State cannot, under the excuse of changes in domestic law, including subsequent Court rulings, renege from treaty obligations once ratified. In effect, the OST places strict checks upon the objectives behind exploring this uncharted territory by State and Non-State actors, far less allowing the possibility of even claiming rights of any kind. Moreover, it is no secret that **private corporations operate predominantly with** the object of individual gains **and** unless driven by the zeal to serve mankind and share profits with all countries, **chances are** that the **investments** made by private parties **will have little** to nil **returns,** far less any substantive protection**.**

#### Investor confidence is necessary for strong Indian private space-tech—that spills over, boosts Indian military heg, and turns case.

**Prasad 16** [Narayan Prasad has a Master of Space & Telecommunications Law, May 2016, National Academy of Legal Studies and Research University of Law Hyderabad, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305402089\_A\_POLICY\_REVIEW\_TOWARDS\_THE\_DEVELOPMENT\_OF\_A\_SPACE\_INDUSTRY\_ECOSYSTEM\_IN\_INDIA/link/578dbd2908ae5c86c9a65d05/download, 12-8-2021 amrita]

As India ramps up its space defence capabilities, **lack of a mature space industrial base will** potentially **hurt** its ambitions**.** **India** counts among the top nations in the world in terms of government space investment 4 , but **is far behind** when it comes to **creating successful private industry** that is globally reputed. India’s space budget has increased in size (Figure 2) and is one of the largest space budgets in the world; however, the lack of an active space industry at turnkey level might have an immense opportunity cost for India in manufacturing satellites and launch vehicles to service the global market.5 This in effect is also due to absence of a single Indian company among the top space companies in the world (which in itself is an alarming statistic) that needs to be addressed urgently through policy push under the several grand schemes announced by the current government, such as ‘Make in India’ and ‘Digital India’. Most of **the apprehensions** for private investment in space industry **come from** the **requirements** of high capital investment, **and** the long gestation periods of space projects to get substantial Return on Investment (RoI) for the investors. These trends have been put aside by a new breed of space companies calling themselves ‘NewSpace’, which thrive on new business models of low cost access to space by capitalising on the advancements made in recent years in small satellite technology, consumer electronics, and computing power. Tiny modular satellites called ‘CubeSats’, weighing 1-4 kgs and costing under $100,000 have revolutionised the way space products and services are delivered to end users. The movement began in Europe and US simultaneously as a by-product of university and space agency collaborated research, but it was the US which took the lead in successfully commercialising these technologies developed in laboratories. Figure 3 shows the forecast of nano satellites weighing between 1-50 kg, which are scheduled to be launched during 2014-16 globally.6The high number arises from the fact that such nano satellites have short development timelines, and provide the necessary agility for satellite operators to develop large constellations that can cater to a larger customer base with high service quality. These NewSpace companies have ushered in widespread changes in the traditional satellite manufacturing and launch services industry, with companies like RocketLabs and Firefly Systems building new launchers cheaply using innovative techniques like additive manufacturing, to reduce the cost to orbit for these satellites. The impact of these companies has been felt within the space industry, as practices from these ‘NewSpace’companies have been adopted to keep the costs low and have a factory type approach in building systems in order to cater to the increasing demand. The NewSpace revolution has now led to companies such as Google, Virgin, and Qualcomm investing in small satellite-based communication technologies. India, however, has remained shielded from the rapid changes that have happened in the global space industry over the past decade. **ISRO** has been **slow to respond on** both **commercial** and academic **fronts,** with only a handful of university-level small satellite missions being launched during the same period, none of which could transform into a full-fledged commercial opportunity for the people involved in these projects. Lack of clarity on space policy in India is to blame, and partly the lack of willingness of DoS to take up additional responsibility of creating an ecosystem that disrupts their own traditional one, without any visible incentives. In the following sections, the need and motivation to develop a strong private industry ecosystem is detailed with necessary arguments. 1.2 Motivations to Develop a Private Industry Ecosystem in India Presently, **India has inherent advantages** over other countries **due** the availability of **skilled workforce**, a stable and business friendly **government,** positive investor climate and low cost of operations**.** Because India was an early mover in space technology, it is **poised to become a major space power albeit** slight policy push towards **greater commercialisation** of the industry. Table 1 shows the PESTLE analysis of India, in lieu of the motivation to develop a strong private space industry. The PESTLE analysis shows high suitability for services-based business models to operate out of India. The government’s encouragement for private space industry within the country to develop capacity and capability in pursuing space activities should thereby be directed to both the spectrums across the industry value chain. A focused space policy mandate can have multiple direct and fringe benefits to the government, especially in the defence sector which has been the current government’s area of interest through its ‘Make in India’ initiative. Some of the direct and indirect benefits of space technology include: Civilian and Commercial **Space industry has the potential to emerge as the third** technological **success** front following the successes of the Information Technology (IT) and Biotechnology in the country. Space **has an important role in** the overall **economic development** of the country **and** in the success of the government initiatives such as Digital India and Make in India. The development of the private space industry shall **aid in rural connectivity, e-governance and** setting up of **manufacturing facilities** base for products of high technology in India, creating headways in the overall emergence of the country at the world stage. The success of the space industry will enhance capacities within the country and complement the government-driven programme, which has been historically proven in advanced space faring countries such as the US. Capacity building in the private industry at a turnkey level for both upstream and downstream shall assist theeconomic development of the country by keeping up to the pace of requirement of the marketplace (e.g. Direct-to-Home TV, Broadband Internet), while reducing the inherent dependence on foreign assets. For example, as per a recent Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG) report, only one among the seven DTH providers is leasing transponder from the INSAT system**. The** primary **reason for this disparity is** the **slow pace** at which **ISRO has added** satellite transponders **to the commercial market.** The net effect is that the DTH providers are incurring higher transponder costs on foreign satellites when INSAT could have been an equally reliable, and more cost efficient, alternative. Space has its bearings over the imagination of youth and a strong emerging local industry can revolutionise the mindset of the national talent pool and can potentially aid in reversal of brain drain from the country. Public outreach, awareness, and STEM education are some of the intangible impact that investment in space technology produces. The capacity built up within the industry shall foster Business-to-Business (B2B) collaborations within the country and with enterprises across the globe and create also a strong focus on Business-to-Customer (B2C) applications which moves from the traditional Government-to-Government (G2G) flow of development of capacity and application of technology. The B2B, B2C ecosystem in the space industry has immense potential of tapping the much successful IT infrastructure of the country and extending the IT knowledge base to core software based applications of spacebased information such as Geographical Information Systems (GIS).It shall create an environment of technological innovation which when supported and encouraged can sustain to create a secondary source of development of high-tech hardware, software and applications for the government. An ecosystem of technological innovation in space technology has the potential of creating the next generation Small and Medium Scale Enterprises (SMEs) in India which shall 17 leverage the frugal nature of engineering and can create products and services independently for local and global requirements. Military **In the development of space technology with several dual use capabilities, there exists a case for the building up a sustained indigenous industry ecosystem that shall support the safety and security apparatus of the country**. These range **from development of capabilities in upstream** such as satellite, launch vehicle development **to** creating specific downstream applicationssuch as Automatic Identification of Ships (AIS), Electronic Intelligence (ELINIT), Communication Intelligence (COMMINT) and other Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Information, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C4I2SR) applications. Space Situational Awareness (SSA) is **the ability to view, understand and predict the physical location of natural and man-made objects orbiting the Earth. SSA is a prominent concern for both military and commercial systems, mainly because of the increasing military reliance on space assets**. The debris created by the anti-satellite testing by China in 2007 and the Kosmos-Iridium collision in 2009 has raised additional concerns about the safety of space assets. India currently relies on NASA’s data, and will operationalise its own system of Multi Object Tracking Radar (MOTR) by 2017.7 Meanwhile in the US, commercial operators have established the Space Data Association (SDA) for providing satellite operators reliable and efficient data for increased safety of satellite operations; this is in addition to the Department of Defense’s (DoD) own surveillance network. **The changing space security environment and the rising international concerns over the rapid growth of military assets in space makes space security one of the most important issues to address.** The need to have a space security policy is being 7 increasingly debated in India **and** the IDSA Task force in 2009 produced a report which attempted to conceptualise such a policy. However, there is reluctance to talk about use of space for national security needs including its military applications. Though efforts are being made to synchronize the activities of ISRO which is responsible for India’s civilian space programme and the Defence Research and Development Organisation (DRDO) which works on the use of space for national security needs, **the lack of a strong private industry that can meet heightened needs for such sophisticated missions hampers the progress in this direction,** apart from the bureaucratic delay that is normally associated when two high security government agencies interact. Capacity building within the space industry shall not only drive commercial applications, but shall aid the government in situations of emergencies (e.g. natural disasters, intelligence gathering for fighting against terrorism) and can eventually develop into a foundation that could potentially contribute as a part of a strong foreign policy drive. Studying the impact of space technology on civilian life is a complicated task, especially when it comes to quantifying the tangible and intangible impact. **The spill-over of space technology is in sectors as varied as defence, agriculture and education.** There exist many ways to show the impact of investment in space technology; some of them illustrated above. **Thus, the technological and knowledge backbone for space technology creates opportunities in the marketplace to create and explore commercial applications on a global scale, which** traditionally might not be the fundamental focus a governmental space agency, as well as **create multiple intangible impacts** across various sectors such as defence, education, agriculture, energy, transportation and environment**.** India has made substantial investment in its government space programme over the years, but it is **a sustained policy push towards investments in the private space industry ecosystem that will create commercial space applications**, complementing the societal benefits motivation currently being pursued by the government.

#### Indian space military heg checks and limits Chinese heg in the Indo-Pacific.

**Bommakanti 7-15-20**[Kartik Bommakanti is a Fellow with the Strategic Studies Programme. Kartik specialises in space military issues and his research is primarily centred on the Indo-Pacific region. He also works on emerging technologies as well as nuclear, conventional and sub-conventional coercion, particularly in the context of the Indian subcontinent and the role of great powers in the subcontinent’s strategic dynamics. He has published in peer reviewed journals., The enduring significance of space weapons for India, 7-15-2020,ORF,https://www.orfonline.org/expert-speak/the-enduring-significance-of-space-weapons-for-india/, 12-8-2021 amrita]

Regardless of the Americans protestations about the Russian test**, there are important underlying implications for India particularly in the context of Chinas’ growing space and counterspace capabilities as well as the repercussions that are likely to ensue if New Delhi were to pursue a weak response to Chinese space military power.** India will need a whole set of additional KEW tests. This author made the case for sea-launched and air launched KEWs in an extensive analysis. However, it was focused mostly on earth to space KEW systems and Directed Energy Weapons (DEWs). Confining India to the acquisition of KEWS and Directed Energy Weapons (DEWs) or cyber and electronic weapons can be expanded to include co-orbital KEWs. The Russian test also illustrates why co-orbital KEWs are also critical. Investment in additional KEW capabilities assumes considerable importance especially for India because of the long-term defence related challenges presented by the People’s Republic of China (PRC). **The ongoing boundary crisis should only lend greater urgency to India’s space weapons programme, simply because space assets in India’s inventory are vital to the prosecution of a potential military campaign whether on land, sea or air against the People’s Republic China (PRC).** The PRC is known to have developed the accoutrements necessary to conduct co-orbital test. For instance, in 2008 the Chinese BX-1 microsatellite while orbiting in close proximity to its mother satellite, executed a maneuver within 45 kilometers of the International Space Station (ISS). While BX-1 did not definitively establish a PRC co-orbital ASAT capability, it did indicate the PRC’s latent capability to conduct co-orbital kinetic tests and mount attacks against a potential adversary’ space assets. India must avoid what one leading Indian space analyst prior to India’s March 2019 KEW test observed: “To date, India’s interests in space have been restricted to using space assets for reconnaissance, navigation and communication. However, China’s ASAT test could influence India’s policies in the field of counter-space capabilities. To address the concerns raised at the regional and global level about this Chinese bravado, the best option for India could be to follow the disarmament and arms control route.” The statement is a non-sequitur, **while India has conducted only but one direct ascent KEW test, it has not matched China** in developing and executing non-destructive earth to space KEW tests, let alone fully match Chinese KEW, DEW, electronic and cyber weapon capabilities to target space assets. **Pursuing the arms control and disarmament route by India will be premature** in response to the PRC’s extensive development of space **and** counterspace capabilities**.** Reinforcing this point is that the PRC’s current and evolving space weapons programme deserve a sustained response. Bringing closure to the development of space and counterspace capabilities **would imply surrender that is completely unwarranted in light of Beijing’s recent and ongoing aggressiveness,** which India is evidently bearing the brunt. Very likely Beijing will be emboldened even more in deducing that India’s skittish response to its space weapons programme should be treated as weakness **and India subjected to further aggression, not just terrestrially, but equally in space.** The External Affairs Minister S. Jaishankar stated there is an imperative for India and China to achieve some “equilibrium”, although he never fully elaborated what exactly it would look like. However, if equilibrium or more precisely a stable balance of power is to be achieved in the Indo-Pacific, military power is crucial. **Space military power has grown in importance** from reconnaissance, navigation and communications to space weapons **and will be crucial to generating an equilibrium.** Ignoring the eventual deployment of weapons in space would be foolhardy for a state such as India when pitted against the PRC**. Consequently, space military power is a key constituent element in India’s capacity to contribute to the Asian balance of power**. Thus, **investing in a direct ascent and co-orbital KEWs as well as DEWS and cyber and electronic weapons geared for destroying or disabling spacecraft is crucial**. If India were to deprive itself of offensive space weapons to take Chinese or other enemy spacecraft, New Delhi would be putting itself at a considerable disadvantage by leaving it at the mercy of a wide variety of Chinese counterspace capabilities and measures against its Imagery Intelligence (IMINT), Communications (COMMINT), Electronic Intelligence (ELINT) and Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) satellites. Indeed, it is perplexing to see arguments that call for India to restrain itself, strive for disarmament and arms control when China makes no significant effort to do so beyond rhetorical commitments. The Russian co-orbital test has underlined the importance of space borne weapons despite entreaties for the non-weaponisation of space. The Modi government must see the emerging space military competition as an opportunity to bolster India’s counterspace capabilities. **It will help cement India as a major space military power and prevent Chinese hegemony over the Indo-Pacific.** Chinese hegemony on the other hand will become a certainty, if New Delhi lapses into self-doubt and remains unduly restrained in the testing, integration and deployment of space weapons.

#### China heg is revisionist and offensive-- in the Indo-Pacific that causes draw-in.

**Brands 19** [Hal Brands is the Henry A. Kissinger Distinguished Professor of Global Affairs at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, a senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments. Zack Cooper is a research fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, an associate at Armitage International, and an adjunct assistant professor at Georgetown University, "After the Responsible Stakeholder, What? Debating America’s China Strategy." Texas National Security Review. Volume 2, Issue 2. February 2019k <https://tnsr.org/2019/02/after-the-responsible-stakeholder-what-debating-americas-china-strategy-2/> 12-10-2021 amrita]

The responsible-stakeholder paradigm offered a coherent “theory of victory”: It identified a desired outcome and employed all elements of American power to bring about that outcome. Over time, the strategy produced greater Sino-American cooperation on a range of issues, from counter-piracy to climate change. **It is increasingly clear, however, that the responsible-stakeholder strategy failed. Two of its core assumptions now appear misplaced: the idea that China’s intentions would become more benign over time, and the belief that Washington had the power to keep Chinese ambitions in check until that shift occurred.** What happened instead was that, as China rose, the Chinese Communist Party became more willing to use its newfound power in coercive and disruptive ways.3 Confounding Western hopes that China would liberalize, **the Chinese Communist Party embraced more repressive policies**, especially after Xi Jinping became general secretary in 2012. **Meanwhile, Beijing sought to control the Indo-Pacific region by** coercing its neighbors, undermining U.S. alliances, practicing mercantilist policies, steadily **increasing its presence** and influence in the South China Sea**, and modernizing its military. In the Indo-Pacific and beyond, moreover, China has engaged in a range of behaviors that challenge American interests: supporting authoritarian regimes, engaging in widespread corruption, pursuing predatory trade practices and major geo-economic projects meant to project Chinese influence further afield,** seeking to stifle international criticism of its human rights abuses, practicing massive intellectual property theft, and striving for technological dominance in critical emerging fields such as artificial intelligence.Recently, China’s confidence has been on display, with Xi stating in 2018 that “no one is in a position to dictate to the Chinese people,” after declaring in 2017 that China is ready to “take center stage in the world.”4 Rather than becoming a responsible stakeholder in a U.S.-led system, **China appears increasingly determined to compete with Washington for primacy in the Indo-Pacific and beyond.** These more assertive policies have been made possible by China’s surprisingly rapid growth**.** Between 1990 and 2016, China’s constant-dollar gross domestic product increased roughly twelve-fold and its military spending grew tenfold.5 The People’s Liberation Army rapidly developed the tools — anti-ship missiles, quiet submarines, advanced fighter aircraft, and integrated air defenses — needed to contest American supremacy in the Western Pacific and give China greater ability to shape events in its region and beyond. Surging national wealth also led to an explosion of Chinese trade, lending, and investment abroad, which enabled far more ambitious geo-economic statecraft**.** All told, **this expansion of Chinese national power is unprecedented in modern history.** It has dramatically narrowed the gap between China and the United States and made it far more difficult for Washington to shape Beijing’s behavior. No strategy can survive the invalidation of its central premises: By the end of the Obama presidency, the responsible-stakeholder concept was living on borrowed time. The Trump administration drove the final stake through the concept in its 2017 National Security Strategy. The document slammed Beijing for attempting to “shape a world antithetical to U.S. values and interests” and declared the failure of China’s “integration into the post-war international order.”6 In particular, **China’s behavior increasingly threatens three enduring U.S. interests. First, the United States seeks to maintain a favorable balance of power in the Indo-Pacific region** and to deter a military conflict — over Taiwan, Korea, or maritime Asia — that could undermine the regional order and cost American or allied lives. Second, **U.S. leaders have an interest in ensuring an open international economy conducive to American prosperity and competitiveness.** Third, **the United States seeks to preserve an international environment in which democracy, human rights, and the rule of law can** flourish, and it seeks to **strengthen** — where possible — the prevalence of those practices abroad. As Chinese power has grown and Chinese behavior has become more assertive, U.S. policymakers have come to see all three of these interests as being imperiled.

#### That goes nuclear-- extinction :/

**Hayes 18** [Peter John Hayes is the Executive Director of the Nautilus Institute for Security and Sustainability, a non-governmental policy-oriented research and advocacy group. He graduated from the University of Melbourne with a degree in History, and from University of California, Berkeley with a Ph.D. in energy and resources. #gobears, Trump and the Interregnum of American Nuclear Hegemony, November 8, 2018. [https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/25751654.2018.1532525 recut 12-10-2021](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/25751654.2018.1532525%20recut%2012-10-2021) amrita]

During a post-hegemonic era, long-standing **nuclear alliances are** likely to be **replaced by** ad hoc nuclear **coalitions**, aligning and realigning around different congeries of threat and even actual nuclear wars, **with** much **higher levels of** uncertainty and **unpredictability** than was the case in the nuclear hegemonic system. There are a number of ways that this dynamic could play out during the interregnum, and these dynamics are likely to be inconsistent and contradictory. In some instances, the sheer momentum of past policy combined with bureaucratic inertia and the potency of political, military service and corporate interests, may ensure that residual aspects of the formerly hegemonic postures are adhered to even as formal nuclear alliances rupture. Even as they reach for the old anchors, these **states may be forced to adjust** and retrench **strategically, or start** to take their own nuclear risks by **making** increasingly explicit **nuclear threats** and deployments **against nuclear-armed adversaries** – as Japan has begun to do with reference to its “technological deterrent” since about 2012.9 This period could last for many years until and **when** nuclear **war breaks out** and leads to a post-nuclear war disorder; or **a** new, post-hegemonic strategic **framework is established** to manage and/or abolish nuclear threat. Under full-blown American nuclear hegemony, fewer states had nuclear weapons, the major nuclear weapons states entered into legally binding restraints on force levels and they learned from nuclear near-misses to promulgate rules of the road and tacit understandings. The lines drawn during full-blown collisions involving nuclear weapons were stark and concentrated the minds of leaders greatly. In a nuclear duel, it was clear that only one of two sides could fire first; the only question was which one. **Now, with nine** nuclear weapons **states, and conflicts** conceivably **involving** three, four or **more of them**, no matter how much leaders concentrate, **it will not be evident** who is aiming at who, **who may fire** first, and during a volley, who fired first and even who hit whom. In a highly proliferated world, **nuclear-armed states** may **feel driven to obtain larger** nuclear **forces** able **to deter multiple adversaries** at the same time, sufficient to conduct not only a few nuclear attacks but **configured to fight more than one** protracted **nuclear war at a time, especially in** nuclear **states torn apart by civil war** and post-nuclear attack reconstruction. The first time nuclear weapons are used since 1945 will be shocking, the second time, less so, the third time, the new normal.

# Case

## Space Debris

1) Their May 18 card only talks about satellite collisions now. There’s no link into future satellites because they already will collide now.

#### 2] Either the asteroids are small and not existential OR we’d have forever to prepare.

Martin Rees 18. Astronomer Royal, founded the Centre for the Study of Existential Risk, Fellow of Trinity College and Emeritus Professor of Cosmology and Astrophysics at the University of Cambridge. 10/16/2018. On the Future: Prospects for Humanity. Princeton University Press.

You may guess that, being an astronomer, anxiety about asteroid collisions keeps me awake at night. Not so. Indeed, this is one of the few threats that we can quantify— and be confident is unlikely. Every ten million years or so, a body a few kilometres across will hit the Earth, causing global catastrophe— so there are a few chances in a million that such an impact occurs within a human lifetime. There are larger numbers of smaller asteroids that could cause regional or local devastation. The 1908 Tunguska event, which flattened hundreds of square kilometres of (fortunately unpopulated) forests in Siberia, released energy equivalent to several hundred Hiroshima bombs. Can we be forewarned of these crash landings? The answer is yes. Plans are afoot to create a data set of the one million potential Earth- crossing asteroids larger than 50 metres and track their orbits precisely enough to identify those that might come dangerously close. With the forewarning of an impact, the most vulnerable areas could be evacuated. Even better news is that we could feasibly develop spacecraft that could protect us. A ‘nudge’, imparted in space several years before the threatened impact, would only need to change an asteroid’s velocity by a few centimetres per second to deflect it from a collision course with the Earth.

#### 3] Squo tracking, shielding, and removal plans solve

Dr. Brian Koberlein 16, Professor of Physics at the Rochester Institute of Technology and PhD in Astrophysics from the University of Connecticut, “Cascade Effect”, 5-4, https://archive.briankoberlein.com/2016/05/04/cascade-effect/index.html

In the movie Gravity the driving force of the plot is a catastrophic cascade of space debris. An exploding satellite sends high speed debris into the path of other satellites, and the resulting collisions create more space debris until everything from a space shuttle to the International Space Station faces an eminent threat of destruction. Not unexpectedly, the movie portrayal of such a situation is not particularly accurate, but the risk of a debris cascade is very real.

It’s known as the Kessler syndrome, after Donald Kessler, who first imagined the scenario in the 1970s. The problem comes down to the fact that small objects in Earth orbit can stay in orbit for a very long time. If an astronaut drops a bolt, it can stay in orbit for decades or centuries. Because the relative speed of two objects in orbit can be quite large, it doesn’t take a big object to pose a real threat to your spacecraft. On the highway a small pebble can chip your car windshield. In space it can be done by a chip of paint traveling at thousands of kilometers per hour. In the history of the space shuttle missions, there were more than 1,600 debris strikes. Because of such strikes, more than 90 space shuttle windows had to be replaced over the lifetime of shuttle missions.

While that might sound alarming, it’s actually quite manageable. Upgrades and maintenance were quite common on the shuttle missions, and we tend to err on the side of caution when it comes to replacing parts. Modern spacecraft also have ways to mitigate the risk of small impacts, such as Whipple shields made of thin layers of material spaced apart so that objects disintegrate when hitting the shield rather than the spacecraft itself. We also have a tracking system that currently tracks more than 300,000 objects bigger than 1 cm, so we can make sure that most spacecraft avoid these objects.

But the risk of big collisions isn’t negligible. In 2009 the Iridium 33 and Kosmos-2251 satellites collided at high speed, destroying both spacecraft and creating more dangerous debris. It wouldn’t take many collisions like this for the debris numbers to rise dramatically, and more debris means a greater risk of collisions. In Gravity the cascade happens very quickly, triggered by a single event. The reality is not quite so grave. Instead of happening overnight, Kessler syndrome would occur gradually, raising collision risks to the point where certain orbits become logistically impractical. It could occur so gradually that we might not notice it early on, and there are some that argue it’s already underway.

The good news is that we’re aware of the threat. And, as the old saying goes, knowing is half the battle. Already we take steps to limit the amount of debris created. New spacecraft include end of life plans to remove them from orbit, either by sending them into Earths atmosphere to burn up, or sending them to a “graveyard orbit” that poses little risk to other spacecraft. There are also plans on the drawing board to clear orbits of debris, particularly in low-Earth orbit where the risk is greatest. The cascade effect is a real risk, but it’s also one we can likely manage with a bit of ingenuity.

#### 4] Newest research from NASA proves any threat is at least a thousand years away

Mack 19 (Eric, “NASA says city-smashing asteroids aren't so common,” 6-27, <https://www.cnet.com/news/nasa-says-city-smashing-asteroids-arent-so-common/>)

Asteroids are all around us, but we shouldn't be losing sleep over the big buggers. A small space rock was spotted just before slamming into the atmosphere last weekend, and over 20,000 near-earth asteroids have been cataloged, but new research from NASA finds impacts that could do serious damage aren't very frequent. Perhaps the last time an asteroid large enough to inflict serious hurt on a limited part of the Earth's surface (we're not talking about an extinction-level space rock like the one that ended the dinosaurs) came knocking was in 1908. In June of that year, the so-called Tunguska Event impacted an unpopulated part of Siberia and was witnessed by only a handful of people, but it flattened 500,000 acres of forest, scorched the Earth and knocked people out of their chairs 40 miles away (64 km). It's easy and terrifying to imagine what the result might have been had chance dictated the impact occurred over a major metropolitan area instead. "Tunguska is the largest cosmic impact witnessed by modern humans," David Morrison, a planetary science researcher at NASA's Ames Research Center in Silicon Valley, said in a release. "It also is characteristic of the sort of impact we are likely to have to protect against in the future." But when researchers revisited the Tunguska Event with the help of computer models and tooked into account the latest data on the population of asteroids in our neighborhood, they found that such major impacts are exceedingly rare. The results, published in the journal Icarus, find that such a powerful impact should only be expected roughly every thousand years or longer rather than once every century or so, as was previously thought. While this is certainly good news for all earthly life forms, the threat of an asteroid impact is still very real and worth preparing for, as the 2013 bolide explosion over Russia reminded us. "A lot of uncertainty remains about how large asteroids break up in the atmosphere and how much damage they could cause on the ground," said NASA researcher and co-author Lorien Wheeler. "However, recent advancements in computational models, along with analyses of the Chelyabinsk and other meteor events, are helping to improve our understanding of these factors so that we can better evaluate potential asteroid threats in the future."

#### 5] No impact to asteroids – the solar system is safer than its ever been and there are no civilization ending asteroids that pose a risk for 2400 years – don’t vote aff on a vague assertion that an asteroid \*could\* hit earth

Siegel 16 (Ethan. 12/21. Ph.D. astrophysicist, author, and science communicator, who professes physics and astronomy at various colleges. “No, Earth is not overdue for a massive asteroid strike” <https://medium.com/starts-with-a-bang/no-earth-is-not-overdue-for-a-massive-asteroid-strike-59ce8edc0cf8>) 9/1/19 RK [added percent converted to fraction]

It’s only a matter of time before a massive asteroid strike occurs on our world. There’s no doubt about it, as the Solar System and beyond is filled with massive rocks that travel, under the influence of gravity, through the interplanetary and interstellar medium. Every year carries with it a rough probability of such an impact for bodies of all sizes, from the pebbles that will never make it to the ground (a virtual certainty) to a 5–10 kilometer behemoth like the one that wiped out the dinosaurs (less than 0.000001%[1/100,000,000] odds). But there’s a myth going around — propagated by scientists\* at reputable agencies like Los Alamos National Laboratory, the American Geophysical Union and NASA’s Planetary Defense Coordination Office — that we’re overdue for one, and so one is likelier-than-normal in our future. The scientific truth indicates otherwise. A map of the known asteroids in the Solar System. Image credit: The United Kingdom Spaceguard Centre. The asteroid population in our Solar System is the number one source of potentially hazardous impacts for our world. Almost all of the Earth-orbit-crossing objects we know of originate from the asteroid belt; of the impacts we find on our world and the other terrestrial planets (Mercury, Venus, Mars and even the Moon), the vast majority indicate an ultimate origin from our asteroid belt as well. A map of the Solar System’s asteroid population by size. Image credit: Marco Colombo, DensityDesign Research Lab, under a c.c.a.-s.a.-4.0 license. Based on what we’ve found in our Solar System, there are approximately a few million potential “10”s on the Torino scale, over 50 million potential “9”s and nearly a billion estimated potential “8”s. With lower likelihoods, Earth is also at risk from impacts due to centaurs, Kuiper belt objects, the Oort cloud and passing objects from the interstellar medium. But when rare events occur, they seem to inspire the worst fears in us. A meteorite trail is seen above a residential apartment block in the Urals city of Chelyabinsk, following the meteor strike on February 15, 2013. Image credit: Oleg Kargopolov/AFP/Getty Images. 2013 was a banner year for collision terror. The year started off with the Chelyabinsk meteor, which caused millions of dollars of property damage and injured more than a thousand people. Then, a fast-moving Oort cloud comet — Comet C/2013 A1 (Siding Spring) — was discovered on a near-collision course with Mars. It was approximately half a kilometer across and wound up missing Mars by only 140,000 kilometers, or roughly 11 Earth diameters. If that object had struck Earth, it would have been a Torino-scale “9” disaster. A composite image of Comet Siding Spring/C2013 A1 near Mars at closest approach, as taken with the Hubble Space Telescope. Image credit: NASA, ESA, PSI, JHU/APL, STScI/AURA. But a near-miss is still a miss. In fact, the largest impact in all of human history — both recorded and archaeologically discovered after-the-fact — is Barringer (meteor) crater in Arizona, which itself only rated an “8” on the Torino scale: the same rating as the 1908 Tunguska event. These events occur every few hundred years at most, and we can often go thousands or perhaps even ten thousand years between them. The Chelyabinsk event’s damage came mostly from broken glass; no meteors of the past century have had enough energy to rate above a “0” on the Torino scale. Meteor (Barringer) crater, in the Arizona desert, is over 1.1 km (0.7 mi) in diameter, and represents only a 3–10 MegaTon release of energy. A 300–400 meter asteroid strike would release 10–100 times the energy. Image credit: USGS/D. Roddy. Moreover, the Solar System itself is more cleared of potential impactors than at any time in history. They still occur, of course, but with lower frequency than ever before. Getting hit by a giant, fast-moving massive space rock is still a real threat, but there are only two common classes of impact. The most common type of impacts — from asteroids — are the most easily trackable. If we do a dedicated ongoing sky survey of the asteroid belt and all near-Earth asteroids, we could give ourselves decades or even centuries of lead time when it comes to these potentially hazardous objects. Asteroids in the early Solar System were more numerous, and cratering was catastrophic. The rate has plummeted over the past 4.5 billion years. Image credit: NASA / GSFC, BENNU’S JOURNEY — Heavy Bombardment. The less common type — from long-period objects — are likely to give us less than two years of lead time, and potentially only months. If a fast-moving, massive body from beyond Jupiter, Neptune or even farther out plummets in towards the Sun, and happens to be on a collision course with Earth, our best option is to get to it as fast as possible with a nuclear impactor to try and divert it or break it up as much as possible. It’s the worst-case scenario, but thankfully, it’s a very unlikely one. While asteroids (grey) and Kuiper Belt objects beyond Neptune (blue and orange) are generally considered Earth’s greatest threats, the centaurs (green) number over 44,000. Image credit: WilyD at English Wikipedia. Trans-Neptunian objects are most likely to head towards Earth after a recent encounter with a nearby, passing star. But we haven’t had one in many hundreds of thousands of years, and there isn’t one slated for perhaps millions more. The odds of a city-killer asteroid striking Earth are below 0.1% every year, and most of the ones that will hit us will land in the ocean (70%) or over a relatively unpopulated area (25%). Only around 5% of the Earth’s surface has a sizable human population density inhabiting it, and the fallout from those events are minor even a small distance away from the direct impact. The extinction-level events are so low-risk that the most dangerous object known to humanity doesn’t pose any danger at all for more than the next 2400 years. The orbital path of Comet Swift-Tuttle, which passes perilously close to crossing Earth’s actual path around the Sun. Image credit: Howard of Teaching Stars, via http://www.teachingstars.com/2012/08/08/the-2012-perseid-meteor-shower/orbital-path-of-swift-tuttle-outer-solar-system\_crop-2/. The odds of a massive asteroid strike are lower than they’ve ever been at any point in Earth’s history. Small asteroids will still hit us and we should still invest in the study and exploration of our Solar System and beyond, but we shouldn’t be afraid. The “quietness” of the past few millennia doesn’t mean we’re overdue for a city-killer asteroid; if anything, it means we’re living in a period of relatively low risk. Don’t let the catastrophic consequences in the game of “what if” blind you to the realities that of all the natural and human-caused disasters facing Earth, asteroids aren’t the one that should be topping our priority lists.

## Ozone

#### Rocket launches are increasing now and are close to matching other major sources of carbon emissions

**Gammon 21**[Katharine Gammon, 7-19-2021, "How the billionaire space race could be one giant leap for pollution," Katharine Gammon has served in the Peace Corps in Bulgaria, and attended MIT and Princeton University and won the 2020 Society for Environmental Journalists fellowship, 2017 Columbia University Reporting Fellowship on Early Childhood Development, 2014 National Health Journalism Fellowship, 2013 MIT Knight Science Bootcamp, the 2012 Woods Hole Ocean Science Journalism Fellowship, a 2013 National Press Foundation Fellowship, a 2011 Fellowship from the National Institute on Drug Abuse, and others.<https://www.theguardian.com/science/2021/jul/19/billionaires-space-tourism-environment-emissions>]//DebateDrills ww

When rockets launch into space, they require a huge amount of propellants to make it out of the Earth’s atmosphere. For SpaceX’s Falcon 9 rocket, it is kerosene, and for Nasa it is liquid hydrogen in their new Space Launch System. Those fuels emit a variety of substances into the atmosphere, including carbon dioxide, water, chlorine and other chemicals. The carbon emissions from rockets are small compared with the aircraft industry, she says. But **they are increasing at nearly 5.6% a year**, and Marais has been running a simulation for a decade, to figure out at what point will they compete with traditional sources we are familiar with. The rocket motor on Richard Branson’s Unity 22 burns as it heads toward space. The rocket motor on Richard Branson’s Unity 22 burns as it heads toward space. “For one long-haul plane flight it’s one to three tons of carbon dioxide [per passenger],” says Marais. **For one rocket launch 200-300 tonnes of carbon dioxide are split between 4 or so passengers**, according to Marais. “So **it doesn’t need to grow that much more to compete with other sources**.” Advertisement Right now, the number of rocket flights is very small: in the whole of 2020, for instance, there were 114 attempted orbital launches in the world, according to Nasa. That compares with the airline industry’s more than 100,000 flights each day on average. But emissions from rockets are emitted right into the upper atmosphere, which means they stay there for a long time: two to three years. Even water injected into the upper atmosphere – where it can form clouds – can have warming impacts, says Marais. “Even something as seemingly innocuous as water can have an impact.” Closer to the ground, all fuels emit huge amounts of heat, which can add ozone to the troposphere, where it acts like a greenhouse gas and retains heat. In addition to carbon dioxide, fuels like kerosene and methane also produce soot. And in the upper atmosphere, the ozone layer can be destroyed by the combination of elements from burning fuels. “While there are a number of environmental impacts resulting from the launch of space vehicles, the depletion of stratospheric ozone is the most studied and most immediately concerning,” wrote Jessica Dallas, a senior policy adviser at the New Zealand Space Agency, in an analysis of research on space launch emissions published last year.

#### Privatization is key to sustainable rocket launches – reliance on public entities is bad because they are too limited, expensive, and undo critical strides being made right now

**Kapoor & Todi 21**[Khushi Kapoor and Keshav Todi On March 20, 2021, 3-20-2021, "The Privatisation of Space Exploration – Finance and Investment Cell, SRCC," Finance and Investment Cell Shri Ram College of Commerce is a student-driven initiative to facilitate knowledge sharing on matters of finance, geopolitics and economy, at Shri Ram College of Commerce and at the university level. The cell aims to provide a stimulus to develop financial instincts among young minds through regular workshops, events and continued collaboration with the industry, to bridge the gap between pedagogy and practice. A small step, that will hopefully yield some great dividends. [https://ficsrcc.com/the-privatisation-of-space-exploration/]//DebateDrills](https://ficsrcc.com/the-privatisation-of-space-exploration/%5D//DebateDrills) ww

**Privatisation** of space exploration has had many benefits for the space industry in the 21st century. Private companies have a greater degree of autonomy in making decisions, which **enables** them to take up **new projects** while taxpayer-funded institutions are accountable to **the Government** and hence, have to often **limit themselves**. Moreover, there is quick decision making in **private companies** while the same process in a public enterprise would have to pass through a number of stages. This advantage has allowed companies like SpaceX, Blue Origin, etc. to cut their costs substantially and perform operations like **launch**ing a rocket to ISS **at** merely **$57 million per seat** as compared to **$80 million per seat** if aboard a Russian shuttle**, and $450 million** each mission before NASA ended its space shuttle program. Moreover, **making reusable landing rocket launchers, improvements in assembly lines and other** such **operations** further ensure lower costs. Due to the well- known success of the top few **p**rivate **s**pace **c**ompanies, many new small companies such as Firefly systems and Vector launch have been able to raise substantial private capital as well. The growth in the space industry also provides employment to millions all over the world, and the rise in the number of private space companies promotes competition amongst them and encourages constant improvements and advancements. Lastly, the publicity of their operations, like live streaming launches, has sparked widespread interest in space exploration among the general public.