# 1NC

### 1NC – OFF

#### Interpretation: If the plan restricts a form of private appropriate, they must specify the extent of that restriction.

#### Restrict is a vague term – lack of specification is considered legally vague.

Dynia 9 Philip A Dynia 2009 "Vagueness" (Philip A. Dynia is an Associate Professor in the Political Science Department of Loyola University New Orleans. He teaches constitutional law and judicial process as well as specialized courses on the Bill of Rights and the First Amendment.)//Elmer

Court has shown three reasons vague statutes are unconstitutional A fundamental explication of the modern Supreme Court’s concerns regarding overly vague statutes is found in Grayned v. City of Rockford (1972). The Court upheld a city ordinance restricting any “noise or diversion” that would disrupt activities at a public school against claims of vagueness. Because Rockford’s ordinance was aimed at disruptive speech and was grounded in the interest of ensuring the order needed for a proper education, the Court found no constitutional violation. But the Court did suggest three reasons why overly vague statutes are unconstitutional. First, due process requires that a law provide fair warning and provides a “persons of ordinary intelligence a reasonable opportunity to know what is prohibited, so that he may act accordingly.” Second, the law must provide “explicit standards” to law enforcement officials, judges, and juries so as to avoid “arbitrary and discriminatory application.” Third, a vague statute can “inhibit the exercise” of First Amendment freedoms and may cause speakers to “steer far wider of the unlawful zone . . . than if the boundaries of the forbidden areas were clearly marked.”

#### Vagueness is a Voting Issue - Anything allows them to no link any neg disads counterplans or turns because specific mining operations and forms of mining may or may not be eliminated depending on the extent of restriction – makes the aff a moving target that’s only clarified in the 1ar and moots neg ground.

#### Paradigm Issues –

#### a] Topicality is Drop the Debater – it’s a fundamental baseline for debate-ability.

#### b] Use Competing Interps – 1] Topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical and 2] Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### c] No RVI’s - 1] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, 2] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and 3] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive.

### 1NC – OFF

#### Plan: Space faring nations should

#### establish a multilateral agreement that restricts space mining done by private entities except in the case of mining for Rare Earth Minerals. They should increase Rare Earth Mineral mining

#### The Committee on the Peaceful use of Outer Space should establish an application system for property rights on celestial bodies conditioned upon open disclosure of data and applications. Private entities will only be granted one property grant per celestial body.

#### The CP solves:

#### 1] Solves Advantage 2 – it applies multilateral norms to space mining which solves spill-over

#### 2] Solves Advantage 1 – makes mining safe and establishes a regulatory regime.

**Steffen 21** [Olaf Steffen, Olaf is a scientist at the Institute of Composite Structures and Adaptive Sytems at the German Aerospace Center. 12-2-2021, "Explore to Exploit: A Data-Centred Approach to Space Mining Regulation," Institute of Composite Structures and Adaptive Systems, German Aerospace Center, [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964621000515 accessed 12/12/21](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964621000515%20accessed%2012/12/21)] Adam

4. The data-centred approach to space mining regulation 4.1. Core description of the regulatory regime and mining rights acquisition process The data gathered in the exploration of a [celestial body](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/astronomical-systems) is not only of value for space mining companies for informing them whether, where and how to exploit resources from the body in question, but also for science. The irretrievability of information relating to the solar system contained in the body that will be lost during resource exploitation carries a value for humanity and future generations and can thus be assigned the characteristic of a common heritage for all mankind as invoked in the Moon Agreement. This characteristic makes exploration data an exceptional and unique candidate for use in a mechanism for acquiring mining rights because its preservation is of public interest and its disclosure in exchange for exclusive mining rights does not place any additional burden on the mining company. The following principles would form the cornerstones of the proposed regulatory regime and rights acquisition mechanism based on exploration data: Without preconditions, no entity has a right to mine the resources of a celestial body. An international regulatory body administers the existing rights of companies for mining a specific celestial body. Mining rights to such bodies can be applied for from this international regulatory body, with applications made public. The application expires after a pre-set period. Mining rights are granted on the provision and disclosure of exploration data on the celestial body within the pre-set period, proposedly gathered in situ, characterising this body and its resources in a pre-defined manner. The explorer's mining right to the resources of the celestial body is published by the regulatory body in a mining rights grant. The data concerning the celestial body are made public as part of the rights grant within the domain of all participating members of the regulatory regime. The exclusive mining rights to any specific body are tradeable. The scope of the regulatory body with respect to the granting of mining rights is not revenue-oriented. The international regulatory body would thus act as a curator of a rights register and an attached database of exploration data. The concept is superficially comparable to patent law, where exclusive rights are granted following the disclosure of an invention to incentivise the efforts made in the development process. In the following section, the characteristics of such a regulatory regime are further discussed with respect to the formation of [monopolies](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/monopolies), market dynamics, conflict avoidance, inclusivity towards less developed countries and the viability of implementation. 4.2. Discussion and means of implementation The proposed regulatory mechanism has advantages both from a business/investor and society perspective. First, it prevents already highly capitalised companies from acquiring exploitation rights in bulk to deny competitors those objects that are easiest to exploit or most valuable, which would otherwise be possible in any kind of pay-for-right mechanism and could result in preventing market access to smaller, emerging companies. Thus, early monopoly formation can be avoided. The use of data disclosure for the granting of mining rights ensures the scientific community has access to this invaluable source of information. In this way, space mining prospecting missions can lead to a boost in research on small celestial bodies at a speed unmatchable by pure government/agency funded science probes. This usefulness to the scientific community could lead to sustained partnerships between prospecting companies and scientific institutions and could even provide a source of funding for the companies through R&D grants and public-private partnerships. The results of the exploration efforts contribute to research on the formation of planets and the history of the solar system and provide valuable insight for space defence against asteroids. The transition of exploration from a tailored mission profile with a purpose-built spacecraft to a standard task in space flight would also lead to a cost reduction of the respective exploration spacecraft through [economies of scale](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/economies-of-scale). This describes the very benefits Elvis [[24](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964621000515" \l "bib24)] and Crawford [[25](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964621000515" \l "bib25)] imagined as possible effects of a space economy. Thus, there is an immediate return for society from the exploitation rights grant. It also reconciles the adverse interests of space development and [space science](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/space-sciences) as laid out by Schwartz [[26](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964621000515" \l "bib26)]. It ensures that, by exploitation, information contained in celestial bodies is not lost for future generations.The application period should not be set in a manner that creates a situation that can be abused through the potential for stockpiling inventory rights. Rather, it is intended to prevent conflict in the phase before exploration data gathered by a mission, as a prerequisite to the mining rights grant, is available. In other words, only one exploration effort at a time can be permitted for a specific body. The time frame between the application and the granting of mining rights (meaning: availability of the required exploration data set) should be tight and should only consider necessary exploration time on site, transit time and possibly a reasonable launch preparation and data processing markup. These contributors to the application period make it clear that the time frame could be dynamic and individualistic, depending on the exploration target (transit time and duration of exploration) and the technology of the exploration probe (transit time). After the expiration of the application period, applications for the exploration target would again be permissible. To prevent the previously mentioned stockpiling of inventory rights, credible proof of an imminent exploration intention would need to be part of the application process, for example, a fixed launch contract or the advanced build status of the exploration probe. Such a mechanism would not contradict the statement in the OST that outer space shall be free for both exploration and scientific investigation. Applications would not apply to purely scientific exploration. An application would only be necessary as a prerequisite for mining. Even resource prospecting could take place without an application (for whatever reason), with a subsequent application comprising in situ data already gathered. For such cases, the application process would need to provide a short period for objections to enable the secretive explorer to make their efforts public. The publication of the application for the mining rights, which is nothing more than a statement of intention to explore, thus provides a strong measure for avoiding conflict. The transparency of where exploration spacecraft are located and, at a later stage, where mining activities take place, provides additional benefits for the sustainable use of space, trust building and deterrence against malign misuse of mining technology. Involuntary spacecraft collisions of competitors in deep space are prevented by the reduction of exploration efforts at the same destination through the application for mining rights by one applicant at a time. As pointed out by Newman and Williamson [[20](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964621000515" \l "bib20)], this is relevant because space debris does not de-orbit in deep space as in the case of LEO. Deep space may be vast, but the velocities involved mean that small debris particles are no less dangerous. Considering NEO mining with fleets of small spacecraft, malfunctions and/or destructive events could create debris clouds crossing Earth's orbit around the sun on a regular basis, presenting another danger to satellites in Earth's own orbit. Thus, by effectively preventing the collision of two spacecraft, one source of debris creation can be mitigated through this regulation mechanism. With respect to Deudney's [[11](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964621000515" \l "bib11)] scepticism of asteroid mining and the dual-use character of technology to manipulate orbits of celestial bodies, it has to be stated that this potential is truly inherent to asteroid mining. An asteroid redirect mission for scientific purposes was pursued by NASA [[49](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964621000515" \l "bib49)] before reorientation towards a manned lunar mission. In one way or another, each type of asteroid mining will require the delivery of the targeted resource to a destination via a comparable technology as formerly envisioned by NASA, be it as a raw material or a useable resource processed in situ, even if this is not necessarily done through redirecting the whole asteroid and placing it in a lunar orbit. However, to be misused as a weapon, space mined resources would have to surpass a certain mass threshold to survive atmospheric entry at the target. This seems unfeasible for currently discussed mining concepts using small-scale spacecraft as described in this article. Redirecting larger masses or whole asteroids would require far more powerful mining vessels or small amounts of thrust over long periods of time. The continuous, (for a mining activity) untypical change in the orbit of an asteroid would make a redirect attempt with hostile intent easily identifiable, effectively deterring such an activity in the first place by ensuring the identification of the aggressor long before the projectile hits its target. The proposed database would provide a catalogue of asteroids with exploration and mining activities in place that should be tracked more closely because of their interaction with spacecraft. This would, in fact, be necessary per se as a precaution to avoid catastrophic mishaps, such as the accidental change of a NEO's orbit to intercept Earth by changing its mass through mining.

#### Space mining kills the terrestrial mining industry – oversaturation.

Zeisl 19 [Yasemin Zeisl, MSc in International Relations and Affairs from the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), “Three Salient Risks of Mining in Space,” 05/03/19, *GlobalRiskIntel*, https://www.globalriskintel.com/insights/three-salient-risks-mining-space, EA]

A potential overhaul of the mining industry if not the global economy is the second risk of mining in outer space. While resources of essential metals on Earth are also slowly declining, they will likely not deplete in the near future. Importing metals from space would therefore not substitute depleted terrestrial reserves but could rather cause an oversaturation of certain resources on the market. This development would lead to a price drop of metals that are sourced from space. Additionally, a reduction in price of rare metals such as rhodium, platinum, or gold may change the value of existing reserves on Earth. Metals that are expensive now may then be used more lavishly, and this development could boost future progress in technology and engineering. Despite this positive outlook, a transformation of the global economy through space mining may imperil profits and jobs in the existing mining industry.

#### Perceived vulnerability to China hurts readiness and causes conflict.

Parthemore 11, Christine. "Elements of security: mitigating the risks of US dependence on critical minerals." (2011). (Fellow at Center for a New American Security)//Elmer

Minerals are a subject of much contention. On one hand, the United States remains less prepared for supply disruptions, price spikes and trade disagreements related to the global minerals trade than most experts realize. On the other hand, public concern over reliable access to the minerals required in key sectors of the U.S. economy, in particular those needed to produce military equipment, is growing. Too frequently, however, such concerns are based on inaccurate assumptions. A sober and informed analysis suggests there are real vulnerabilities, which place critical national security and foreign policy interests at risk. In worst-case scenarios, supplies of minerals that the United States does not produce domestically may be disrupted, creating price spikes and lags in delivery. Even short of major supply disruptions, supplier countries can exert leverage over the United States by threatening to cut off certain key mineral supplies. The United States may also lose ground strategically if it continues to lag in managing mineral issues, as countries that consider assured access to minerals as far more strategically important are increasingly setting the rules for trade in this area. China’s rising dominance is at the heart of this growing public debate. Its 2010 cutoff of rare earth elements2 – a unique set of minerals that are difficult to process yet critical to many hightech applications – attracted particular attention. After Japan detained a Chinese trawler captain over a skirmish in the East China Sea, Japanese companies reported weeks of stalled shipments of rare earths from China amid rumors of an official embargo. This may sound like a minor trade dispute, but China currently controls production of about 95 percent of the world’s rare earths, which are critical to building laser-guidance systems for weapons, refining petroleum and building wind turbines. Coinciding with possessing this incredible leverage over the rest of the world, China has also reduced its export quotas for these minerals. For its part, the Chinese government contended that it did not put any formal export embargo in place, and that its plans to reduce exports simply reflect the need to meet growing domestic demand for rare earths. Japan-China relations experienced further strain in their already tense relationship. In the United States, many reporters, policy analysts and decision makers did not foresee this challenge. Feeling blindsided, some in the United States characterized the situation in a manner that demonized China rather than using the opportunity to better understand the true nature of U.S. supply chain vulnerabilities. The 2010 rare earths case and others are increasing interest in critical minerals among U.S. policymakers. Congress held hearings on the strategic importance of minerals between 2007 and 2010, and the 2010 National Defense Authorization Act required DOD to study and report on its dependence on rare earth elements for weapons, communications and other systems.3 During a 2009 hearing on minerals and military readiness, Republican Representative Randy Forbes of Virginia called minerals, “one of those things that no one really talks about or worries about until something goes wrong. It’s at that point – the point where we don’t have the steel we need to build MRAPs [Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicles] or the rhenium we need to build a JSF [Joint Strike Fighter] engine that the stockpile becomes critically important.”4 In October 2010, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton stated that it would be “in our interests commercially and strategically” to find additional sources of supply for rare earth minerals, and stated that China’s recent cuts to rare earth exports “served as a wakeup call that being so dependent on only one source, disruption could occur for natural disaster reasons or other kinds of events could intervene.”5 In January 2011, Sen. Mark Begich, D-Alaska, Sen. Lisa Murkowski, R-Alaska, and Rep. Mike Coffman, R-Colo., wrote a letter to Defense Secretary Robert Gates expressing concern for minerals required for producing defense equipment such as Joint Direct Attack Munitions (JDAMs), which stated, “Clearly, rare earth supply limitations present a serious vulnerability to our national security. Yet early indications are that DOD has dismissed the severity of the situation to date.”6 Additionally, the Department of Energy (DOE) launched a multiyear effort to explore potential vulnerabilities in supply chains for minerals that will be critical to four distinct areas of energy technology innovation. While concern is growing, the media and policymakers often focus too narrowly on what may seem the most compelling indicators – usually import dependence or scarcity – in prescribing solutions to reduce U.S. vulnerabilities, in particular to supply disruptions in critical minerals such as rare earths. This focus is sparking protectionist attitudes, with some worrying that import dependence poses an inherent risk to the U.S. economy. Discussion of minerals also frequently focuses on supply scarcity and resource depletion in absolute terms. However, both the rhenium and rare earth minerals disruptions of the past five years were triggered by deliberate decisions made by political leaders to leverage their positions of strength, not by market forces, disorder or scarcities of these minerals. Countries often revert to hoarding, pressuring suppliers and otherwise behaving as if scarcities are present even when they are not, based solely on concerns that shortages are likely in the near term. In fact, neither scarcity nor import dependence alone is sufficient to signal vulnerability, and a combination of factors including concentration of suppliers is most often required for mineral issues to become security or foreign policy problems. This report, based on two years of research, site visits and discussions with stakeholders, explores how the supply, demand and use of minerals can impair U.S. foreign relations, economic interests and defense readiness. It examines cases of five individual minerals – lithium, gallium, rhenium, tantalum and niobium – and rare earth elements, such as neodymium, samarium and dysprosium, as a sixth group in order to show the complexity of addressing these concerns. Each of these minerals is critical for defense technologies and U.S. economic growth plans. They share characteristics with minerals that have caused important political or economic concerns for the United States in the past. Additionally, lithium is frequently cited in the media and in discussions of how clean energy supply chains are critical to meeting America’s future economic, energy and environmental goals. Within the past five years, two of these cases – rhenium and rare earth minerals – have involved supply disruptions or important threats of disruptions for the United States and its allies. Each of these minerals will require federal government attention in the coming years. Pg. 6-10

#### Strong Readiness solves conflict – amplifies diplomacy, strengthens alliances, and shores up credibility

Inboden 16 William Inboden 2016 “The Role of a Strong National Defense” <https://s3.amazonaws.com/ims-2016/PDF/2016_Index_of_US_Military_Strength_ESSAYS_INBODEN.pdf> (PhD, is Executive Director of the William P. Clements, Jr. Center for History, Strategy, and Statecraft and Associate Professor of Public Affairs at the University of Texas-Austin)//Elmer

One of the few core responsibilities of the federal government mandated by the Constitution of the United States is “to provide for the common defence.”2 Upon commissioning, every American military officer swears an oath to “support and defend” this Constitution.3 Accordingly, the core mission of the American military is to protect and defend our nation. This means **deterring potential aggressors** and, if deterrence fails, fighting and winning wars. Any consideration of the military’s role and American defense policy must start with that foundational principle. Yet if **the need for a strong military begins with the mission to fight and win wars, it does not end there**. As the quote from Theodore Roosevelt at the beginning of this essay illustrates, American leaders have long appreciated that a formidable military can produce abundant diplomatic and economic dividends, even—especially—when not wielded in wartime. The United States’ military capability supported our nation’s rise to global greatness over the past century, but this was often because of the **increased influence and credibility** produced by this capability rather than the overt use of force. Along the way, there developed an American strategic tradition that integrated military strength with diplomatic acumen, economic growth, and international influence.4 It is an historic tradition with an impressive heritage and continuing salience today. Drawing on the historical record, there are many ways beyond the kinetic use of force that a strong national defense bolsters our national power and global influence. A robust defense budget and defense policy also strengthens our nation in manifest other ways. A well-equipped defense enhances our capabilities and influence across virtually all **other elements** of national power: **our economy, our diplomacy, our alliances, and our credibility and influence in the world**. Conversely, an underresourced national defense threatens to diminish our national power across all of these other dimensions. **A strong national defense is thus indispensable for a peaceful, successful, and free America**—even if a shot is never fired. The diplomatic successes in building and maintaining a stable and peaceful international order achieved by the United States over the past century have been enabled by **America’s military dominance**. Conversely, the calamitous defense budget cuts and corresponding rise of potential peer competitors in the present day are already undermining America’s diplomatic and economic influence. A well-appointed military improves diplomacy with adversaries, **strengthens our alliances, signals credibility** and resolve, **deters aggression**, and enhances national morale. Yet this is not to disregard the manifest other dividends that a strong military can pay. There are multiple pathways by which investments in military hard power produce economic benefits. For example, the military’s role in protecting a stable international environment also creates predictable and secure conditions in which economic growth can flourish. **The American security umbrella facilitated Western Europe’s postwar reconstruction and economic revival, and Asia’s half-century economic boom has been partly a function of America’s treaty alliances in the region maintaining peace and stability, exemplified by the United States Navy’s Seventh Fleet protecting an open maritime order, freedom of navigation, and secure sea lanes**.

### 1NC – OFF

#### CP Text – Space-Faring States should:

#### Establish a multilateral agreement and body to govern and foster the expansion of Asteroid Mining that applies to private entities in all countries.

#### Clarifies and establishes transferrable property rights on celestial bodies.

#### Mandate that private entities engaging in Asteroid Mining must not harm the Environment.

#### Clarify conflict resolution should be resolved through the Outer Space Treaty and adjudicated by the International Court of Justice.

#### Limit Asteroid Mining to only within the Asteroid’s orbit.

#### Solves Un-Regulated Mining - CP solves ambiguity that makes Mining valuable and solves conflicts.

Coffey 9 – Sarah, B.A., Alfred University, J.D., Case Western Reserve University School of Law, “ESTABLISHING A LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR PROPERTY RIGHTS TO NATURAL RESOURCES IN OUTER SPACE”, CASE W. RES. J. INT’L L. , Vol. 41:119, <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1238&context=jil>

Drawing on the strengths of the proposals discussed above, this Note suggests a new proposal for governing property rights to outer space resources. This proposal falls within the bounds set by the Outer Space Treaty and avoids many of the problems that prevented the Moon Treaty from being widely ratified. Both developed and developing nations will benefit from the proposal. In addition, it encourages the exploration and exploitation of resources from space. First, an international agreement should be made that clarifies property rights on celestial bodies and establishes a limited international body to oversee its execution and implementation. The agreement should clearly state the rule that the Outer Space Treaty is widely understood to have indirectly stated that: nations, companies, and individuals may not own real estate on celestial bodies, but may have property rights to resources they derive from the moon or other celestial bodies. Stating this outright in a new treaty will prevent the types of ongoing debates that arise from the imprecise or ambiguous language of agreements such as the Outer Space Treaty and the Moon Agreement. Since the OST is widely understood to have this meaning anyway, nations are likely to assent to this portion of the treaty. It solidifies the rights of expeditions to legally claim the resources they extract from the moon, and the knowledge that they are acting within a stable legal framework should encourage nations to send expeditions without fear that the resources will be confiscated or deemed illegal. The agreement should establish an authoritative body to be formed under the already existing U.N. Office of Outer Space Affairs. The body would serve limited functions, so it would not be overly difficult, time consuming, or costly to initiate and maintain. It would have a council on which every space-faring nation or nations otherwise involved with a space would be guaranteed a seat, with limited seats reserved for developing nations. The body would serve limited functions in that it would oversee the general execution of the agreement and be the contact point for participating nations, but under normal circumstances it would not make everyday decisions regarding which country may use what areas and resources. Instead, the credit system would be used. Each nation would be allocated a certain number of credits representing tonnage of resources to be extracted from the lunar surface for a given period of time. The credits would be allocated to all member countries with additional credits given to developing nations.164 The credits would be freely transferable, so nations without space-faring capabilities could benefit by selling their credits, leasing them while retaining ownership, or creating novel agreements that benefit the nation.165 Nations may sell their credits to their own citizens, or if all the nation’s credits are already in use, facilitate in purchasing them from other nations. Individuals and corporations must still go through the appropriate channels in their nation, per the OST, because it is the nation that is ultimately responsible for their safety and actions.166 The members of the new space property treaty will need to determine what exactly the credits represent. For example, particular plots of land on the moon could be permanently tied to a particular nation’s credits, or the credits may represent tonnage that has no fixed location until a nation extracts it on a first come basis. The former would provide some features of real property rights and discourage wasteful use the land.167 The latter, however, seems to better comport with the idea that the moon is the “common heritage of mankind” and no section is owned by a nation or person. This allows expeditions to prospect freely, as they do under the International Seabed Authority,168 and use their credits only when they decide on a location to begin extraction. When a nation exercises its credits on land, that land will become the exclusive economic zone of that nation, with other parties free to pass through as long as they do not disturb it or take resources from it. Like the ISS model, nations may collaborate and form agreements among themselves regarding particular issues without needing to go through the authoritative body so long as the agreements do not violate the overarching agreement on property rights. The natural resources extracted could be taxed by the ton to encourage nations not to take more than they need and to fund the operations of the authority governing the new agreement. There may even be a time or tonnage limit for staying on a piece of land so that particularly rich areas of resources will not be monopolized by any one country without giving other nations the opportunity to compete. Additionally, the authority may establish environmental rules to ensure that the mining does not harm the environment and that the mining and its effects would not be visible from earth. Any conflicts arising from lunar activities would be governed by article XIII of the Outer Space Treaty, which calls for issues regarding outer space to be resolved between State parties to the treaty or between a party and the international organization that oversees the activities.169 Applying that provision to this legal framework, if member parties have a dispute they must first try to resolve the issues through independent negotiation or by working with the authoritative body. Further, article III of the OST states that parties shall comply with international law, including the U.N. charter.170 The implication is that disputes arising in space law should be resolved in the same way as disputes in other areas of international law.171 Chapter IV of the U.N. charter states that parties shall “seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.”172 If such action is successful, chapter XIV of the U.N. Charter provides that nations may bring their disputes to the International Court of Justice or make agreements to bring their issues to another tribunal.173 Therefore, in the event of a dispute under this legal framework the parties must first negotiate between themselves to resolve it. For the foreseeable future, there will likely not be enough space activity to necessitate a special space law tribunal, and if parties are unable to successfully resolve their dispute through diplomatic channels they may bring their dispute to the International Court of Justice. If at some future time there is enough space activity and disputes that an international space tribunal is necessary, one may be created at that time.

#### Top level – either the aff removes all space mining and they link into this disad or they just reduce it slightly which means no solvency – we’re not really sure what restrict means and the 1ar will definitely shift but hold the line

#### Commercial mining solves extinction from scarcity, climate, terror, war, and disease.

Pelton 17—(Director Emeritus of the Space and Advanced Communications Research Institute at George Washington University, PHD in IR from Georgetown).. Pelton, Joseph N. 2017. The New Gold Rush: The Riches of Space Beckon! Springer. Accessed 8/30/19.

Are We Humans Doomed to Extinction? What will we do when Earth’s resources are used up by humanity? The world is now hugely over populated, with billions and billions crammed into our overcrowded cities. By 2050, we may be 9 billion strong, and by 2100 well over 11 billion people on Planet Earth. Some at the United Nations say we might even be an amazing 12 billion crawling around this small globe. And over 80 % of us will be living in congested cities. These cities will be ever more vulnerable to terrorist attack, natural disaster, and other plights that come with overcrowding and a dearth of jobs that will be fueled by rapid automation and the rise of artifi cial intelligence across the global economy. We are already rapidly running out of water and minerals. Climate change is threatening our very existence. Political leaders and even the Pope have cautioned us against inaction. Perhaps the naysayers are right. All humanity is at tremendous risk. Is there no hope for the future? This book is about hope. We think that there is literally heavenly hope for humanity. But we are not talking here about divine intervention. We are envisioning a new space economy that recognizes that there is more water in the skies that all our oceans. Th ere is a new wealth of natural resources and clean energy in the reaches of outer space—more than most of us could ever dream possible. There are those that say why waste money on outer space when we have severe problems here at home? Going into space is not a waste of money. It is our future. It is our hope for new jobs and resources. The great challenge of our times is to reverse public thinking to see space not as a resource drain but as the doorway to opportunity. The new space frontier can literally open up a “gold rush in the skies.” In brief, we think there is new hope for humanity. We see a new a pathway to the future via new ventures in space. For too long, space programs have been seen as a money pit. In the process, we have overlooked the great abundance available to us in the skies above. It is important to recognize there is already the beginning of a new gold rush in space—a pathway to astral abundance. “New Space” is a term increasingly used to describe radical new commercial space initiatives—many of which have come from Silicon Valley and often with backing from the group of entrepreneurs known popularly as the “space billionaires.” New space is revolutionizing the space industry with lower cost space transportation and space systems that represent significant cost savings and new technological breakthroughs. “New Commercial Space” and the “New Space Economy” represent more than a new way of looking at outer space. These new pathways to the stars could prove vital to human survival. If one does not believe in spending money to probe the mysteries of the universe then perhaps we can try what might be called “calibrated greed” on for size. One only needs to go to a cubesat workshop, or to Silicon Valley or one of many conferences like the “Disrupt Space” event in Bremen, Germany, held in April 2016 to recognize that entrepreneurial New Space initiatives are changing everything [ 1 ]. In fact, the very nature and dimensions of what outer space activities are today have changed forever. It is no longer your grandfather’s concept of outer space that was once dominated by the big national space agencies. The entrepreneurs are taking over. The hopeful statements in this book and the hard economic and technical data that backs them up are more than a minority opinion. It is a topic of growing interest at the World Economic Forum, where business and political heavyweights meet in Davos, Switzerland, to discuss how to stimulate new patterns of global economic growth. It is even the growing view of a group that call themselves “space ethicists.” Here is how Christopher J. Newman, at the University of Sunderland in the United Kingdom has put it: Space ethicists have offered the view that space exploration is not only desirable; it is a duty that we, as a species, must undertake in order to secure the survival of humanity over the longer term. Expanding both the resource base and, eventually, the habitats available for humanity means that any expenditure on space exploration, far from being viewed as frivolous, can legitimately be rationalized as an ethical investment choice. (Newman) On the other hand there are space ethicists and space exobiologists who argue that humans have created ecological ruin on the planet—and now space debris is starting to pollute space. Th ese countervailing thoughts by the “no growth” camp of space ethicists say we have no right to colonize other planets or to mine the Moon and asteroids—or at least no right to do so until we can prove we can sustain life here on Earth for the longer term. However, for most who are planning for the new space economy the opinion of space philosophers doesn’t really fl oat their boat. Legislators, bankers, and aspiring space entrepreneurs are far more interested in the views of the super-rich capitalists called the space billionaires. A number of these billionaires and space executives have already put some very serious money into enterprises intent on creating a new pathway to the stars. No less than five billionaires with established space ventures—Elon Musk, Paul Allen, Jeff Bezos, Sir Richard Branson, and Robert Bigelow—have invested millions if not billions of dollars into commercializing space. They are developing new technologies and establishing space enterprises that can bring the wealth of outer space down to Earth. This is not a pipe dream, but will increasingly be the economic reality of the 2020s. These wealthy space entrepreneurs see major new economic opportunities. To them space represents the last great frontier for enterprising pioneers. Th us they see an ever-expanding space frontier that offers opportunities in low-cost space transportation, satellite solar power satellites to produce clean energy 24h a day, space mining, space manufacturing and production, and eventually space habitats and colonies as a trajectory to a better human future. Some even more visionary thinkers envision the possibility of terraforming Mars, or creating new structures in space to protect our planet from cosmic hazards and even raising Earth’s orbit to escape the rising heat levels of the Sun in millennia to come. Some, of course, will say this is sci-fi hogwash. It can’t be done. We say that this is what people would have said in 1900 about airplanes, rocket ships, cell phones and nuclear devices. The skeptics laughed at Columbus and his plan to sail across the oceans to discover new worlds. When Thomas Jefferson bought the Louisiana Purchase from France or Seward bought Alaska, there were plenty of naysayers that said such investment in the unknown was an extravagant waste of money. A healthy skepticism is useful and can play a role in economic and business success. Before one dismisses the idea of an impending major new space economy and a new gold rush, it might useful to see what has already transpired in space development in just the past five decades. The world’s first geosynchronous communications satellite had a throughput capability of about 500 kb / s. In contrast, today’s state of the art Viasat 2 —a half century later— has an impressive throughput of some 140 Gb/s. Th is means that the relative throughput is nearly 300,000 greater, while its lifetime is some ten times longer (Figs. 1.1 and 1.2 ). Each new generation of communications satellite has had more power, better antenna systems, improved pointing and stabilization, and an extended lifetime. And the capabilities represented by remote sensing satellites , meteorological satellites , and navigation and timing satellites have also expanded their capabilities and performance in an impressive manner. When satellite applications first started, the market was measured in millions of dollars. Today commercial satellite services exceed a quarter of a billion dollars. Vital services such as the Internet, aircraft traffi c control and management, international banking, search and rescue and much, much more depend on application satellites. Th ose that would doubt the importance of satellites to the global economy might wish to view on You Tube the video “If Th ere Were a Day Without Satellites?” [ 2 ]. Let’s check in on what some of those very rich and smart guys think about the new space economy and its potential. (We are sorry to say that so far there are no female space billionaires, but surely this, too, will come someday soon.) Of course this twenty-fi rst century breakthrough that we call the New Space economy will not come just from new space commerce. It will also come from the amazing new technologies here on Earth. Vital new terrestrial technologies will accompany this cosmic journey into tomorrow. Information technology, robotics, artificial intelligence and commercial space travel systems have now set us on a course to allow us humans to harvest the amazing riches in the skies—new natural resources, new energy, and even totally new ways of looking at the purpose of human existence. If we pursue this course steadfastly, it can be the beginning of a New Space renaissance. But if we don’t seek to realize our ultimate destiny in space, Homo sapiens can end up in the dustbin of history—just like literally millions of already failed species. In each and every one of the five mass extinction events that have occurred over the last 1.5 billion years on Earth, some 50–80 % of all species have gone the way of the T. Rex, the woolly mammoth, and the Dodo bird along with extinct ferns, grasses and cacti. On the other hand, the best days of the human race could be just beginning. If we are smart about how we go about discovering and using these riches in the skies and applying the best of our new technologies, it could be the start of a new beginning for humanity. Konstantin Tsiokovsky, the Russian astronautics pioneer, who fi rst conceived of practical designs for spaceships, famously said: “A planet is the cradle of mankind, but one cannot live in a cradle forever.” Well before Tsiokovsky another genius, Leonardo da Vinci, said, quite poetically: “Once you have tasted flight, you will forever walk the earth with your eyes turned skyward, for there you have been, and there you will always long to return.” The founder of the X-Prize and of Planetary Resources, Inc., Dr. Peter Diamandis, has much more brashly said much the same thing in quite diff erent words when he said: “The meek shall inherit the Earth. The rest of us will go to Mars.” The New Space Billionaires Peter Diamandis is not alone in his thinking. From the list of “visionaries” quoted earlier, Elon Musk, the founder of SpaceX; Sir Richard Branson, the founder of Virgin Galactic; and Paul Allen, the co-founder of Microsoft and the man who financed SpaceShipOne, the world’s first successful spaceplane have all said the future will include a vibrant new space economy. Th ey, and others, have said that we can, we should and we soon shall go into space and realize the bounty that it can offer to us. Th e New Space enterprise is today indeed being led by those so-called space billionaires , who have an exciting vision of the future. They and others in the commercial space economy believe that the exploitation of outer space may open up a new golden age of astral abundance. They see outer space as a new frontier that can be a great source of new materials, energy and various forms of new wealth that might even save us from excesses of the past. Th is gold rush in the skies represents a new beginning. We are not talking about expensive new space ventures funded by NASA or other space agencies in Europe, Japan, China or India. No, these eff orts which we and others call New Space are today being forged by imaginative and resourceful commercial entrepreneurs. Th ese twenty-fi rst century visionaries have the fortitude and zeal to look to the abundance above. New breakthroughs in technology and New Space enterprises may be able to create an “astral life raft” for humanity. Just as Columbus and the Vikings had the imaginative drive that led them to discover the riches of a new world, we now have a cadre of space billionaires that are now leading us into this New Space era of tomorrow. These bold leaders, such as Paul Allen and Sir Richard Branson, plus other space entrepreneurs including Jeff Bezos of Amazon and Blue Origin, and Robert Bigelow, Chairman of Budget Suites and Bigelow Aerospace, not only dream of their future in the space industry but also have billions of dollars in assets. These are the bright stars of an entirely new industry that are leading us into the age of New Space commerce. These space billionaires, each in their own way, are proponents of a new age of astral abundance. Each of them is launching new commercial space industries. They are literally transforming our vision of tomorrow. These new types of entrepreneurial aerospace companies—the New Space enterprises—give new hope and new promise of transforming our world as we know it today. The New Space Frontier What happens in space in the next few decades, plus corresponding new information technologies and advanced robotics, will change our world forever. These changes will redefi ne wealth, change our views of work and employment and upend almost everything we think we know about economics, wealth, jobs, and politics. Th ese changes are about truly disruptive technologies of the most fundamental kinds. If you thought the Internet, smart phones, and spandex were disruptive technologies, just hang on. You have not seen anything yet. In short, if you want to understand a transition more fundamental than the changes brought to the twentieth century world by computers, communications and the Internet, then read this book. There are truly riches in the skies. Near-Earth asteroids largely composed of platinum and rare earth metals have an incredible value. Helium-3 isotopes accessible in outer space could provide clean and abundant energy. There is far more water in outer space than is in our oceans. In the pages that follow we will explain the potential for a cosmic shift in our global economy, our ecology, and our commercial and legal systems. These can take place by the end of this century. And if these changes do not take place we will be in trouble. Our conventional petro-chemical energy systems will fail us economically and eventually blanket us with a hydrocarbon haze of smog that will threaten our health and our very survival. Our rare precious metals that we need for modern electronic appliances will skyrocket in price, and the struggle between “haves” and “have nots” will grow increasingly ugly. A lack of affordable and readily available water, natural resources, food, health care and medical supplies, plus systematic threats to urban security and systemic warfare are the alternatives to astral abundance. The choices between astral abundance and a downward spiral in global standards of living are stark. Within the next few decades these problems will be increasingly real. By then the world may almost be begging for new, out of- the-box thinking. International peace and security will be an indispensable prerequisite for exploitation of astral abundance, as will good government for all. No one nation can be rich and secure when everyone else is poor and insecure. In short, global space security and strategic space defense, mediated by global space agreements, are part of this new pathway to the future.

#### Resource scarcity coming now and causes extinction—asteroid mining is the only way to solve

Crombrugghe 18 – Guerric, Business Development Manager Brussels, Brussels Capital Region, “Asteroid mining as a necessary answer to mineral scarcity”, LinkedIn, 1/11/2018, <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/asteroid-mining-necessary-answer-mineral-scarcity-de-crombrugghe>

We need minerals, and we always will. Yet, our reserves are finite and a 100% end-of-life recycling rate is impossible to achieve. Eventually, new entrants will therefore be required to sustain our system. While the business case for asteroid mining can obviously not be closed with current technologies, it will someday become a necessity. We may as well start preparing ourselves. Scarcity of resources, the challenge of the 21st century According to the World Bank, in 2016 humanity's growth rate was of 1.18% in terms of population, and 2.50% in terms of GDP. Both of these, in turn, drive our staggering resource consumption: there are more of us, and each of us needs more. On the other, the Earth is a closed system, and resources are only available in a finite amount. We all know by now that there is only this much oil & gas, but the same can actually be said for water, arable land, minerals, etc. These two simple observations have sparkled the debate around the scarcity of resources. Even with the best intentions, mathematics teaches us that it is impossible to indefinitely extract resources from a given finite supply [1]. The problem arising in the short-term is the exhaustion of the existing supply. That limit is actually coming in fast. In a paper published in 2007, Stephen Kessler demonstrates that the global mineral reserves are only sufficient for the next 50 years. The figure on the right shows the ratio of known global reserve to global annual consumption, given a rough indication of adequacy in years. It dates from an earlier paper, published in 1994. Since then, the development of environmental-friendly technologies (e.g. batteries, electric engines, etc.) has drastically increased the consumption rate of high-tech metals such as cobalt, platinum, rare earths, or titanium. On the other hand, exploration programs have allowed to discover new deposits, notably of gold and diamond. We will certainly be able to continue to increase - or at least sustain - our reserves, but only temporarily. Recycling and other temporary fixes An obvious solution is recycling, i.e. rejuvenating our stocks. A popular concept to illustrate this idea is that of urban mining: retrieving the ores present in smartphones and other electronic devices. It may prove to be not only more environmental-friendly, be also safer and more cost-effective. Nevertheless, every solution based on recycling is, again, nothing more than a temporary fix, buying us a finite amount of time. The United Nations Environment Programme studied in a report the current recycling rate of 60 metals. More than half of them have an end-of-life recycling rate below 1%, and less than one-third are above 50%. Nickel, for example, is relatively easy to retrieve, with and end-of-life recycling rate of up to 63% under the best conditions. At that rate, less than 1% of the initial stock is available after only 10 cycle. Even with a staggering 99% efficiency, the same 1% limit is achieved in less than 460 cycles. Not bad, of course, but still not enough. Should our hunger for resources continue, and even with the most optimised recycling techniques, a second problem will arise in the longer term: the amount of resources needed at a given time will simply exceed the total available stock. Unless we manage to find growth vectors that do not require raw materials, that tipping point is an impassable limit. Its proximity obviously depends on our consumption rate. Asteroid mining? No matter which way we look at it, we will thus be short on resources, either through sheer exhaustion (i.e. transformation in an unrecoverable form) or because the demand will exceed the total reserves. We can - and should - talk about recycling, dematerialisation, and other more ethically questionable solutions such as bio-engineering. Nonetheless, no matter how good they are, these are only temporary fixes. If we don't radically change our lifestyle, we will sooner or later have to address the elephant in the room: the Earth is a closed system, we need new entrants. How can space help? Short answer: all these minerals can be found in space. Some are difficult to obtain, others are even more difficult, none are straightforward. The most accessible destination is near-Earth asteroids, a reservoir of over 17,000 known - and counting - giant rocks that regularly cross the orbit of our planet. They are commonly classified in three main families. The most interesting one, for our case, is that of the S-type asteroids. These are metallic bodies, containing first and foremost nickel, iron and cobalt, but also gold, ores from the platinum group. But the list doesn't stop there, many other minerals can be found in smaller amounts: iridium, silver, osmium, palladium, rhenium, rhodium, ruthenium, manganese, molybdenum, aluminium, titanium, etc. How do we get there? Let's take an example: Ryugu, formerly known as 1999 JU3. It's a C-type asteroid measured to be approximately one kilometre in size [2]. In addition to nickel, iron and cobalt, it also contains a fair share of water, nitrogen, hydrogen, and ammonia. Its total value is estimated to be approximately 80 billion USD. Fantastic! But how do we get there and, most importantly, how much does it cost? Well, we may have the start of an answer to these questions. Reaching Ryugu is a technological challenge, but it is feasible. In December 2014, the Japanese space agency has launched a spacecraft, Hayabusa2, heading to the asteroid. Its mission includes the collection of a small sample which will be sent back to the Earth, with a landing planned for December 2020. The target for the sample size is at least 100 µg. The total cost of the mission was projected to be around 200 million USD. That's 2 trillion USD per gram. Let's be optimistic and assume that the sample retrieved is pure gold. At today's rate, it is worth 42.5 USD per gram. That's a difference of over 10 orders of magnitude. Some may argue that Hayabusa2 has many other objectives that retrieving a sample. The mission does indeed include multiple landers, thorough scientific investigations, etc. There is actually another asteroid sample return mission underway, which we could you as a second point of comparison: OSIRIS-Rex, from NASA. It's heading for Bennu, also a C-type asteroid, which it will reach in August 2018. Total cost of the mission: 980 million USD. Target sample size: at least 60 g. We achieve thus roughly speaking 16 million USD per gram. Better, but still 6 orders of magnitude off compared to pure gold. It's pretty much as good as it gets with existing state-of-the-art technologies. Not much of a business case. Should we forget about it? Referring back to our earlier conclusion on resource scarcity, we had two options. Either we drastically reduce our resource consumption, to such a degree that reserves can last for longer than humanity itself, or we extend our closed system, the Earth, to nearby asteroids. In the current state of affairs, I am honestly not sure which course of action is the easiest. As they get increasingly rare, the cost of minerals will go up. On the other hand, as explained in a previous article, we can expect the cost of space activities to go steadily down. Step by step, these 6 orders of magnitude will slowly get munched away from both ends, until eventually asteroid mining becomes a viable operation. In other words: it will only become financially interesting once minerals become a thousand times more expensive and space activities a thousand times cheaper. As a point of reference, the introduction of reusable rockets by SpaceX, widely considered as one of the few truly disruptive changes in the aerospace sector in the last few decades, has "only" brought a cost reduction of 30%. While it's clearly amazing, we still need at least 220 innovations of the same calibre [3] before we can make it work (again: assuming the price of minerals simultaneously goes up by a factor of a thousand). It's therefore quite likely that space mining will not take place within our lifetime [4]. How can we accelerate the process? Firstly, we can only celebrate and support the numerous private initiatives which contribute to make that reality happen, either indirectly (e.g. launchers, space systems, etc.) or directly (e.g. in-space manufacturing, lunar exploration, etc.). Shout out to all the folks who manage to keep the flame of space exploration burning while generating profit for their investors. Secondly, space agencies and other institutional actors should continue to act as promoters of pioneering mission such as Hayabusa2, OSIRIS-REx, or DART. We can only regret that the Asteroid Redirect Mission from NASA and the Asteroid Impact Mission from ESA were not funded. From my perspective, these should actually be amongst the top priorities of our space exploration agenda. Not only are they instrumental to our understanding of the solar system, but they are also essential if we want to avoid the same fate as the dinosaurs. It's a question of survival. As a bonus, they also pave the way towards cost-efficient asteroid mining. In the meantime, we might want to consume existing resources a bit more efficiently.

#### Resource Shortages Exacerbate Conflict

Wingo 13 - Dennis Wingo, Former CTO of the Orbital Recovery Corporation, Founder & CEO of Skycorp Inc, and Greentrail Energy Inc., Co-Founder & CTO of Orbital Recovery Inc. Leader of NASA's the Lunar Orbiter Image Recovery Project (LOIRP), First in history to rescue and operate a spacecraft (ISEE-3) in interplanetary space, and University of Alabama in Huntsville Consortium for Materials Development in Space Researcher At University of Alabama in Huntsville Consortium for Materials Development in Space “Commentary | The Inevitability of Extraterrestrial Mining”, *Space News*, 7/29/2013, https://spacenews.com/36511the-inevitability-of-extraterrestrial-mining/

I am honored to provide the counterpoint to my esteemed colleague Ambassador Roger Harrison’s negative contention concerning the mining of extraterrestrial materials off of planet Earth. Let’s begin with his ending: “The conclusion is inescapable, though liable to be escaped, i.e., that raw materials will never be mined in space and sold profitably within the atmosphere or anywhere else. … Asteroids will continue unvexed in their obits, and the Moon too.” I bring a different quote, from the book “Empire Express,” the story of the intercontinental railroad, from U.S. Army Lt. Zebulon Pike, for whom Pike’s Peak is named: “In various places there were tracts of many leagues, where the wind had thrown up sand in all the fanciful forms of the ocean’s rolling wave, and on which not a spear of vegetable matter existed.” Pike’s visions of sand dunes, pathless wastes and sterile soils were reported, widely read and faithfully believed by geographers. The myth became innocently embellished by subsequent visitors, especially those in the party of Maj. Stephen H. Long, who traversed the whole area in 1820. It was reported to be “an unfit residence for any but a nomad population … forever to remain the unmolested haunt of the native hunter, the bison, and the jackal.” The delicious irony is that Mr. Harrison today lives in the shadow of Pike’s Peak, and the U.S. Air Force Academy where he teaches is in the middle of the confidently prophesied unmolested haunt. When Long’s report was written, the Erie Canal across New York was five years from completion and it was another 31 years before the first railroad was completed across the state. Mr. Harrison’s technical objections are for the most part valid today for his scenario, just as objections to a railroad across the North American continent were valid in the 1820s. However, technology is being developed today that will enable extraterrestrial mining, manufacturing and development just as technology was developed that would enable the creation of the national railroad. Mr. Harrison says it is an illusion that we are running out of resources. He is correct. That is not our claim. The claim is that extraction costs of economically viable terrestrial resources are rising dramatically and may soon exceed the cost of extraction from much more plentiful extraterrestrial sources. Today rapidly advancing costs and diminishing returns are rapidly redefining mining due to diminishing ore grades. This fact is developed in a 2012 distinguished lecture by Dan Wood before the Society of Environmental Geologists, “Crucial Challenges to Discovery and Mining — Tomorrow’s Deeper Ore Bodies.” This is a vitally important issue to solve as resource conflict has been the impetus for most wars in human history. We live in a global civilization of over 7 billion people, which will expand to over 9 billion before plateauing in mid-century. While American politicians are not paying attention to what this means, the rest of the world is noticing. Gross domestic product (GDP) growth and increasing global resource demand are addressed in “Iron Ore Outlook 2050,” a report commissioned for the Indian government. The GDP of the major powers (the United States, Europe, China, India and Japan) is forecast to rise from $48 trillion in 2010 to $149 trillion by 2050. The report’s substance is that with this massive increase in global GDP, an intensifying scramble for metal resources is inevitable. If the trend of resource consumption demand increase continues unabated, there are three likely potential outcomes. The first is collapse, forecast by the “Limits to Growth” school of thought. The second and more likely scenario is fierce national economic competition leading to wars over diminishing resources. The third, and most desirable, is to increase the global resource base by the economic and industrial development of the inner solar system. Mr. Harrison uses cost as the primary reason that extraterrestrial mining will never happen by focusing on a straw man argument related to mining asteroids in orbits far from Earth. Just as the U.S. railroad infrastructure began on shorter routes with lower capital requirements and shorter payback periods, asteroid mining can begin with our nearest neighbor, the Moon, where telepresence robotics, high-bandwidth communications and a short three-day trip for humans negate his premise. We know from the Apollo samples that plentiful metallic asteroidal materials exist in the lunar highlands. We also know from several missions that extensive water, titanium, thorium, uranium, aluminum and native iron all exist on the Moon, in easily separable oxide form. Improvements in remote sensing data from current missions and computer modeling continue to increase the amount of potential asteroidal material on the Moon, increasing confidence in the Moon first premise. The extensive resources of the Moon become the catalyst for an inner solar system-wide economy providing fuel, vehicles and the all-important experience in developing an industrial infrastructure off planet. The asteroids then become the force multiplier of inner solar system development with billions of tons of water, metals and free space energy from solar power. Mars figures in here as well as the second home of humanity, creating further demand for asteroidal resources, and providing something else that is becoming increasingly scarce on the Earth: hope for the future. The technical barriers that Mr. Harrison points to are being overcome just as those of the 19th century were. New technology developments in 3-D printing, additive manufacturing and advanced robotics are breaking down the final barriers to exploiting off-planet resources and indeed the industrial development of the inner solar system. It is not a question if, it is a question of when, and by whom. Just as the Pacific Railway Act of 1862 was a primary catalyst for a century of American economic growth, it should be the role of government to develop policies and concrete legislation to support this development for the continued health of the American economy and the future of all mankind.

#### Those Conflicts go Nuclear

Klare 13 – Michael T., professor emeritus of peace and world-security studies at Hampshire College and senior visiting fellow at the Arms Control Association in Washington, DC, " How Resource Scarcity and Climate Change Could Produce a Global Explosion", *The Nation*, 4/22/2013, <https://www.thenation.com/article/how-resource-scarcity-and-climate-change-could-produce-global-explosion/> JHW

Resource Shortages and Resource Wars Start with one simple given: the prospect of future scarcities of vital natural resources, including energy, water, land, food and critical minerals. This in itself would guarantee social unrest, geopolitical friction and war. It is important to note that absolute scarcity doesn’t have to be on the horizon in any given resource category for this scenario to kick in. A lack of adequate supplies to meet the needs of a growing, ever more urbanized and industrialized global population is enough. Given the wave of extinctions that scientists are recording, some resources—particular species of fish, animals and trees, for example—will become less abundant in the decades to come, and may even disappear altogether. But key materials for modern civilization like oil, uranium and copper will simply prove harder and more costly to acquire, leading to supply bottlenecks and periodic shortages. Oil—the single most important commodity in the international economy—provides an apt example. Although global oil supplies may actually grow in the coming decades, many experts doubt that they can be expanded sufficiently to meet the needs of a rising global middle class that is, for instance, expected to buy millions of new cars in the near future. In its 2011 World Energy Outlook, the International Energy Agency claimed that an anticipated global oil demand of 104 million barrels per day in 2035 will be satisfied. This, the report suggested, would be thanks in large part to additional supplies of “unconventional oil” (Canadian tar sands, shale oil and so on), as well as 55 million barrels of new oil from fields “yet to be found” and “yet to be developed.” However, many analysts scoff at this optimistic assessment, arguing that rising production costs (for energy that will be ever more difficult and costly to extract), environmental opposition, warfare, corruption and other impediments will make it extremely difficult to achieve increases of this magnitude. In other words, even if production manages for a time to top the 2010 level of 87 million barrels per day, the goal of 104 million barrels will never be reached and the world’s major consumers will face virtual, if not absolute, scarcity. Water provides another potent example. On an annual basis, the supply of drinking water provided by natural precipitation remains more or less constant: about 40,000 cubic kilometers. But much of this precipitation lands on Greenland, Antarctica, Siberia and inner Amazonia where there are very few people, so the supply available to major concentrations of humanity is often surprisingly limited. In many regions with high population levels, water supplies are already relatively sparse. This is especially true of North Africa, Central Asia and the Middle East, where the demand for water continues to grow as a result of rising populations, urbanization and the emergence of new water-intensive industries. The result, even when the supply remains constant, is an environment of increasing scarcity. Wherever you look, the picture is roughly the same: supplies of critical resources may be rising or falling, but rarely do they appear to be outpacing demand, producing a sense of widespread and systemic scarcity. However generated, a perception of scarcity—or imminent scarcity—regularly leads to anxiety, resentment, hostility and contentiousness. This pattern is very well understood, and has been evident throughout human history. In his book Constant Battles, for example, Steven LeBlanc, director of collections for Harvard’s Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, notes that many ancient civilizations experienced higher levels of warfare when faced with resource shortages brought about by population growth, crop failures or persistent drought. Jared Diamond, author of the bestseller Collapse, has detected a similar pattern in Mayan civilization and the Anasazi culture of New Mexico’s Chaco Canyon. More recently, concern over adequate food for the home population was a significant factor in Japan’s invasion of Manchuria in 1931 and Germany’s invasions of Poland in 1939 and the Soviet Union in 1941, according to Lizzie Collingham, author of The Taste of War. Although the global supply of most basic commodities has grown enormously since the end of World War II, analysts see the persistence of resource-related conflict in areas where materials remain scarce or there is anxiety about the future reliability of supplies. Many experts believe, for example, that the fighting in Darfur and other war-ravaged areas of North Africa has been driven, at least in part, by competition among desert tribes for access to scarce water supplies, exacerbated in some cases by rising population levels. “In Darfur,” says a 2009 report from the UN Environment Programme on the role of natural resources in the conflict, “recurrent drought, increasing demographic pressures, and political marginalization are among the forces that have pushed the region into a spiral of lawlessness and violence that has led to 300,000 deaths and the displacement of more than two million people since 2003.” Anxiety over future supplies is often also a factor in conflicts that break out over access to oil or control of contested undersea reserves of oil and natural gas. In 1979, for instance, when the Islamic revolution in Iran overthrew the Shah and the Soviets invaded Afghanistan, Washington began to fear that someday it might be denied access to Persian Gulf oil. At that point, President Jimmy Carter promptly announced what came to be called the Carter Doctrine. In his 1980 State of the Union Address, Carter affirmed that any move to impede the flow of oil from the Gulf would be viewed as a threat to America’s “vital interests” and would be repelled by “any means necessary, including military force.” In 1990, this principle was invoked by President George H.W. Bush to justify intervention in the first Persian Gulf War, just as his son would use it, in part, to justify the 2003 invasion of Iraq. Today, it remains the basis for US plans to employ force to stop the Iranians from closing the Strait of Hormuz, the strategic waterway connecting the Persian Gulf to the Indian Ocean through which about 35 percent of the world’s seaborne oil commerce passes. Recently, a set of resource conflicts have been rising toward the boiling point between China and its neighbors in Southeast Asia when it comes to control of offshore oil and gas reserves in the South China Sea. Although the resulting naval clashes have yet to result in a loss of life, a strong possibility of military escalation exists. A similar situation has also arisen in the East China Sea, where China and Japan are jousting for control over similarly valuable undersea reserves. Meanwhile, in the South Atlantic Ocean, Argentina and Britain are once again squabbling over the Falkland Islands (called Las Malvinas by the Argentinians) because oil has been discovered in surrounding waters. By all accounts, resource-driven potential conflicts like these will only multiply in the years ahead as demand rises, supplies dwindle and more of what remains will be found in disputed areas. In a 2012 study titled Resources Futures, the respected British think-tank Chatham House expressed particular concern about possible resource wars over water, especially in areas like the Nile and Jordan River basins where several groups or countries must share the same river for the majority of their water supplies and few possess the wherewithal to develop alternatives. “Against this backdrop of tight supplies and competition, issues related to water rights, prices, and pollution are becoming contentious,” the report noted. “In areas with limited capacity to govern shared resources, balance competing demands, and mobilize new investments, tensions over water may erupt into more open confrontations.” Heading for a Resource-Shock World Tensions like these would be destined to grow by themselves because in so many areas supplies of key resources will not be able to keep up with demand. As it happens, though, they are not “by themselves.” On this planet, a second major force has entered the equation in a significant way. With the growing reality of climate change, everything becomes a lot more terrifying. Normally, when we consider the impact of climate change, we think primarily about the environment—the melting Arctic ice cap or Greenland ice shield, rising global sea levels, intensifying storms, expanding desert and endangered or disappearing species like the polar bear. But a growing number of experts are coming to realize that the most potent effects of climate change will be experienced by humans directly through the impairment or wholesale destruction of habitats upon which we rely for food production, industrial activities or simply to live. Essentially, climate change will wreak its havoc on us by constraining our access to the basics of life: vital resources that include food, water, land and energy. This will be devastating to human life, even as it significantly increases the danger of resource conflicts of all sorts erupting. We already know enough about the future effects of climate change to predict the following with reasonable confidence: \* Rising sea levels will in the next half-century erase many coastal areas, destroying large cities, critical infrastructure (including roads, railroads, ports, airports, pipelines, refineries and power plants) and prime agricultural land. \* Diminished rainfall and prolonged droughts will turn once-verdant croplands into dust bowls, reducing food output and turning millions into “climate refugees.” \* More severe storms and intense heat waves will kill crops, trigger forest fires, cause floods and destroy critical infrastructure. No one can predict how much food, land, water and energy will be lost as a result of this onslaught (and other climate-change effects that are harder to predict or even possibly imagine), but the cumulative effect will undoubtedly be staggering. In Resources Futures, Chatham House offers a particularly dire warning when it comes to the threat of diminished precipitation to rain-fed agriculture. “By 2020,” the report says, “yields from rain-fed agriculture could be reduced by up to 50%” in some areas. The highest rates of loss are expected to be in Africa, where reliance on rain-fed farming is greatest, but agriculture in China, India, Pakistan and Central Asia is also likely to be severely affected. Heat waves, droughts and other effects of climate change will also reduce the flow of many vital rivers, diminishing water supplies for irrigation, hydro-electricity power facilities and nuclear reactors (which need massive amounts of water for cooling purposes). The melting of glaciers, especially in the Andes in Latin America and the Himalayas in South Asia, will also rob communities and cities of crucial water supplies. An expected increase in the frequency of hurricanes and typhoons will pose a growing threat to offshore oil rigs, coastal refineries, transmission lines and other components of the global energy system. The melting of the Arctic ice cap will open that region to oil and gas exploration, but an increase in iceberg activity will make all efforts to exploit that region’s energy supplies perilous and exceedingly costly. Longer growing seasons in the north, especially Siberia and Canada’s northern provinces, might compensate to some degree for the desiccation of croplands in more southerly latitudes. However, moving the global agricultural system (and the world’s farmers) northward from abandoned farmlands in the United States, Mexico, Brazil, India, China, Argentina and Australia would be a daunting prospect. It is safe to assume that climate change, especially when combined with growing supply shortages, will result in a significant reduction in the planet’s vital resources, augmenting the kinds of pressures that have historically led to conflict, even under better circumstances. In this way, according to the Chatham House report, climate change is best understood as a “threat multiplier…a key factor exacerbating existing resource vulnerability” in states already prone to such disorders. Like other experts on the subject, Chatham House’s analysts claim, for example, that climate change will reduce crop output in many areas, sending global food prices soaring and triggering unrest among those already pushed to the limit under existing conditions. “Increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events, such as droughts, heat waves and floods, will also result in much larger and frequent local harvest shocks around the world….These shocks will affect global food prices whenever key centers of agricultural production area are hit—further amplifying global food price volatility.” This, in turn, will increase the likelihood of civil unrest. When, for instance, a brutal heat wave decimated Russia’s wheat crop during the summer of 2010, the global price of wheat (and so of that staple of life, bread) began an inexorable upward climb, reaching particularly high levels in North Africa and the Middle East. With local governments unwilling or unable to help desperate populations, anger over impossible-to-afford food merged with resentment toward autocratic regimes to trigger the massive popular outburst we know as the Arab Spring. Many such explosions are likely in the future, Chatham House suggests, if current trends continue as climate change and resource scarcity meld into a single reality in our world. A single provocative question from that group should haunt us all: “Are we on the cusp of a new world order dominated by struggles over access to affordable resources?” For the US intelligence community, which appears to have been influenced by the report, the response was blunt. In March, for the first time, Director of National Intelligence James R. Clapper listed “competition and scarcity involving natural resources” as a national security threat on a par with global terrorism, cyberwar and nuclear proliferation. “Many countries important to the United States are vulnerable to natural resource shocks that degrade economic development, frustrate attempts to democratize, raise the risk of regime-threatening instability, and aggravate regional tensions,” he wrote in his prepared statement for the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. “Extreme weather events (floods, droughts, heat waves) will increasingly disrupt food and energy markets, exacerbating state weakness, forcing human migrations, and triggering riots, civil disobedience, and vandalism.” There was a new phrase embedded in his comments: “resource shocks.” It catches something of the world we’re barreling toward, and the language is striking for an intelligence community that, like the government it serves, has largely played down or ignored the dangers of climate change. For the first time, senior government analysts may be coming to appreciate what energy experts, resource analysts and scientists have long been warning about: the unbridled consumption of the world’s natural resources, combined with the advent of extreme climate change, could produce a global explosion of human chaos and conflict. We are now heading directly into a resource-shock world.

## Case

### Multilateralism

#### Top level – Harker changed their plan text from establishing a multilateral treaty to simply restricting asteroid mining to get out of extra-T, but that means they can’t solve this advantage because a multilateral treaty isn’t getting developed if space faring nations individually restrict appropriation

#### Only the counterplan solves this advantage bc it IS a multilateral treaty that countries would go through, which all their evidence supports but their plan doesn’t follow

#### Also hold the line for the plan text – all it says is they restrict space mining and nothing else so don’t assume it’s multilateral – anything else would be extra t and their explanation in CX was WAY MORE than what the plan text is

### Debris

#### AT Scoles:

#### 1] The real danger is from NASA’s mission to transplant rocks --- plan doesn’t affect, and there’s other methods of mining

Sarah Scoles 15, “Dust from asteroid mining spells danger for satellites,” New Scientist, 5-27-2015, https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg22630235-100-dust-from-asteroid-mining-spells-danger-for-satellites/

NASA chose the second option for its Asteroid Redirect Mission, which aims to pluck a boulder from an asteroid’s surface and relocate it to a stable orbit around the moon. But an asteroid’s gravity is so weak that it’s not hard for surface particles to escape into space. Now a new model warns that debris shed by such transplanted rocks could intrude where many defence and communication satellites live – in geosynchronous orbit. According to Casey Handmer of the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena and Javier Roa of the Technical University of Madrid in Spain, 5 per cent of the escaped debris will end up in regions traversed by satellites. Over 10 years, it would cross geosynchronous orbit 63 times on average. A satellite in the wrong spot at the wrong time will suffer a damaging high-speed collision with that dust. The study also looks at the “catastrophic disruption” of an asteroid 5 metres across or bigger. Its total break-up into a pile of rubble would increase the risk to satellites by more than 30 per cent (arxiv.org/abs/1505.03800). That may not have immediate consequences. But as Earth orbits get more crowded with spent rocket stages and satellites, we will have to worry about cascades of collisions like the one depicted in the movie Gravity. Handmer and Roa want to point out the problem now so that we can find a solution before any satellites get dinged. “It is possible to quantify and manage the risk,” says Handmer. “A few basic precautions will prevent harm due to stray asteroid material.”

#### 2] Collision risk is infinitesimally small

Fange 17 Daniel Von Fange 17, Web Application Engineer, Founder and Owner of LeanCoder, Full Stack, Polyglot Web Developer, “Kessler Syndrome is Over Hyped”, 5/21/2017, http://braino.org/essays/kessler\_syndrome\_is\_over\_hyped/

The orbital area around earth can be broken down into four regions. Low LEO - Up to about 400km. Things that orbit here burn up in the earth’s atmosphere quickly - between a few months to two years. The space station operates at the high end of this range. It loses about a kilometer of altitude a month and if not pushed higher every few months, would soon burn up. For all practical purposes, Low LEO doesn’t matter for Kessler Syndrome. If Low LEO was ever full of space junk, we’d just wait a year and a half, and the problem would be over. High LEO - 400km to 2000km. This where most heavy satellites and most space junk orbits. The air is thin enough here that satellites only go down slowly, and they have a much farther distance to fall. It can take 50 years for stuff here to get down. This is where Kessler Syndrome could be an issue. Mid Orbit - GPS satellites and other navigation satellites travel here in lonely, long lives. The volume of space is so huge, and the number of satellites so few, that we don’t need to worry about Kessler here. GEO - If you put a satellite far enough out from earth, the speed that the satellite travels around the earth will match the speed of the surface of the earth rotating under it. From the ground, the satellite will appear to hang motionless. Usually the geostationary orbit is used by big weather satellites and big TV broadcasting satellites. (This apparent motionlessness is why satellite TV dishes can be mounted pointing in a fixed direction. You can find approximate south just by looking around at the dishes in your northern hemisphere neighborhood.) For Kessler purposes, GEO orbit is roughly a ring 384,400 km around. However, all the satellites here are moving the same direction at the same speed - debris doesn’t get free velocity from the speed of the satellites. Also, it’s quite expensive to get a satellite here, and so there aren’t many, only about one satellite per 1000km of the ring. Kessler is not a problem here. How bad could Kessler Syndrome in High LEO be? Let’s imagine a worst case scenario. An evil alien intelligence chops up everything in High LEO, turning it into 1cm cubes of death orbiting at 1000km, spread as evenly across the surface of this sphere as orbital mechanics would allow. Is humanity cut off from space? I’m guessing the world has launched about 10,000 tons of satellites total. For guessing purposes, I’ll assume 2,500 tons of satellites and junk currently in High LEO. If satellites are made of aluminum, with a density of 2.70 g/cm3, then that’s 839,985,870 1cm cubes. A sphere for an orbit of 1,000km has a surface area of 682,752,000 square KM. So there would be one cube of junk per .81 square KM. If a rocket traveled through that, its odds of hitting that cube are tiny - less than 1 in 10,000.

#### 3] Concedes Asteroid Mining can be regulated to still be allowed to occur – says “possible to … manage risk” – no solvency deficit to the CP.

#### AT McKnight – It’s not talking abt Asteroid Mining – it’s talking about status quo debris from current dust and rockets – inserted the table below – their evidence isn’t predictive, it’s descriptive – means current dust thumps.

McKnight 17 Dr. Darren McKnight 17, Ph.D., Technical Director for Integrity Applications, Previously Senior Vice President and Director of Science and Technology Strategy at Science Applications International Corporation, “Proposed Series of Orbital Debris Remediation Activities,” 3rd International Conference and Exhibition on Satellite & Space Missions, 5/13/2017, https://iaaweb.org/iaa/Scientific%20Activity/debrisminutes03166.pdf [graphics omitted]
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#### Means D/B – either Squo Debris Thumps or disproves the I/L – past Debris didn’t trigger escalations.