# Highland HJ Rocky Mountain Aff

#### I affirm the resolution resolved: the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust

#### First, an analysis of the resolution: Today’s topic asks us to discuss whether the private appropriation of space is justified, meaning the debate is one strictly centered around proving the morality surrounding the actions of private companies in outer space—NOT whether governments should step in to regulate appropriation. Thus, the burden of the affirmative is not one of solving any harms presented in the discussion, but rather one of proving an ethical justification for company actions. Likewise, the negative’s burden is to prove that private appropriation of outer space IS justified.

#### With that, the highest moral value the judge should seek to uphold in relation to this topic is the Sanctity of Life, because all life holds inherent and infinite value, both in the current world and into the future. To measure the achievement of the sanctity of life, you ought to use the value criterion of promoting Global Security, defined by Cambridge Dictionary as protection of the world against war and catastrophe.

## Contention 1 Concerns the Private Space Tourism Industry

#### In a series of events akin to something straight out of a classic 80’s sci fi film, the world’s most elite have begun taking private tours toward the borders of space. Howell from the University of North Dakota in December of last year writes that companies, such as Jeff Bezos’ Blue Origin and Elon Musk’s SpaceX, have formed flights that can bring anyone with the necessary financial capital to space. Howell notes that 2021 was just the beginning, and that this year we should expect to see more companies, both national and foreign, that will launch exponentially more flights. In fact, Rosenblum of the MIT Technology Review in 2013 calculates that as space tourism expands, we could see upwards of 1,000 rocket launches occurring every single year, growing into a multi-million-dollar industry.

#### Unfortunately, while this industry brings some major monetary benefits, it also brings with it a unique destruction of our atmosphere because of the rocket’s black carbon emissions. A scientific report from Live Science in 2010 reports that tourism rockets emit soot and black carbon that buildup in the atmosphere at three times the height of airline traffic and remain there for years. The report finds that our atmosphere has a particular sensitivity to the type of particles that rockets emit because the emissions are injected directly into the stratosphere, with black carbon holding the potential to steadily warm the globe and shred the ozone. Grush 18 further explains that as rocket launches increase the effect on our ozone will only get worse, approaching a tipping point from which we cannot recover. Overall, Ross and Vedda from the University of Florida in 2018 conclude that while most man-made pollution is contained to the lower aspects of our atmosphere, rocket launches particle emissions directly affect the most sensitive outer layers of the stratosphere and are sufficient to spell a death sentence for the ozone.

#### The Impact is Rapidly Accelerating the effects of Climate Change. Shulka 21 reports that scientific studies done on rocket launches found that a single space tourist flight, which only last for about an hour and a half, generates as much pollution as a 10-hour trans-Atlantic flight. Overall, Shulka concludes that the soot injected into the atmosphere from the space tourism industry would increase global temperatures over the poles by 1 degree and reduce polar sea ice levels by 5%.

## Contention 2 Concerns Catalyzing the Next Arms Race in Space

#### As private space development has accelerated in the US over the past decade, the government has been swift to capitalize on the growth. Williams 20 writes that both every president since the days of Obama have enshrined the right of of private interests to claim, own, and sell resources in space. In addition to this legal support, Tosar of BBVA in 2020 confirms that the companies that are taking part in the space industry have been attracting millions of dollars in investment, with the potential economic incentives making space extremely appealing.

#### Unfortunately, as private sector appropriation has continued to expand, the US military has been stimulated into rapidly militarizing space in order to defend economic interests. Delgado-Perez of the International Scholar in 2020 reports that commercial space exploration holds the potential for great economic gains due to the abundance of scarce minerals that are hard to find here on Earth. Inevitably though, she reports that this commercialization would lead to geopolitical competition over these extraterrestrial resources that threaten both world peace and security, especially as more nations enter the arena. Delgado-Perez finds that this securitization of private assets has already begun when in 2018 President Trump established the Space Force in order to protect economic interests in space. This has created a snowball effect in space, as she writes that International Cooperation Instruments like the Outer Space Treaty were never designed for commercial developments in space, which has left private enterprises afloat in an unstable legal vacuum that threatens to implode in geopolitical competition. Overall, she concludes that to protect investments of national space industries, states are likely to resort to military power to protect and secure their assets, essentially making space the fourth border domain over which states claim and defend their sovereignty through force.

#### For this reason, Reynolds of the New York Post on December 2nd of last year writes that the US military’s expansion into space has forced major world powers, like China, to accelerate their militarization in response. China has gone all-in for space, developing new hypersonic missiles that can launch nuclear warheads from an orbital system that can deliver the payload with devastating speed and accuracy. In addition, Russia and China have begun continuously attacking US satellites with a variety of methods, from cyber warfare to radio jamming, as well as practicing the use of anti-satellite missiles that could destroy the US’s whole fleet. In essence, foreign powers are now not concerned about maintaining peace.

#### The Impact is a War Among the Stars.

#### Hitchens of the Center for International and Security Studies in 2017 reports that rising tensions in space mean that warfare is now inevitable that threatens the now fragile diplomatic stability among nuclear powers. Overall, Grego of the Global Security Program in 2018 confirms the threat, reporting that because space is offense dominant, the pressure for nations to strike first means the chance of escalating to full scale warfare becomes a horrifying reality. The use it or lose it pressure force upon states due to the compressed reaction timelines are launched means the potential use of nuclear weapons increases exponentially.

#### Thus, because I believe that private appropriation of space threatens the security of mankind, and by extent the sanctity of life, that I am proud to affirm.

# Evidence

### F/W

#### Security – Cambridge Dictionary

“Global Security.” GLOBAL SECURITY | Definition in the Cambridge English Dictionary, Cambridge English Dictionary, n.d., dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/global-security.

Global Security: protection of the world against war and other threats:

## C1

### UQ

#### Space tourism is a rapidly growing market --- 2021 was just the beginning

Howell 21 [Elizabeth Howell, Ph.D., is a contributing writer for Space.com; she holds a Ph.D. and M.Sc. in Space Studies from the University of North Dakota, and a Bachelor of Journalism from Canada's Carleton University. Her latest book, NASA Leadership Moments, is co-written with astronaut Dave Williams. “Space Tourism Took a Giant Leap in 2021: Here’s 10 Milestones from the Year.” December 27, 2021. https://www.space.com/space-tourism-giant-leap-2021-milestones]

This year saw more space tourists fly to space on a bunch of different systems, and the story has only just begun. Virgin Galactic, Blue Origin and SpaceX each flew their first tourist-focused missions this year, sending aloft several people each with minimal training in professional spaceflight. Meanwhile, Roscosmos (the Russian federal space agency) brought two sets of space tourists into space, including a mission with Space Adventures. With 2022 also set to be busy, between more tourist flights and the expected addition of company Axiom Space (using a SpaceX Crew Dragon), we rounded up some of the main milestones of 2021 below. The four members of the Axiom Space Ax-1 crew: Michael Lopez-Alegria, former NASA astronaut, Axiom Space vice president and Ax-1 commander; Larry Connor, U.S. real estate entrepreneur and Ax-1 pilot; Mark Pathy, Canadian investor and philanthropist; and Eytan Stibbe, Israeli businessman and fighter pilot. (Image credit: collectSPACE.com) Axiom Space revealed its clients Jan. 26 for its first privately-funded and operated mission to the International Space Station (ISS). Called Axiom Mission 1 (Ax-1), the flight is arranged under a commercial agreement with NASA. Slated to launch on a SpaceX Dragon spacecraft are Larry Connor, an American real estate and technology entrepreneur; Eytan Stibbe, a businessman and former Israeli fighter pilot; Mark Pathy, a Canadian investor and philanthropist; and Michael Lopez-Alegria, a retired NASA astronaut with nearly 260 days in space already across four missions. In June, SpaceX and Axiom announced an agreement to fly three more missions to the orbiting complex after Ax-1. NASA officially cleared the Ax-1 crew for flight on Dec. 20. 2) Starship launches test flight and sticks the landing After several attempts on previous test landing that didn't make it safely to landing, SpaceX's Starship SN-15 prototype launched its own test flight May 5 and made it all the way from takeoff to touchdown. The uncrewed test flight coincidentally fell on the 60th anniversary of the United States' first-ever crewed spaceflight, which saw NASA astronaut Alan Shepard make it to suborbital space. SpaceX has said it hopes to use Starship to branch out in the solar system, especially for crewed Mars missions. 3) Virgin Galactic launches Richard Branson On July 11, Virgin Galactic launched its first operational tourist flight, featuring founder Richard Branson. It was "the experience of a lifetime," Branson said during a live broadcast of the flight. The four-person crew and two pilots of the Unity 22 test flight mission took off from the company's Spaceport America facility in New Mexico and flew just above the boundary of space, where everyone experienced about four minutes of weightlessness. Future flights of Virgin Galactic, though, have been delayed due to a Federal Aviation Administration investigation into a reported incident that happened during the spaceflight. That said, Virgin has opened up tickets again to paying spaceflyers, now at $450,000 apiece. 4) Blue Origin launches Jeff Bezos to space Days after the Virgin flight, Blue Origin launched its first crewed spaceflight on July 20, featuring founder Jeff Bezos and a set of other three space tourists, including Mercury 13 aviator Wally Funk. Since the system flies autonomously, no pilots were required to be on board (although Funk is highly qualified as an aviator) as the New Shepard system lifted off from Blue Origin's Launch Site One near the West Texas town of Van Horn. While Bezos and Branson denied their companies were in competition, the broadcast of Bezos' flight made several cutting remarks about the company flying above the Kármán line, an internationally recognized boundary of spaceflight that Virgin Galactic flights don't reach. Bezos also said in an interview in July that Blue Origin is not focused on competition, but building a "road to space." The company has adopted that catchphrase as a tagline and repeats it frequently during live broadcasts. 5) SpaceX stacks tallest booster ever with Starship SpaceX's first orbital Starship SN20 is stacked atop its massive Super Heavy Booster 4 for the first time on Aug. 6, 2021 at the company's Starbase facility near Boca Chica Village in South Texas. They stood 395 feet tall, taller than NASA's Saturn V moon rocket. (Image credit: SpaceX) SpaceX's newest Starship prototype (SN-20) perched on its massive Super Heavy booster for the first time on Friday (Aug. 6), briefly setting a new record for the world's tallest rocket during preparations for an orbital mission. The hour-long fit check brought the stack to 395 feet tall (120 m), taller than NASA's massive Saturn V moon rocket, which was 363 feet tall (110 m). Super Heavy alone stands 230 feet (70 meters) tall and Starship SN4 includes another 165 feet (50 m) of height. The next major milestone for Starship is the orbital launch that may take place in 2022, pending an environmental review by the Federal Aviation Administration and related government groups. SpaceX founder Elon Musk has pushed back launch estimates several times due to the review. 6) Inspiration4 launches 4 civilians on first orbital mission Billionaire Jared Isaacman's privately chartered spaceflight launched on Sept. 15, 2021 aboard a SpaceX Crew Dragon spacecraft, flying high in Earth orbit on a nearly three-day mission. Inspiration4 was the first crewed orbital mission with no professional astronauts on board (as the Virgin Galactic and Blue Origin flights preceding it were all suborbital missions.) Isaacman, a pilot, commanded the flight and was accompanied by physician assistant Hayley Arceneaux, data engineer Chris Sembroski, and geoscientist and science communication specialist Sian Proctor. Sembroski and Proctor won their seats in contests to support St. Jude Children's Research Hospital in Memphis, while Arceneaux is employed at that hospital. Resilience and its crew circled Earth for three days, splashing down off the Florida coast on Sept. 18. The mission exceeded its fundraising goal for St. Jude. 7) Blue Origin launches William Shatner A "Star Trek" star boldly went into suborbital space Oct. 13 on Blue Origin's second crewed space mission, called NS-18. William Shatner, 90, is best known for playing Captain James T. Kirk on "Star Trek: The Original Series." "That was unlike anything they described," Shatner was heard saying via a radio link as the capsule parachuted back to Earth, after carrying him and three other crew members to suborbital space. Shatner is now the oldest person to have ever flown to space, beating the record set by Wally Funk, 82, who flew on Blue Origin's first crewed flight July 20. Crew member Glen de Vries died in a plane crash weeks after the flight and Blue Origin dedicated their next crewed mission in December to him. 8) Russian film crew shoots drama on ISS Russian actress Yulia Peresild (center), director Klim Shipenko (second from right) and cosmonaut Oleg Novitskiy (right) bid farewell to their Russian crewmates Anton Shkaplerov (second from left) and Pyotr Dubrov before returning to Earth on Oct. 17, 2021. (Image credit: Roscosmos/Anton Shkaplerov via Twitter) Just days after Shatner's ride to space, a Russian film crew including actress Yulia Peresild and producer Klim Shipenko landed with cosmonaut Oleg Novitskiy of the Russian federal space corporation Roscosmos on Oct. 17.

#### Industry is projected to grow to over 1,000 launches per year

Rosenblum 13 [Andrew Rosenblum is a guest contributor to MIT Technology Review who reports on drones, artificial intelligence, security, and commercial space travel for Popular Science, Wired, Fortune, and other publications. “Space Tourism’s Black Carbon Problem.” May 16, 2013. https://www.popsci.com/science/article/2013-05/space-tourism-experiment-geo-engineering/]

Here’s where space tourism comes into play: The number of space launches annually around the world numbers around 70 today, but that figure could rise drastically, as private companies jockey to turn space tourism into routine adventure travel. The aerospace research firm Futron forecasts that by 2021 the space tourism market will consist of 13,000 potential customers, with possible revenues of roughly $650 million per year. Assuming the business is successful, commercial space travel might very well reach 1,000 launches per year some time in the next decade – XCOR alone plans to ramp up to four launches per day, as part of its “Southwest airlines” model. That creates 1,000 opportunities to shoot black carbon directly into the stratosphere. The amount of black carbon emitted during combustion on Earth, or in the trophosphere, where airlines fly, tends to be low, because of the relatively rich supply of oxygen. Once you get into the stratosphere, where low pressure leads to less oxygen, black carbon can amount to as much as 5% of the products of combustion. The Federal Aviation Administration (F.A.A.), the organization responsible for assessing environmental impacts and deciding whether to grant licenses to launch vehicles into space, says the effects of black carbon in the stratosphere are unclear. “Although black carbon is known to be a short-term climate forcer, research on the potential climate change impacts of black carbon from rockets is in a very early stage, and any projections of impacts are speculative,” writes George Nield, the F.A.A.’s associate administrator for commercial space transportation, in an email. The space-tourism industry has downplayed black carbon’s potential harm. Virgin Galactic declined repeated inquiries to comment. Andrew Nelson, the chief operating officer of XCOR Aerospace, which is currently selling $95,000 tickets for sub-orbital flights, says that the blend of kerosene and liquid oxygen in his XR-5K18 rocket engine powering its Lynx suborbital spaceplane will emit much less in the way of “aromatic” hydrocarbons than traditional kerosene-based rocket fuel. And he says the XR-5K18 will burn much more cleanly than the solid rocket boosters used in the Space Shuttle or “hybrid” rocket engines, which burn both solid and liquid propellant. “XCOR will have di minimus impact on our environment,” Nelson says. “Our fuels are almost completely free of particulate matter. [They have ] 20-40 times less aromatics than traditional rocket fuels, and hundreds, if not thousands of times less particulate matter than hybrids or solids. So the concern about carbon or other particles is moot for us.” Toohey still wants to see peer-reviewed studies of the actual interaction of XCOR and other engines with the stratosphere. “I have not seen any publications that confirm (or refute) the claims of particle-free emissions from combustion of any fuel in the upper atmosphere,” Toohey says. “So I think it is fair to say that we need studies to benchmark the emissions of all rocket types in order to be able to assess their impacts.”

### Link

#### Space tourism destroys the ozone due to black carbon buildups, soot, and particle emissions --- destroys ozone and causes catastrophic warming

LiveScience 10 [Live Science Staff. “New Climate Change Worry: Space Tourism Soot.” October 22, 2010. https://www.livescience.com/10202-climate-change-worry-space-tourism-soot.html]

Humans’ attempts to visit space may not be good for the folks back home, according to a new study that finds soot emitted by space tourism rockets could significantly contribute to global climate change in coming decades. The researchers assumed that a fast-growing suborbital space tourism market will develop over the next decade, and they examined the climate impact of soot and carbon dioxide emissions from 1,000 suborbital rocket flights per year, the approximate number advertised in recent materials promoting space tourism. "Rockets are the only direct source of human-produced compounds above about 14 miles (22.5 kilometers), and so it is important to understand how their exhaust affects the atmosphere," said the study's chief researcher, Martin Ross of The Aerospace Corp. in El Segundo, Calif. He and his colleagues describe their findings in a scientific paper that has been accepted for publication in Geophysical Research Letters. A layer of soot According to the study, soot particles emitted by the proposed fleet of space tourism rockets would accumulate at about 25 miles (40 km) altitude, three times higher than the altitude of airline traffic. Unlike soot from jets or coal power plants, which is injected lower in the atmosphere and falls to earth within weeks, the particles created by rockets remain in the atmosphere for years, efficiently absorbing sunlight that would otherwise reach the Earth's surface. The result is a global pattern of change, according to researcher Michael Mills of the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) in Boulder, Colo. "The response of the climate system to a relatively small input of black carbon is surprising," Mills said in a statement. "Our results show particular climate system sensitivity to the type of particles that rockets emit." Using a computer model of the Earth's atmosphere, the researchers discovered that beneath the predicted layer of soot, the Earth's surface would cool by as much as 1.2 degrees Fahrenheit (0.7 degrees Celsius). Antarctica would warm by 1.5 degrees F (0.8 degrees C). Meanwhile, equatorial regions could lose about 1 percent of their ozone, while the poles could gain 10 percent. The global effect would be an increase in the amount of solar energy absorbed by the Earth's atmosphere. That means the soot from the rockets contributes to atmospheric heating at a rate higher than the carbon dioxide from those same rockets. An earlier study by Ross, published in March 2009 in the journal Astrophysics, found that rocket emissions are particularly harmful to the ozone because they're injected directly into the stratosphere where the ozone layer resides. Considering black carbon The researchers based their predictions on business plans for suborbital space travel in the year 2020, Ross said. The current global fleet of hydrocarbon-fueled orbital rockets emits about one-tenth of the soot assumed in the study. "Climate impact assessments of suborbital and orbital rockets must consider black carbon emissions, or else they ignore the most significant part of the total climate impact from rockets," Ross said. "This includes existing assessments that may need to be brought up to date."

#### That crosses crucial tipping points

Loren Grush 18. Senior reporter. "Why it’s time to study how rocket emissions change the atmosphere". The Verge. 5-31-2018. https://www.theverge.com/2018/5/31/17287062/rocket-emissions-black-carbon-alumina-particles-ozone-layer-stratosphere

Every time a rocket launches, it produces a plume of exhaust in its wake that leaves a mark on the environment. These plumes are filled with materials that can collect in the air over time, potentially altering the atmosphere in dangerous ways. It’s a phenomenon that’s not well-understood, and some scientists say we need to start studying these emissions now before the number of rocket launches increases significantly. It’s not the gas in these plumes that’s most concerning. Some rockets do produce heat-trapping greenhouse gases, like carbon dioxide, but those emissions are negligible, according to experts. “The rocket business could grow by a factor of 1,000 and the carbon dioxide and water vapor emissions would still be small compared to other industrial sources,” Martin Ross, a senior project engineer at the Aerospace Corporation who studies the effects of rockets on the atmosphere, tells The Verge. Instead, it’s tiny particles that are produced inside the trail that we need to watch out for, Ross says. Small pieces of soot and a chemical called alumina are created in the wakes of rocket launches. They then get injected into the stratosphere, the layer of Earth’s atmosphere that begins six miles up and ends around 32 miles high. Research shows that this material may build up in the stratosphere over time and slowly lead to the depletion of a layer of oxygen known as the ozone. The ozone acts like a big shield, protecting Earth against the Sun’s harmful ultraviolet radiation. However, the magnitude of this ozone depletion isn’t totally known, says Ross. That’s why he and others at the Aerospace Corporation, a nonprofit that provides research and guidance on space missions, are calling for more studies. They say it’s especially important now since the private space industry is at the early stages of a launch revolution. Currently, the number of launches each year is relatively small, around 80 to 90, so the aerospace industry’s impact on the atmosphere is not much of a concern. But in a new paper published in April, Ross and his colleague Jim Vedda argue that as launches increase, policymakers will eventually want to know what kind of damage these vehicles are causing to the environment and if regulations are necessary. When that time comes, it will be better to have as much data as possible to make the best decisions. “It’s a call for more research in this area to know exactly what we’re putting into the upper atmosphere and in what quantities,” Vedda, a senior policy analyst at the Aerospace Corporation, tells The Verge. “So when the debates start, we have the good hard data that says, ‘Here’s a well-defined model of what’s actually happening.’” So far, the research we have about these emissions mostly comes from lab experiments, modeling, and some direct detections of rocket plumes. At the turn of the century, a few high-altitude planes equipped with sensors flew through plumes created by the Space Shuttle and other vehicles to figure out what was inside. Drifting plumes created by the Space Shuttle Atlantis. Image: NASA It turns out that all kinds of rockets produce these emissions, but some types of vehicles produce more than others. Rockets that run on solid propellants produce a higher amount of alumina particles, a combination of aluminum and oxygen that is white and reflective. Most orbital rockets don’t run on solid propellants these days, though some launch companies like the United Launch Alliance do add solid rocket boosters to vehicles to give them extra thrust. Meanwhile, rockets that run on liquid kerosene, a type of refined oil, produce more of the dark soot particles, what is known as black carbon. Kerosene is used as a propellant for rockets such as ULA’s Atlas V and SpaceX’s Falcon 9. Alumina and black carbon from rockets can stick around in the stratosphere for three to five years, according to Ross. As these materials collect high above the Earth, they can have interesting effects on the air. Black carbon forms a thin layer that intercepts and absorbs the sunlight that hits Earth. “It would act as a thin, black umbrella,” says Ross. That may help keep the lower atmosphere cool, but the intercepted energy from the Sun doesn’t just go away; it gets deposited into the stratosphere, warming it up. This warming ultimately causes chemical reactions that could lead to the depletion of the ozone layer. The reflective alumina particles can also affect the ozone but in a different way. Whereas the soot acts like a black umbrella, the alumina acts like a white one, reflecting sunlight back into space. However, chemical reactions occur on the surface of these white particles, which, in turn, destroy the ozone layer, Ross says. Black carbon and alumina have actually been proposed by scientists as possible geoengineering agents or tools for cooling down our warming climate. But while they may keep the lower atmosphere cool, geoengineering agents may have other unwanted side effects, too. They might interact with jet streams, causing droughts or more tropical storms. That’s why many scientists have criticized the idea of geoengineering to combat climate change. However, rockets are putting these particles into the air no matter what, and this byproduct of ozone loss is particularly concerning for Ross and Vedda. As the ozone diminishes, more of the Sun’s harmful radiation could reach the ground. These UVB rays can cause skin cancer and cataracts. “That’s what we need to understand — the ozone depletion aspect of this because protection of the ozone layer is an international imperative,” says Ross. The 1987 Montreal Protocol, for example, is an international agreement to phase out materials that deplete the ozone. Right now, Ross estimates that rocket launches around the world inject 10 gigagrams, or 11,000 tons, of soot and alumina particles into the atmosphere each year. But that number could be going up. SpaceX has vowed to increase the number of launches it does each year, and numerous other companies are going to start launching their own vehicles soon. What kind of impact that will have on the atmosphere is unclear. That’s why Ross and Vedda suggest the government and universities invest in a series of research programs, in which scientists collect more data on rocket particles from aircraft and satellites. “All of this plays into the scenario in which we’re envisioning a very significant increase in the number of launches, as these very large satellite constellations are deployed and as more nations get involved in space activities,” says Vedda. “Rocket emissions have been a pretty minuscule part of the emissions into the atmosphere, but this is going to change as the activity accelerates.” Vedda and Ross argue we should get ahead of the pollution issue before it has more drastic consequences, as we should have done with space debris. In the early days of spaceflight, no one was really concerned with how many spacecraft were put into space. But soon, experts recognized that this space debris could collide and build up over time, making low Earth orbit unusable someday. So now, there are regulations in place to prevent the problem from getting worse, but a lot of the damage had already been done. The researchers hope to be much more prepared about these rocket emissions: study as much as we can now, so we can make the best policy decisions in the future. “At some point, there will be a tipping point where all of a sudden, everybody says, ‘Wait a minute we need to understand this better,’” says Ross. “We want to be proactive before this tipping point occurs.”

#### Rocket launches sufficient to destroy the ozone

Martin Ross & James Vedda 18. Martin Ross, Ph.D. planetary science from UCLA, senior project engineer in civil and commercial launch programs at the Aerospace Corporation; James Vedda, Ph.D. political science from the University of Florida, senior policy analyst at the Aerospace Corporation’s Center for Space Policy & Strategy. "Time To Clear The Air About Launch Pollution". SpaceNews. 7-3-2018. https://spacenews.com/op-ed-time-to-clear-the-air-about-launch-pollution/

In recent years, governments, intergovernmental organizations, and businesses have begun to focus on the challenge posed by orbital debris. As often seems to be the case, we appear to be a decade or two too slow in coming to consensus on the risks. If we had foreseen a half-century ago the challenges that orbital debris presents today, what would we have done differently? Combustion emissions from launch vehicles present the space industry with a comparable concern that we can begin to address now, before it grows and becomes a potential impediment to space access. Most human-generated pollution is concentrated on or near the surface of the Earth, whether on land, sea, or in the troposphere, the lowest layer of the atmosphere. However, rockets emit a variety of gases and particles directly into all levels of the stratosphere, the only industrial activity to do so. The stratosphere extends roughly from 10 to 50 kilometers above the Earth’s surface and contains the Earth’s ozone layer. The global civil aviation fleet generally cruises in the troposphere, only occasionally polluting the stratosphere directly. Among the most consequential emissions are soot and alumina, which are long-lived and accumulate in the stratosphere. These accumulations promote chemical reactions and absorption and scattering of sunlight that modify the composition and flow of radiation in the stratosphere. Ultimately, these processes reduce stratospheric ozone, warm the stratosphere, and cool the Earth’s surface. Little is known about these particle accumulations and their contributions to stratospheric ozone depletion and thermal perturbations because of a lack of consistent and focused research. Since 1987, emissions of ozone-depleting pollutants are highly regulated by international agreement through the Montreal Protocol on Substances That Deplete the Ozone Layer. Even with recent advances in reusability and the introduction of large launch vehicles and new launch sites around the globe, rocket launches occur irregularly so that concerns about the damage done to the ozone layer by rocket emissions have not elicited regulation. But with projections that the global launch rate will at least double in the coming decade, increased scrutiny under the Montreal Protocol is likely. Increased concerns about the environmental impact of rocket launches, provoked by perceptions of a rapidly growing launch industry, could result in international calls for launch limitations or the phase-out of propellants that the launch industry has come to depend on. The timing and intensity of a regulatory backlash as launch rates increase is impossible to predict accurately, especially because the science of rocket emissions is still not well understood. Rather than allow a legal and regulatory process to unfold in the absence of high-quality, peer-reviewed data, governments and the launch industry should conduct the scientific research needed to fill the knowledge gaps. This will allow the launch community to engage in future far reaching discussions regarding the impacts of rocket emissions with the support of empirical data and computer models that carry the imprimatur of the rocket engineering and atmospheric science communities. The launch industry has enjoyed freedom of action with respect to rocket engine emissions since the start of the space age. Studies of future launch architectures, market demand, and lifecycle costs rarely consider regulation of emissions as a potential future risk factor. Even when emissions are considered, the impacts are examined on a system-by-system basis; the cumulative impact of the global launch fleet is not acknowledged. The net impacts of the global launch industry, across all propellant types, are the parameters of interest to international regulators and, therefore, the global impacts create the regulatory risk. In addition to acknowledging the risks and potential unintended consequences of launch emissions for ozone and the flow of radiation in the atmosphere, the space industry must recognize the extent that other emerging actors may interact with the stratosphere. For example, so-called “geoengineering” or “climate intervention” schemes propose to inject particles into the stratosphere to intercept sunlight and mitigate the warming effects of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases. Regulation of such geoengineering activity is already under discussion. Space launch operators, as contributors of stratospheric emissions, could get swept up into these discussions, which involve the same types of particulate matter associated with rocket emissions. Any resulting regulations or guidelines must include adequate consideration of launch activities, which will require a better understanding of rocket emissions than we have today. To improve that understanding, industry should encourage and support scientific research on rocket engine emissions and how they affect the atmosphere. There has been little research to date. The few research papers that have appeared in recent decades mostly point out the knowledge gaps rather than add to the knowledge base. The research has been unfocused, disorganized, and not suited to the needs of the launch industry. As it stands today, the scientific community can predict ozone depletion attributable to rocket emissions to no better than an order of magnitude. In an environment of growing launch rates, new propellants, larger, reusable launch vehicles, and the emergence of other stratospheric polluters, this is not sufficient. Lack of accurate information inevitably invites distorted competitive claims and unwarranted and overly restrictive regulation. A vigorous research program would be guided by the goal to collect high confidence information and data that describe rocket emissions as inputs into global atmosphere models and would include the following components: All of the instrumentation, models, and expertise to carry out this research already exists within the engineering and scientific communities. The in situ and test stand measurements would validate combustion and plume models. Validated models permit the development of emission profiles for particular rocket engine types. These profiles, with various growth assumptions, would be used to construct global emission projections. Finally, the global emissions scenarios would provide data to construct input profiles for modern three-dimensional whole atmospheric chemistry and climate models in order to estimate ozone loss, climate forcing, and a variety of secondary effects such as changes in the global circulation and cloud formation. A policy to promote objective and vigorous research, across the full range of propellant types, will provide the space industry with the information required to take ownership of the problem and exert strong influence on the future debate. By accepting the reality of the risk to freedom of action presented by rocket emissions, and promoting a full and complete scientific understanding of the global impacts, the industry can best inoculate itself from attempts to regulate or limit launch development and operations and disassociate itself from other polluters. There is historical precedent for such an approach. In order to promote supersonic civil aviation development, during the 1990s NASA partnered with the aviation industry to carry out the High Speed Research (HSR) program. One of the goals of HSR was to understand how High Speed Civil Transport (HSCT) aircraft would affect stratospheric ozone. Earlier HSCT efforts in the 1970s were severely and wrongly hampered by knowledge gaps with respect to ozone depletion. HSR demonstrated the airframe, engine, and operational combinations that would minimize ozone impacts and permit (if the economics had been convincing) unregulated development and deployment. The launch industry should organize around a similar approach and partner with the scientific and regulatory communities to determine how space launch can freely develop while minimizing the risks of regulatory intervention. As launch rates and launch vehicle sizes increase, the impact of rocket emissions approaches a “tipping point” when international regulation becomes likely, probably beginning with efforts to protect the ozone layer or limit stratospheric pollution to ward off geoengineering. If the launch industry moves quickly to support the necessary scientific research and fully understand these impacts – in concert with other private-sector and government stakeholders – it is more likely that future regulation will be well-informed and as limiting as possible. As with other large-scale ventures, the application of specialized expertise is essential to anticipating the risks and needs of the enterprise and to managing the impacts on society. With irrefutable data, modeling, and analyses, emissions-related regulations or limitations can be anticipated and configured to ensure that space-based capabilities and systems continue to enhance and improve human life and extend the space industry’s progress made over the past six decades.

### Impact

#### Space Tourism is devastating for the Earth’s Climate – studies prove

Shulka, Nikita. “The Environmental Costs of the Space Tourism Business.” Earth.Org - Past | Present | Future, 6 Sept. 2021, earth.org/environmental-costs-of-space-tourism-business/.

On July 20, Jeff Bezos, the founder of Amazon, flew into space along with three other companions in one of Blue Origin’s human-rated capsules. Just nine days prior, Richard Branson boarded the Virgin Galactic Unity 22 Spaceflight, which blasted off into suborbital space for a few minutes. Both companies plan on selling commercial tickets to their spacecrafts soon. SpaceX, owned by Elon Musk, plans to launch its first civilian mission in September 2021. While much of the world watched in awe as these billionaires soared into space, scientists worry that the rise and future of space tourism business could harm the Earth’s atmosphere and exacerbate the effects of climate change. Space exploration pollution has been gaining more attention in recent years and should not be ignored. The spacecraft operated by Branson’s Virgin Galactic is powered by a hybrid engine. These engines burn rubber and other fuels, and they generate a lot of soot. A space tourism flight, which lasts about an hour-and-a-half, generates as much pollution as a 10-hour trans-Atlantic flight. This raises concern considering Virgin Galactic’s ambitions to fly tourists several times a day. Small particles such as soot and aluminium oxides, can have a severe impact on the atmosphere. A 2010 research paper modelled the effects of soot injected into the atmosphere from a thousand private suborbital flights a year and found that it would increase the temperature over the poles by 1 degree Celsius and reduce polar sea ice levels by 5%. SpaceX plans on launching 395 flights in space annually. However, a single flight reportedly can generate a carbon footprint equivalent of 278 people combined. The fuel for its Falcon 9 engine consists of kerosene and liquid oxygen, which creates a lot of carbon dioxide when burnt. Holding 440 tonnes of fuel, SpaceX would release 4,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere per year if its plans of launching every two weeks are achieved. Bezos’ New Shepard, on the other hand, has been hailed as one of the cleanest in the industry.

## C2

### UQ

#### Private space appropriation is enshrined in US law across presidencies

Williams 20 [(Matt Williams, Reporter) “Trump signs an executive order allowing mining the moon and asteroids,” Phys Org, April 13, 2020, <https://phys.org/news/2020-04-trump-moon-asteroids.html>]

Trump signs an executive order allowing mining the moon and asteroidsIn 2015, the Obama administration signed the U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act (CSLCA, or H.R. 2262) into law. This bill was intended to "facilitate a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry" by making it legal for American companies and citizens to own and sell resources that they extract from asteroids and off-world locations (like the moon, Mars or beyond). On April 6th, the Trump administration took things a step further by signing an executive order that formally recognizes the rights of private interests to claim resources in [space](https://phys.org/tags/space/). This order, titled "[Encouraging International Support for the Recovery and Use of Space Resources](https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-encouraging-international-support-recovery-use-space-resources/)," effectively ends the decades-long debate that began with the signing of [the Outer Space Treaty](https://www.universetoday.com/20590/moon-for-sale/) in 1967.

#### New investments coming and companies are launching – economic incentives make space appealing

Tosar 20 [(Borja Tosar, reporter) “Asteroid Mining: A New Space Race,” OpenMind BBVA, May 18, 2020, <https://www.bbvaopenmind.com/en/science/physics/asteroid-mining-a-new-space-race/>]

This is not science fiction. There are now space mining companies, such as [Planetary Resources,](https://www.consensys.space/pr) which has already launched several mini-satellites to test several of its patents. Other companies like [Asteroid Mining Corporation](https://asteroidminingcorporation.co.uk/) or [Trans Astronautica Corporation,](https://www.transastracorp.com/) although still far from their goal, are already attracting millions of dollars of private [in] investment interested in being on the front line of a possible future space business. Is asteroid mining possible? This new space race already began back when the Hayabusa missions successfully returned a few grams of an asteroid’s regolith, so the technology to harvest asteroid material exists, we just have to change the scale. It is no longer a technological problem. Is it economically viable? We are increasingly dependent on rare elements (such as those in the palladium group), which are expensive to exploit on Earth and come with a high environmental cost, so the sum of these two factors could make it profitable to travel to the asteroids to extract these raw materials. Astrophysicist Neil deGrasse argues that [the planet’s first trillionaire will undoubtedly be a space miner.](https://www.cnbc.com/2015/05/01/build-the-economy-here-on-earth-by-exploring-space-tyson.html)

### Link

#### US private sector space expansion has forced the government to militarize to defend national interests and assets – it’s oil in the middle east all over again

Delgado-Perez, Veronica. “Analisis: The Commercialization of Space Risks Launching a Militarized Space Race.” The International Scholar, The International Scholar, 14 Dec. 2020, www.theintlscholar.com/periodical/12/14/2020/analysis-commercialization-space-risk-international-law-military-space-race.

Were outer space not considered a global commons, that would imply that the resources and results of commercial exploration may fall within the jurisdiction of a country. It is thus incumbent upon Washington — and its commercial enterprises — to demonstrate how American commercial exploration of space benefits other countries and complies with international space law, or otherwise to adhere to the spirit of past treaties which emphasize the impartiality of outer space until such time as the law is clarified. International Law is Adrift in Space. The potential benefits of commercial space exploration cannot be ignored. From an economic standpoint, the space industry would generate a significant economic boon for both states and private companies, due to the abundance and variety of resources — particularly scarce minerals that are difficult to extract on Earth. As one example of the vastness of resources held in outer space, one asteroid has the potential to contain more than the total supply of platinum [than has been] extracted throughout the history of mankind. It may very well open the door to an advanced era of space navigation, building extraterrestrial infrastructure that facilitates the exploration and use of space’s resources, and extra-planetary human habitation. Inevitably, there are significant drawbacks to the commercialization of space exploration. These can vary, for instance, from the commercial dominance of space’s natural resources only by those states with the technical and financial capital to support space missions, [would lead] to geopolitical competition over extraterrestrial resources that threatens world peace and security, to the potential for the monopolization of extraterrestrial resources by states and private companies. As was the case during the Cold War, the Soviet Union and the United States began a Space Race in which they struggled to achieve supremacy in space exploration and domination of science. Today, the number of space powers has increased thanks to continual advancements in flight, combustion, and fueling technologies. In the three decades since the end of the Cold War, technologically advanced countries like China, Japan, and France which previously had no space program have successfully navigated to the top tier of space-faring agencies and programs. In 2018, the U.S. allocated $41 billion to space programs, followed by China at $5.8 billion, and Russia at $3.1 billion. Collectively, the three major space powers control almost 65% of the global industry, showing space powers are monopolizing space and reinforcing the inequality gap between states that do not have sufficient economic and technological capacity to invest. With new actors on the game stage, conflicts of interest may arise. There is a risk that each actor adopts a kind of short-term Realist approach to space policy — one which is driven by self-interest in reaping the greatest benefits of extraterrestrial exploration and commercialization while controlling access to others. If unmitigated, states may choose to militarize outer space to gain a strategic edge over competitors and adversaries. This process has already begun. Under the Trump administration, the Pentagon established the U.S. Space Force as a new branch of the Armed Forces to protect the country and allied interests in space. Already, Delta 4 — one of the U.S. Space Force’s missions — conducts strategic and theater missile warnings, manages weapon systems, and provides information to missile defense forces. The measure shows that for the U.S., outer space is not only a domain of scientific exploration but has the potential to become increasingly securitized. With the impending expiration of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) between the U.S. and Russia on February 5, 2021, a number of security dilemmas could arise. If the world’s two largest nuclear powers do not edge toward extending the treaty, Washington and Moscow risk returning to the era of unrestricted expansion of launch platforms and strategically-deployed nuclear warheads — potentially with the aid of military infrastructure in space. Although President-elect Biden has expressed his interest in negotiating an extension of New START, how Moscow and Washington might proceed remains an open question. Bilateral progress towards a new arms-control regime would require establishing limits on the number and range of long- and mid-range missiles, establishing measures to limit the expansion of traditional missile deployment to space, and banning the deployment of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction in outer space. More than the risk of the securitization of space, state, and private actors could begin to claim exclusive legal rights over the resources they discover. Indeed, the U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act, which came into force in 2015, expressly recognizes the right of U.S. Citizens to possess, own, transport, use, and sell space resources. By this means, domestic law already acknowledges the legal claim to property by individuals, which is prohibited by international law. Under the Outer Space Treaty, states renounced any traditional form of acquisition of territories and agreed not to foray unilaterally into space to extend their national policies on Earth or to exercise any kind of sovereignty over celestial bodies or resources. The absence of a modern international treaty that addresses these issues should be received with grave concern, as there is significant potential for risk to become reality. Existing UN treaties lack the technological context and foresight to address legal questions regarding the potential for commercial exploration and exploitation of outer space or its resources. During the sixties and seventies, when international instruments like the Outer Space treaty were conceived, the principal aim of states was to support and expand the scale of the state’s national capacity for operation in space and the development of legal instruments to guide state’s international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space. These instruments were never designed to respond to [for] commercial questions over mining or tourism in space, private investment in space activities, or the emergence of non-state private enterprises operating in space. As a result, private enterprises operating in the vacuum of space also float in an unstable legal vacuum which threatens to implode in geopolitical competition. Beyond Stars and States. In an increasingly commercial outer space in which there are no set limits to the exploitation of resources or claim to property, states and private companies will inevitably pursue the development of new extraterrestrial industries to suit their geoeconomic interests. If unchecked, the legal protection of outer space as a domain of exploration for the benefit of all humanity would functionally fail. To protect investments and profit from national space industries, states would likely resort to military force to protect and secure private assets. Over time, space would ultimately become a fourth border domain over which states claim, exercise, and defend sovereignty — including through the use of force. The challenge is thus to prevent the circumstances that could lead to space-borne conflict before it is made possible. Notwithstanding, commercial exploration and the use of natural resources need not lead to predation among actors involved in space. The potential rewards — both technological and environmental — that could come from investment in the harvesting of resources in space are immense. International law cannot afford to wait for the security dilemma posed by commercial activity in space to manifest before addressing it but must anticipate and proactively adopt measures to address future issues that govern extraterrestrial human activity. The only remedy for the lack of legal governance over commercial activity in space is the creation of new international laws through a comprehensive international treaty on commercial operations in space. The new treaty must expressly regulate commercial activities by states and private companies, enshrine an international liability and compensation regime covering damages caused with workable sanction provisions, and reinforce norms that restrict any militarization of outer space. The international community should focus its efforts on establishing a legal regime, with mandatory provisions (rather than non-binding resolutions, observations, commentaries, and conclusions) which generate both international responsibility and provide enforceable sanctions in the event of violations.

### IL

#### IL - US militaristic expansion has forced both China and Russia’s hand – new space race is upon us and the US is losing

Reynolds, Glenn H. “America Is behind in the New Space Race China Is Determined to Win.” New York Post, New York Post, 2 Dec. 2021, nypost.com/2021/12/02/america-is-behind-in-space-race-china-is-determined-to-win/.

After that things kind of died down. Apollo was a Democratic initiative, pushed by Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson. Republican President Richard Nixon wasn’t as supportive, and the 1967 Outer Space Treaty had eliminated the prize by banning “national appropriation” of the Moon and other celestial bodies and by limiting (though not banning) the militarization of outer space. The Soviet Union, crippled by communism, couldn’t really afford to compete anyway, and the US government preferred to put its money into social programs. We got Skylab and eventually the white-elephant Space Shuttle, but both the United States and the Soviets (later the Russians) settled That’s changed. A new rising power, China, is looking for places where it can [to] outflank America. China has gone all-in for space, and it’s not shy about space militarization, either. China’s sometime-ally Russia is also trying harder, and the United States, despite the recent creation of the Space Force, is frankly behind. Beijing just tested a hypersonic missile that can deliver nuclear weapons and a Fractional Orbital Bombardment System that can place those missiles in hard-to-notice paths or even (though this would violate the Outer Space Treaty) in full orbit. China is researching how to build very large structures in space that could support solar-power beaming or military uses. Russia recently destroyed a satellite with an anti-satellite weapon in a demonstration of power that has created a debris cloud threatening the International Space Station, Starlink satellites and more. And both Russia and China are continuously attacking US satellites. These are what are called “reversible” attacks: blinding satellites with laser beams, jamming radio frequencies and launching cyberattacks. But both countries are also practicing “kinetic” attacks — attacks that would destroy satellites and spacecraft, as Russia did with that satellite. In an actual war, they’d want to blind US satellites and cripple US navigation and communications. (The Navy has gone back to teaching cadets how to navigate old-school using the stars just in case GPS goes out.) Short of a hot war, China might want to take out satellites for other reasons: Satellite images have been instrumental in exposing the Uighur concentration camps and new Chinese missile deployments and raised questions about whether the Wuhan coronavirus came from a lab. (Parking-lot photos suggest yes.) China is also working on space nuclear power, both for electricity on lunar bases (which they’re planning) and for propulsion. (No word on whether they’re looking at America’s never-deployed nuclear-pulse propulsion system, Orion, but I wouldn’t rule it out.) In short, it’s a new space race, and the Chinese, unlike the old Soviet Union, aren’t concerned about projecting a peaceful image. So what is the United States doing? Well, we’ve created the Space Force. A new bureaucracy generally acts energetic and creative for a decade or so before it ossifies (like NASA in the 1960s), so Space Force’s creation is an indication that the powers that be think we need that kind of energy and creativity in the coming decade. (Though Pentagon higher-ups don’t inspire much confidence these days.)

### Impact

#### Thus the Impact is a new nuclear arms race

#### Space weaponization and arms racing shatters diplomatic ties and threatens political stability

Hitchens ’17 (Theresa Hitchens, Theresa Hitchens is Senior Research Scholar at the Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, Prior to joining CISSM, Hitchens was the director of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) in Geneva from 2009 through 2014. Among her activities and accomplishments at UNIDIR, Hitchens served as a consultant to the U.N. Group of Governmental Experts on Transparency and Confidence Building Measures in Outer Space Activities, provided expert advice to the Conference on Disarmament regarding the prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS), and launched UNIDIR's annual conference on cyber security, From 2001 to 2008, Hitchens worked at the Center for Defense Information, where she served as Director, and headed the center’s Space Security Project, setting the strategic direction of the center and conducting research on space policy and other international security issues, “Space weapon technology and policy”, School of Public Policy University of Maryland, <https://aip.scitation.org/doi/pdf/10.1063/1.5009221?class=pdf>, November 2017)

Abstract. The military use of space, including in support of nuclear weapons infrastructure, has greatly increased over the past 30 years. In the current era, **rising geopolitical tensions between** the United States and Russia and China **have led to assumptions** in all three major space powers **that warfighting in space now is inevitable, and possible because of rapid technological advancements**. New capabilities for disrupting and destroying satellites include radio-frequency jamming, the use of lasers, maneuverable space objects and more capable direct-ascent anti-satellite weapons. **This situation, however, threatens international security and stability among nuclear powers. There is a continuing and necessary role for diplomacy, especially the establishment of normative rules of behavior, to reduce risks of misperceptions and crisis escalation, including** up to the **use of nuclear weapons**. U**.S. policy and strategy should seek a balance between traditional military approaches to protecting its space assets and diplomatic tools to create a more secure space environment.** I. INTRODUCTION Outer space is recognized by all nations as “the province of mankind” not subject to national boundaries or appropriation via both treaty – especially the 1967 Outer Space Treaty1 – and by the practice of nation states. Since the dawn of the space age, the use of satellites has become integral to the global economy, including providing communications, weather services, mapping, precision timing and navigation services for shipping, secure crossborder banking, and Internet connectivity. Every state has both an interest in making use of space, and reason to deal with its use by other states, because **the activities in space by one actor have the potential to impact all others**, for good or for bad. In addressing international and national security, and nuclear security in particular, the space environment has played a role of great importance from almost the beginning of the nuclear age. The first satellites launched by the Soviet Union and the United States were oriented toward seeking information on what was transpiring in areas controlled by the other, and to verify bilateral arms control agreements. While in short order space systems also were integrated to the offensive uses of long-range delivery systems by providing photographic information about potential targets, strategic space systems were during the Cold War widely viewed as stabilizing the Superpower nuclear competition. The use of space for military purposes has continued into the present era, with increasing capabilities to take advantage of large segments of the electromagnetic spectrum for acquiring intelligence, communicating globally, and generally supporting ways of using nuclear weapons both for deterrence, and, should deterrence fail, use of those weapons against an adversary. Most of the nuclear weapon possessing states operate satellites for these purposes. Perhaps as importantly, space systems over the last two decades have become integral to the tactical warfighting ability of many modern states – a situation that has complicated the status of space systems as strategically stabilizing. Indeed, the growing use of space by many countries to achieve victory on the battlefield has increased both the vulnerability of militaries to attacks on their space systems and has, at the same time, increased their value as potential targets in a war. Over the past 50 years, the Soviet Union, the United States, and China have carried out experiments in or aimed at the outer space environment – mostly the area close to the atmosphere in Low Earth Orbit (LEO) – that show the capability to destroy a satellite, or to disrupt its functions. The specter of space warfare for many years has, among other negative consequences, raised concerns that a state’s nuclear retaliatory capability could be compromised. This concern also applies more generally, of course, to an ability to disrupt communications functions for other military, or civilian, purposes. In the 1980s, there was a period when the United States, and perhaps others, explored whether systems based in space could be used to destroy an adversary’s intercontinental ballistic missiles, or their payloads. The so-called Star Wars program under the Reagan Administration envisioned the deployment of a system of satellites that would seek to destroy the missiles/warheads launched at the United States. One technology explored envisioned detonating a nuclear explosive to generate a beam of x-rays that would put out of commission the adversary’s warhead. Thus far, such technologies have not succeeded in playing a role in the nuclear-weapon situation globally. However, the U.S. descendant of the Star Wars program – currently limited to conventionally equipped, ground- and sea-based missile defense interceptors with limited capability against a full-blown nuclear attack – continues to stress nuclear deterrence and stability between the United States and Russia, as well as China, which maintains a much smaller nuclear arsenal than the Cold War adversaries. However, recent missile experiments by China have demonstrated the vulnerability of the geosynchronous equatorial orbit (GEO), where many hundreds of satellites are “parked” carrying out communications and other functions, including nuclear weapons support systems and spy satellites. II. INCREASED THREATS INVOLVING OUTER SPACE Since the first satellites were launched in the 1950s by the Soviet Union and then the United States, the Russian Federation, the United States, China, India, Japan, and other states have, without much coordination, launched so many satellites into space into various orbits and at various altitudes that there is currently a strong risk of both congestion and competition. There is no global regime for regulating outer space activities. The Outer Space Treaty of 1967, to which all the launching states, and most others, are party2 mandates that outer space be used solely for peaceful purposes, and prohibits the stationing of nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction in that environment. (The Treaty does not prohibit the transit of nuclear weapons, e.g. as a payload on a submarine-launched ballistic missile, through outer space; furthermore under common law practice, defensive military activities are tolerated as compliant with “peaceful purposes.”) The Outer Space Treaty, however, makes it clear that states are responsible for their own space activities, and compliance with international law. And while there are a number of other spacerelated treaties, UN principles and voluntary agreements managed by various UN and multilateral bodies, a nation’s activities in space are largely regulated by that nation alone. There is no international legal requirement for any one state to coordinate its satellite launches or maneuvers with others. Environmental Threats: Crowding and Debris Some 1,500 operational satellites are now in orbit, owned by more than 80 states or other entities. These states and entities have varying levels both of proficiency and of knowledge of the established laws and rules affecting space. In the radio frequency band of the electromagnetic spectrum, interference is rising, especially in the GEO regime. Some of this interference is deliberate, undertaken for political purposes, despite the fact that deliberate interference is one of the few legally binding restraints in the international space arena3 . The evolution in satellite technology has led to the wider use of smaller satellites, including so-called “Cubesats,” that can be deployed in constellations, especially in LEO. The number of operational satellites is expected to rise to many thousands within the decade. LEO, in particular, is becoming incredibly crowded with satellites, making tracking of on-orbit objects extremely difficult. Furthermore, many small satellites have no ability to maneuver to avoid collisions with other satellites and space debris. The half-century of using space has resulted, from the breakup of satellites and other activities, in a considerable amount of on-orbit debris – including satellites no longer in use, parts of satellites that have broken up, launcher stages, nuts and bolts, and debris from the deliberate destruction of satellites. The United States and others track some 23,000 orbiting pieces with a diameter of greater than 10 cm. This debris is especially dangerous if a satellite or transiting vehicle collides with a piece, since the closing velocity of such a collision on-orbit is very high – some 7.5 kilometers per second (faster than a bullet) in LEO. Worse yet, even very small debris, most of which cannot be detected much less tracked, can destroy an operational satellite; it is estimated that some 500,000 to one million pieces of debris smaller than 10 centimeters exist on orbit. **It is widely agreed that new international measures to better coordinate space activities are required to ensure that the space environment is sustained**. In 2007, the United Nations Committee for the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS) in Vienna, Austria, agreed on a set of guidelines for the mitigation of space debris, which are slowly being implemented by many space-faring states. It may be that such measures will eventually require removal of debris from orbit, as the decay of debris from space into the atmosphere where it burns up (or falls on Earth) is a very long-term prospect, taking as much as 25 years in LEO. Sadly, the lifetime of debris in GEO, like diamonds, is practically forever. COPUOS currently is working on a set of recommended best practices to ensure the “long-term sustainability of space.” COPUOS has a 2018 deadline to finish this work; however, there is already discussion of follow-on effort that may include international guidelines for debris removal. Increasing Military Tensions in Space In the geopolitical sphere, compared with the period following the breakup of the Soviet Union, the current decade is witnessing increased tensions between the United States and Russia, and between the United States and China.

#### That goes nuclear – space is fragile and offense dominant, so even small incidents escalate

Laura Grego 18, Senior Scientist in the Global Security Program at the Union of Concerned Scientists, Postdoctoral Researcher at the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, PhD in Experimental Physics at the California Institute of Technology, Space and Crisis Stability, Union of Concerned Scientists, 3-19-18, <https://www.law.upenn.edu/live/files/7804-grego-space-and-crisis-stabilitypdf>

Why space is a particular problem for crisis stability For a number of reasons, space poses particular challenges in preventing a crisis from starting or from being managed well. Some of these are to do with the physical nature of space, such as the short timelines and difficulty of attribution inherent in space operations. Some are due to the way space is used, such as the entanglement of strategic and tactical missions and the prevalence of dual-use technologies. Some are due to the history of space, such the absence of a shared understanding of appropriate behaviors and consequences, and a dearth of stabilizing personal and institutional relationships. While some of these have terrestrial equivalents, taken together, they present a special challenge. The vulnerability of satellites and first strike incentives Satellites are inherently fragile and difficult to protect; in the language of strategic planners, space is an “offense-dominant” regime. This can lead to a number of pressures to strike first that don‘t exist for other, better-protected domains. Satellites travel on predictable orbits, and many pass repeatedly over all of the earth‘s nations. Low-earth orbiting satellites are reachable by missiles much less capable than those needed to launch satellites into orbit, as well as by directed energy which can interfere with sensors or with communications channels. Because launch mass is at a premium, satellite armor is impractical. Maneuvers on orbit need costly amounts of fuel, which has to be brought along on launch, limiting satellites‘ ability to move away from threats. And so, these very valuable satellites are also inherently vulnerable and may present as attractive targets. Thus, an actor with substantial dependence on space has an incentive to strike first if hostilities look probable, to ensure these valuable assets are not lost. Even if both (or all) sides in a conflict prefer not to engage in war, this weakness may provide an incentive to approach it closely anyway. A RAND Corporation monograph commissioned by the Air Force15 described the issue this way: First-strike stability is a concept that Glenn Kent and David Thaler developed in 1989 to examine the structural dynamics of mutual deterrence between two or more nuclear states.16 It is similar to crisis stability, which Charles Glaser described as ―a measure of the countries‘ incentives not to preempt in a crisis, that is, not to attack first in order to beat the attack of the enemy,‖17 except that it does not delve into the psychological factors present in specific crises. Rather, first strike stability focuses on each side‘s force posture and the balance of capabilities and vulnerabilities that could make a crisis unstable should a confrontation occur. For example, in the case of the United States, the fact that conventional weapons are so heavily dependent on vulnerable satellites may create incentives for the US to strike first terrestrially in the lead up to a confrontation, before its space-derived advantages are eroded by anti-satellite attacks.18 Indeed, any actor for which satellites or space-based weapons are an important part of its military posture, whether for support missions or on-orbit weapons, will feel “use it or lose it” pressure because of the inherent vulnerability of satellites. Short timelines and difficulty of attribution The compressed timelines characteristic of crises combine with these “use it or lose it” pressures to shrink timelines. This dynamic couples dangerously with the inherent difficulty of determining the causes of satellite degradation, whether malicious or from natural causes, in a timely way. Space is a difficult environment in which to operate. Satellites orbit amidst increasing amounts of debris. A collision with a debris object the size of a marble could be catastrophic for a satellite, but objects of that size cannot be reliably tracked. So a failure due to a collision with a small piece of untracked debris may be left open to other interpretations. Satellite electronics are also subject to high levels of damaging radiation. Because of their remoteness, satellites as a rule cannot be repaired or maintained. While on-board diagnostics and space surveillance can help the user understand what went wrong, it is difficult to have a complete picture on short timescales. Satellite failure on-orbit is a regular occurrence19 (indeed, many satellites are kept in service long past their intended lifetimes). In the past, when fewer actors had access to satellite-disrupting technologies, satellite failures were usually ascribed to “natural” causes. But increasingly, even during times of peace operators may assume malicious intent. More to the point, in a crisis when the costs of inaction may be perceived to be costly, there is an incentive to choose the worst-case interpretation of events even if the information is incomplete or inconclusive. Entanglement of strategic and tactical missions During the Cold War, nuclear and conventional arms were well separated, and escalation pathways were relatively clear. While space-based assets performed critical strategic missions, including early warning of ballistic missile launch and secure communications in a crisis, there was a relatively clear sense that these targets were off limits, as attacks could undermine nuclear deterrence. In the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, the US and Soviet Union pledged not to interfere with each other‘s ―national technical means‖ of verifying compliance with the agreement, yet another recognition that attacking strategically important satellites could be destabilizing.20 There was also restraint in building the hardware that could hold these assets at risk. However, where the lines between strategic satellite missions and other missions are blurred, these norms can be weakened. For example, the satellites that provide early warning of ballistic missile launch are associated with nuclear deterrent posture, but also are critical sensors for missile defenses. Strategic surveillance and missile warning satellites also support efforts to locate and destroy mobile conventional missile launchers. Interfering with an early warning sensor satellite might be intended to dissuade an adversary from using nuclear weapons first by degrading their missile defenses and thus hindering their first-strike posture. However, for a state that uses early warning satellites to enable a “hair trigger” or launch-on-attack posture, the interference with such a satellite might instead be interpreted as a precursor to a nuclear attack. It may accelerate the use of nuclear weapons rather than inhibit it. Misperception and dual-use technologies Some space technologies and activities can be used both for relatively benign purposes but also for hostile ones. It may be difficult for an actor to understand the intent behind the development, testing, use, and stockpiling of these technologies, and see threats where there are none. (Or miss a threat until it is too late.) This may start a cycle of action and reaction based on misperception. For example, relatively low-mass satellites can now maneuver autonomously and closely approach other satellites without their cooperation; this may be for peaceful purposes such as satellite maintenance or the building of complex space structures, or for more controversial reasons such as intelligence-gathering or anti-satellite attacks. Ground-based lasers can be used to dazzle the sensors of an adversary‘s remote sensing satellites, and with sufficient power, they may damage those sensors. The power needed to dazzle a satellite is low, achievable with commercially available lasers coupled to a mirror which can track the satellite. Laser ranging networks use low-powered lasers to track satellites and to monitor precisely the Earth‘s shape and gravitational field, and use similar technologies. 21 Higher-powered lasers coupled with satellite-tracking optics have fewer legitimate uses. Because midcourse missile defense systems are intended to destroy long-range ballistic missile warheads, which travel at speeds and altitudes comparable to those of satellites, such defense systems also have inherent ASAT capabilities. In fact, while the technologies being developed for long-range missile defenses might not prove very effective against ballistic missiles—for example, because of the countermeasure problems associated with midcourse missile defense— they could be far more effective against satellites. This capacity is not just theoretical. In 2007, China demonstrated a direct-ascent anti-satellite capability which could be used both in an ASAT and missile defense role, and in 2009, the United States used a ship-based missile defense interceptor to destroy a satellite, as well. US plans indicated a projected inventory of missile defense interceptors with capability to reach all low earth orbiting satellites in the dozens in the 2020s, and in the hundreds by 2030.22 Discrimination The consequences of interfering with a satellite may be vastly different depending on who is affected and how, and whether the satellite represents a legitimate military objective. However, it will not always be clear who the owners and operators of a satellite are, and users of a satellite‘s services may be numerous and not public. Registration of satellites is incomplete23 and current ownership is not necessarily updated in a readily available repository. The identification of a satellite as military or civilian may be deliberately obscured. Or its value as a military asset may change over time; for example, the share of capacity of a commercial satellite used by military customers may wax and wane. A potential adversary‘s satellite may have different or additional missions that are more vital to that adversary than an outsider may perceive. An ASAT attack that creates persistent debris could result in significant collateral damage to a wide range of other actors; unlike terrestrial attacks, these consequences are not limited geographically, and could harm other users unpredictably. In 2015, the Pentagon‘s annual wargame, or simulated conflict, involving space assets focused on a future regional conflict. The official report out24 warned that it was hard to keep the conflict contained geographically when using anti-satellite weapons: As the wargame unfolded, a regional crisis quickly escalated, partly because of the interconnectedness of a multi-domain fight involving a capable adversary. The wargame participants emphasized the challenges in containing horizontal escalation once space control capabilities are employed to achieve limited national objectives. Lack of shared understanding of consequences/proportionality States have fairly similar understandings of the implications of military actions on the ground, in the air, and at sea, built over decades of experience. The United States and the Soviet Union/Russia have built some shared understanding of each other‘s strategic thinking on nuclear weapons, though this is less true for other states with nuclear weapons. But in the context of nuclear weapons, there is an arguable understanding about the crisis escalation based on the type of weapon (strategic or tactical) and the target (counterforce—against other nuclear targets, or countervalue—against civilian targets). Because of a lack of experience in hostilities that target space-based capabilities, it is not entirely clear what the proper response to a space activity is and where the escalation thresholds or “red lines” lie. Exacerbating this is the asymmetry in space investments; not all actors will assign the same value to a given target or same escalatory nature to different weapons.