| **1NC-Counterplan** |
| --- |

**The Committee on the Peaceful use of Outer Space ought to**

* **establish an application system for property rights on celestial bodies. Applications and approval of property rights should be granted upon the condition of**
* **Applications must be publicly announced**
* **Property Rights will be made tradeable between private entities**
* **Property Rights will be set to expire on the conclusion of a successful extraction mission**
* **Private Entities will only be allowed one property right grant per celestial body and cannot have more than one grant at a time**
* **Ban the militarization of outer space**

**The counterplan establishes international norms for safe extraction of resources on celestial bodies while increasing R&D in outer space.**

**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%2520accessed%252012/12/21)**] Adam**

**4. The data-centered 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 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, characterizing 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#bib24)**] and Crawford [**[**25**](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964621000515#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#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#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#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#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.**

**No need to ban – regulations solve all of their problems meaning the aff isn’t true.**

| **1NC-Tech** |
| --- |

**Strong commercial space catalyzes tech innovation – progress at the margins and spinoff tech change global information networks**

**Hampson 17**

Joshua Hampson 2017, Security Studies Fellow at the Niskanen Center, 1-25-2017, “The Future of Space Commercialization”, Niskanen Center, https://republicans-science.house.gov/sites/republicans.science.house.gov/files/documents/TheFutureofSpaceCommercializationFinal.pdf

Innovation is generally hard to predict; some new technologies seem to come out of nowhere and others only take off when paired with a new application. It is difficult to predict the future, but **it is reasonable to expect that a growing space economy would open opportunities for technological and organizational innovation**. In terms of technology, **the difficult environment of outer space helps incentivize progress along the margins.** Because each object launched into orbit costs a significant amount of money—at the moment between $27,000 and $43,000 per pound, though that will likely drop in the future —each 19 reduction in payload size saves money or means more can be launched. At the same time, the ability to fit more capability into a smaller satellite opens outer space to actors that previously were priced out of the market. This is one of the reasons why small, affordable satellites are increasingly pursued by companies or organizations that cannot afford to launch larger traditional satellites. These small 20 satellites also provide non-traditional launchers, such as engineering students or prototypers, the opportunity to learn about satellite production and test new technologies before working on a full-sized satellite. **That expansion of developers, experimenters, and testers cannot but help increase innovation opportunities**. **Technological developments from outer space have been applied to terrestrial life since the earliest days of space exploration**. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) maintains a website that lists technologies that have spun off from such research projects**. Lightweight** 21 **nanotubes**, useful in protecting astronauts during space exploration, **are now being tested for applications in emergency response gear and electrical insulation**. The need for certainty about the resiliency of materials used in space led to the development of an analytics tool useful across a range of industries. Temper foam, the material used in memory-foam pillows, was developed for NASA for seat covers. **As more companies pursue their own space goals, more innovations will likely come from the commercial sector. Outer space is not just a catalyst for technological development.** Satellite constellations and their unique line-of-sight vantage point **can provide new perspectives to old industries**. Deploying satellites into low-Earth orbit, as Facebook wants to do, can connect large, previously-unreached swathes of 22 humanity to the Internet. **Remote sensing technology could change how whole industries operate, such as crop monitoring, herd management, crisis response, and land evaluation, among others**. 23 While satellites cannot provide all essential information for some of these industries, they can fill in some useful gaps and work as part of a wider system of tools. **Space infrastructure, in helping to change how people connect and perceive Earth, could help spark innovations on the ground as well. These innovations, changes to global networks, and new opportunities could lead to wider economic growth.**

**Even if they claim they don’t defend implementation, the disad still disproves the desirability of the aff by indicating that the aff’s normative statement is bad**

**Short innovation cycles mean every contract counts**

John J. **Klein 19**, Senior Fellow and Strategist at Falcon Research Inc. and adjunct professor at the George Washington University Space Policy Institute, 1-15-2019, "Rethinking Requirements and Risk in the New Space Age," Center for a New American Security, https://www.cnas.org/publications/reports/rethinking-requirements-and-risk-in-the-new-space-age

Unfortunately, these variances in models between the MDAP’s lengthy development cycle and the commercial space sector’s 18-month innovation cycle are a result of stark differences in thinking about requirements and risk. Requirements and risk for MDAPs commonly focus on ensuring critical mission capabilities at a given cost. In contrast, the commercial space sector tends to focus more on providing innovation quickly using economies of scale. The commercial sector understands that time dynamically shapes decisions related to requirements and risk **because of the relatively short innovation cycle**. **In a highly competitive space sector with tight profit margins, those unable to innovate quickly will likely be out of business soon**. Alternatively, space systems with mission assurance requirements – where failures are detrimental to national security and military operations – often drive DoD’s timelines. Program managers of critical national security space systems commonly require additional time to test and verify that satellites can perform missions with a very low probability of failure.

**Tech innovation solves every existential threat – cumulative extinction events outweigh the aff**

Dylan **Matthews 18**. Co-founder of Vox, citing Nick Beckstead @ Rutgers University. 10-26-2018. "How to help people millions of years from now." Vox. <https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/26/18023366/far-future-effective-altruism-existential-risk-doing-good>

If you care about improving human lives, you should overwhelmingly care about those quadrillions of lives rather than the comparatively small number of people alive today. The 7.6 billion people now living, after all, amount to less than 0.003 percent of the population that will live in the **future**. It’s reasonable to suggest that those **quadrillions** of future people have, accordingly, **hundreds of thousands of times** more moral weight than those of us living here **today** do. That’s the basic argument behind Nick Beckstead’s 2013 Rutgers philosophy dissertation, “On the overwhelming importance of shaping the far future.” It’s a glorious mindfuck of a thesis, not least because Beckstead shows very convincingly that this is a conclusion any plausible moral view would reach. It’s not just something that weird utilitarians have to deal with. And Beckstead, to his considerable credit, walks the walk on this. He works at the Open Philanthropy Project on grants relating to the far future and runs a charitable fund for donors who want to prioritize the far future. And arguments from him and others have turned “long-termism” into a very vibrant, important strand of the effective altruism community. But what does prioritizing the far future even mean? The most **literal** thing it could mean is preventing human **extinction**, to ensure that the species persists as long as possible. For the long-term-focused effective altruists I know, that typically means identifying concrete threats to humanity’s continued existence — like unfriendly artificial intelligence, or a pandemic, or global warming/out of control geoengineering — and engaging in activities to prevent that specific eventuality. But in a set of slides he made in 2013, Beckstead makes a compelling case that while that’s certainly **part** of what caring about the far future entails, approaches that address **specific threats** to humanity (which he calls “**targeted**” approaches to the far future) have to **complement** “**broad**” approaches, where instead of trying to **predict** what’s going to kill us all, you just **generally try to keep civilization running as best it can**, so that it is, as a whole, well-equipped to deal with **potential** extinction events in the **future**, not just in 2030 or 2040 but in 3500 or 95000 or even 37 million. In other words, caring about the far future **doesn’t mean just paying attention to low-probability risks of total annihilation**; it also means **acting on pressing needs now**. For example: We’re going to be **better prepared** to prevent extinction from **AI** or a **supervirus** or **global warming** if society as a whole makes **a lot of scientific progress**. And a significant bottleneck there is that the vast majority of humanity doesn’t get high-enough-quality education to engage in scientific research, if they want to, which reduces the odds that we have enough trained scientists to come up with the breakthroughs we need as a civilization to survive and thrive. So maybe one of the **best thing**s we can do for the **far future** is to improve school systems — here and now — to harness the group economist Raj Chetty calls “lost Einsteins” (**potential innovators** who are thwarted by poverty and inequality in rich countries) and, more importantly, the hundreds of millions of kids in developing countries dealing with even worse education systems than those in depressed communities in the rich world. What if living ethically for the far future means living ethically now? Beckstead mentions some other broad, or very broad, ideas (these are all his descriptions): Help make computers faster so that people everywhere can work more efficiently Change intellectual property law so that technological innovation can happen more quickly Advocate for open borders so that people from poorly governed countries can move to better-governed countries and be more productive Meta-research: improve **incentives** and **norms** in **academic work** to better advance human knowledge Improve education Advocate for political party X to make future people have values more like political party X ”If you look at these areas (economic growth and technological progress, access to information, individual capability, social coordination, motives) a lot of everyday good works contribute,” Beckstead writes. “An implication of this is that a lot of everyday good works are good from a broad perspective, even though hardly anyone thinks explicitly in terms of far future standards.” Look at those examples again: It’s just a list of what normal altruistically motivated people, not effective altruism folks, generally do. Charities in the US love talking about the lost opportunities for innovation that poverty creates. Lots of smart people who want to make a difference become scientists, or try to work as teachers or on improving education policy, and lord knows there are plenty of people who become political party operatives out of a conviction that the moral consequences of the party’s platform are good. All of which is to say: Maybe effective altruists aren’t that special, or at least maybe we don’t have access to that many specific and weird conclusions about how best to help the world. If the far future is what matters, and generally trying to make the world work better is among the best ways to help the far future, then effective altruism just becomes plain ol’ do-goodery.\*

**Technology good – indigenous nations make use of satellite data incorporating it into indigenous culture**

**Native Views From Space 3** https://www.nasa.gov/vision/earth/lookingatearth/F\_Native\_Views\_Space.html

Through traditional customs and symbols like the medicine wheel, a circular arrangement of stones often interpreted as representing the relationship between Earth, air, water and fire, Native Americans have long recognized and celebrated the connectedness among all natural things. Indeed, the Native American view of the world has always been consistent with that of Earth system science -- that Earth is a single system of interconnected parts. James Rattling Leaf, a member of South Dakota's Rosebud Sioux tribe, is helping Native Americans to see interactions between Earth's various components -- land, air, water and living things -- in a new light. As director of the Land and Natural Resources Program at Sinte Gleska University's (SGU) Sicangu Policy Institute, Rattling Leaf heads several projects under the NativeView initiative aimed at improving resource management, agriculture, economic development and education through the use of NASA data and technology. NativeView is a geospatial education and application effort led by SGU, a tribal college located on the Rosebud Reservation in Mission, South Dakota, in cooperation with the United States Geological Survey (USGS). In all, more than 30 tribal colleges and universities around the country are involved in the project.A major goal of NativeView is to effectively merge Western science with Native American culture. "Reverence and knowledge for the land is ingrained in tribal spirituality, social interactions, community services and individual life," Rattling Leaf said. "Aerial and satellite imagery are natural extensions of the traditional view of the landscape."

| **1NC-Minning** |
| --- |

**Commercial asteroid mining is coming now – lower costs and improving tech make it economically viable – and the legal basis is already in place in multiple countries– that helps acquire water for rocket fuel and rare earth metals**

**Gilbert 21**

alex gilbert, is a complex systems researcher and a PhD student in space resources at the Colorado School of Mines. "Mining in Space Is Coming." Milken Institute Review, April 26, 2021, [www.milkenreview.org/articles/mining-in-space-is-coming](http://www.milkenreview.org/articles/mining-in-space-is-coming). [Quality Control]

**Space exploration is back**. after decades of disappointment, a combination of better technology, falling costs and a rush of competitive energy from the private sector has put space travel **front and center**. indeed, many analysts (even some with their feet on the ground) believe that commercial developments in the space industry may be on the cusp of starting the largest resource rush in history: **mining on the Moon**, Mars and **asteroids**.

While this may sound fantastical, some baby steps toward the goal have already been taken. Last year, NASA awarded contracts to four companies to extract small amounts of lunar regolith by 2024, effectively **beginning the era of commercial space mining**. Whether this proves to be the dawn of a gigantic adjunct to mining on earth — and more immediately, a key to unlocking cost-effective space travel — will turn on the answers to a host of questions ranging from what resources can be efficiently. As every fan of science fiction knows, the resources of the solar system appear **virtually unlimite**d compared to those on Earth. There are whole other planets, dozens of moons, thousands of massive asteroids and millions of small ones that doubtless contain humungous quantities of materials that are scarce and very valuable (back on Earth). Visionaries including Jeff Bezos imagine heavy industry moving to space and Earth becoming a residential area. However, as entrepreneurs look to harness the riches beyond the atmosphere, access to space resources remains tangled in the realities of economics and governance.Start with the fact that space belongs to no country, complicating traditional methods of resource allocation, property rights and trade. With limited demand for materials in space itself and the need for huge amounts of energy to return materials to Earth, creating a viable industry will turn on major advances in technology, finance and business models. That said, there’s no grass growing under potential pioneers’ feet. Potential economic, scientific and even security benefits underlie an emerging geopolitical competition to pursue space mining. The United States is rapidly emerging as a front-runner, in part due to its ambitious Artemis Program to lead a multinational consortium back to the Moon. But it is also a leader in **creating a legal infrastructure for mineral exploitation**. The United States has adopted the world’s first spaceresources law, recognizing the property rights of private companies and individuals to materials gathered in space.

However, the United States is hardly alone. Luxembourg and the United Arab Emirates (you read those right) are racing to codify space-resources laws of their own, hoping to attract investment to their entrepot nations with business-friendly legal frameworks. China reportedly views space-resource development as a national priority, part of a strategy to challenge U.S. economic and security primacy in space. Meanwhile, Russia, Japan, India and the European Space Agency all harbor space-mining ambitions of their own. Governing these emerging interests is an outdated treaty framework from the Cold War. Sooner rather than later, we’ll need new agreements to facilitate private investment and ensure international cooperation.

What’s Out There

Back up for a moment. For the record, space is already being heavily exploited, because space resources include non-material assets such as orbital locations and abundant sunlight that enable satellites to provide services to Earth. Indeed, satellite-based telecommunications and global positioning systems have become indispensable infrastructure underpinning the modern economy. Mining space for materials, of course, is another matter.

In the past several decades, planetary science has confirmed what has long been suspected: celestial bodies are potential sources for dozens of natural materials that, in the right time and place, are **incredibly valuable**. Of these, water may be the most attractive in the near-term, because — with assistance from solar energy or nuclear fission — H2O can be split into hydrogen and oxygen to make **rocket propellant**, facilitating in-space refueling. So-called “**rare earth” metals** are also **potential targets** of asteroid miners intending to service Earth markets. Consisting of 17 elements, including lanthanum, neodymium, and yttrium, these critical materials (most of which are today mined in China at great environmental cost) **are required for electronic**s. **And they loom as bottlenecks in making the transition from fossil fuels to renewables backed up by battery storage.**

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

**Meyers 15** Meyers, Ross. J.D. candidate at the University of Oregon Law School. "The doctrine of appropriation and asteroid mining: incentivizing the private exploration and development of outer space." Or. Rev. Int'l L. 17 (2015): 183. Italics in original. [Quality Control]

The **doctrine of appropriation** is a reasonable rule for adjudicating asteroid claims, and it could **easily be modified to apply to asteroid mining**. In the context of water rights, the doctrine of appropriation requires that the claimant be a landowner in order to claim the right to use a water source. It does not make sense, however, for the international community to grant complete ownership over asteroids toa single entity, so the landowner requirement of the rule should be removed. A similar modification would need to be made to the "beneficial use" language of the doctrine.

In the context of water rights, an appropriator obtains rights only to water that he or she can reasonably put to beneficial use. The metals contained in asteroids have a high level of marketability. For that reason, a mining entity could potentially put any amount of obtained metal to beneficial use, in the sense that the resources can be sold. This, however, would defeat the purpose of the rule, which is to limit such unreasonable claims. To ameliorate this problem, the doctrine of appropriation could be modified to define "beneficial use "constructively by providing that beneficial use is assumed for any resources that have been removed from the asteroid that the mining entity can reasonably hope to transport to market in a return journey. With the **astronomical cost** of undertaking a trip to such an asteroid, this modification would limit mining entities to only what they can carry back, thereby leaving the untapped resources available to other entities capable of making the same trip. Considering the size and profitability of metal deposits on asteroids, this modification to the doctrine of appropriation would **not be overly burdensome to corporate interests**. At the same time, it would **satisfy the economic imperative of promoting the rapid development of asteroid resources.**

By changing the landowner requirement, and qualifying the “beneficial use" language, the doctrine of appropriation would be essentially ready for application to asteroid mining claims. The only other changes necessary would be some additional requirements that are common to other space related provisions, like those found in the Outer Space Treaty of 1968. For example, a reporting requirement or clause guaranteeing asylum for other astronauts. A functional rule might read something like this:

*State parties or private entities may, upon actual possession, lay claim to natural resources found on or below the surface of asteroids. Rights to appropriate are given in order of seniority, starting with the first party to land on the surface of the asteroid and establish control over the resources, be it water, methane, metal, or any other beneficial substances. A party will be said to have established control over a resource once he has mined the substance and removed it from the asteroid. A senior appropriator may use as much of the asteroid's resources as he can take from the asteroid and put to beneficial use, and may continue to enlarge his share until another junior appropriator begins to appropriate resources from source for beneficial use. For the purposes of this Agreement, "beneficial use “refers to the amount of resources that an appropriator has removed from the asteroid that the actor may reasonably hope to bring home in a return voyage. Resources in excess of what an appropriator can reasonably hope to transport to market in a single voyage do not qualify as having a beneficial use, and are therefore not yet claimed. This means that the extraction of metal from an asteroid does not serve to provide ownership if the appropriator plans on letting the resources languish until another voyage is undertaken to secure the resources and bring them back to Earth. Junior appropriators receive rights in the source of resources (the asteroid) as they find it, and may prevent the senior appropriator from enlarging his share to the junior appropriator’s detriment under a no-injury rule. No state party will attempt to hinder other parties from landing on or using the asteroid, and parties will assist other entities on an asteroid, should they need emergency assistance. Mining claims on asteroids will be reported to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and state parties agree to release the location of the asteroid, and any scientific findings to the United Nations, the general public, and the scientific community. In the event that the asteroid is on a collision course with any other celestial body, all state parties agree to follow the course of action suggested by the United Nations. Should the United Nations decide the asteroid must be destroyed, no state party may claim liability for resources contained within the asteroid, but not yet captured. This provision applies only to asteroids as classified by the scientific community, and does not apply to planets, comets, meteorites, or any other celestial body not mentioned.*

There is no doubt that asteroids may be **extremely beneficial to mankind,** both as a **source of resources** and as a jumping-off point to **far off locations in space**. The human-race has progressed scientifically and technologically to the point that space travel is within commercial reach, and the need for new international laws governing the ownership of space has never been more apparent. The Outer Space Treaty of 1968made great strides in developing rational rules for space and many of its provisions should be maintained in their original form. However, by allowing ownership of asteroids under the doctrine of **appropriation**, the international community can **incentivize the exploration and development of space in a way that reflects the needs of society in general**, **without vesting an absolute monopoly in a single entity.** The doctrine of appropriation helped drive American westward expansion, and its application to space mining would help drive the human race in its expansion into the space, the final frontier.

**Asteroid mining offsets terrestrial growth that ruins the environment and enables solar power satellites – both solve climate change**

**Taylor 19** Chris Taylor is a veteran journalist. Previously senior news writer for Time.com a year later. In 2000, he was named San Francisco bureau chief for Time magazine. He has served as senior editor for Business 2.0, West Coast editor for Fortune Small Business and West Coast web editor for Fast Company. Chris is a graduate of Merton College, Oxford and the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism. "How asteroid mining will save the Earth — and mint trillionaires." Mashable, 2019, mashable.com/feature/asteroid-mining-space-economy. [Quality Control]

The mission is essential, Joyce declares, to save Earth from its **major problems**. First of all, the fictional billionaire wheels in a fictional Nobel economist to demonstrate the actual truth that the entire global economy is sitting on a **mountain of debt**. It has to keep growing or it will **implode**, so we might as well take the majority of the **industrial growth off-world where it can’t do any more harm to the biosphere.**

Secondly, there’s the **climate change fix**. Suarez sees asteroid mining as the only way we’re going to build **solar power satellites.** Which, as you probably know, is a form of uninterrupted solar power collection that is theoretically more effective, inch for inch, than any solar panels on Earth at high noon, but operating 24/7. (In space, basically, **it’s always double high noon).**

The power collected is beamed back to large receptors on Earth with large, low-power microwaves, which researchers think will be harmless enough to let humans and animals pass through the beam. A space solar power array like the one China is said to be working on could reliably supply 2,000 gigawatts — or **over 1,000 times more power than the largest solar farm currently in existence.**

“We're looking at a 20-year window to **completely replace human civilization's power infrastructure,**” Suarez told me, citing the report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change on the coming catastrophe. Solar satellite technology “has existed since the 1970s. What we were missing is **millions of tons of construction materials** in orbit. **Asteroid mining can place it there.”**

The Earth-centric early 21st century can’t really wrap its brain around this, but the idea is not to bring all that building material and precious metals down into our gravity well. Far better to create a whole new commodities exchange in space. You mine the useful stuff of asteroids both near to Earth and far, thousands of them taking less energy to reach than the moon. That’s something else we’re still grasping, how relatively easy it is to ship stuff in zero-G environments.

**Asteroid mining solves rare earth metal depletion – prevents tech stagnation and unsustainable resource extraction**

**Mitchell 20**

Robin Mitchell is an electronic engineer who has been involved in electronics since the age of 13. After completing a BEng at the University of Warwick, Robin moved into the field of online content creation developing articles. "How might asteroid mining be key to electronics future?" 28-09-2020, [www.electropages.com/blog/2020/09/how-might-asteroid-mining-be-key-electronics-future](http://www.electropages.com/blog/2020/09/how-might-asteroid-mining-be-key-electronics-future). [Quality Control]

As electronics continue to become increasingly more important in everyday life, so is the ability to **produce electronic components**. With the supply of minerals on Earth having a finite size, some are worried that Earth will soon run out of critical resources such as **platinum and lithium**. What are asteroids, what are they composed of, and could they be the key to providing humanity with a near-infinite source of minerals?

What minerals are commonly needed for electronics?

Since the introduction of the first commercial circuits, electronics have become incredibly advanced with silicon dies having billions of active components, resistors the size of dust specks, and capacitors that can hold obscene amounts of charge for their size. However, many of these components rely on minerals that most will never have heard of for them to be able to work. Basic components such as resistors and capacitors use common materials including iron, carbon, and aluminium, but components such as LEDs, silicon dies, and thin-film displays use lanthanum, cerium, neodymium, and europium. While many of these minerals **fall under the “rare-earth” category**, that does not necessarily mean that they are rare; but many are.

Why are these minerals running out?

Minerals that are rare by nature are uncommon in the crust, and mass industrialisation is quickly using up remaining reserves of these minerals. However, it is important to understand what reserve means and how reserves are calculated. Let’s take Uranium as an example to understand this concept better; as things currently stand, there are 80 years of Uranium reserves left. Now, this does not mean that all the uranium will be used up globally in 80 years, this means that at the current price of Uranium, proven sources will continue to supply Uranium at a profitable rate for 80 years. When all reserves are used up, the price for that mineral increases, and this makes areas that used to be unprofitable more profitable, thus generating new reserves.

However, there is another aspect to resources that need to be considered; **environmental damage**. A good example to demonstrate this is Lithium. While Lithium is rather abundant in the crust, it is spread very wide, making most crust uneconomical to mine. If all cars on earth went electric, the proven reserves of Lithium would run out in 3 years. Of course, new reserves would be made available, and this would extend the ability to use Lithium in industrial practices. However, mining Lithium has a massive environmental impact and sees vast amounts of land destroyed and made toxic due to by-products in the extraction process. The same applies to many rare minerals; many tons of earth is needed to get even the smallest quantity.What are asteroids, and what are they made of?Asteroids are small cosmic bodies that orbit a star and can range in size, density, and composition. One of the largest asteroids in the Solar System, Vesta, has a diameter approximately 330 miles, while some of the smallest can be just two meters across. Asteroids mostly consist of rock as well as minerals, but their exact composition greatly varies. For example, M-type asteroids are those that mostly consist of nickel-iron, while C-type asteroids consist of clay and silicate rocks. Other minerals that are often found in asteroids include gold, cobalt, palladium, platinum, and osmium.

Could asteroid mining be the key to ensuring limitless supplies?

While asteroids themselves may contain trace amounts of rare minerals, their size and lack of an ecosystem **would allow for a mining operation to destroy an entire asteroid with no repercussions.** Asteroids are also plentiful in the Solar System, and would most likely **provide humanities resource needs for millions of years.** For perspective, the total weight of the asteroid belt is only 3% that of the moon, but that is still 2.39×1021 kilograms. Even then, that is only the asteroid belt and does not consider stray asteroids that orbit the sun, planets, and rings around Saturn / Jupiter.

**Both of those cause extinction**

**Bell 19** Aidan Bell is the co-founder of EnviroBuild, a sustainable building materials company based in London. PhD from Manchester in Inorganic Chemistry. "The Conflict of Tech Innovation and Sustainability." TechNative, 22 Jan. 2019, technative.io/the-conflict-of-tech-innovation-and-sustainability. [Quality Control]

Technological advancement has existed throughout human history

Humans have walked the Earth for 200,000 years, inventing **countless new processes and systems along the way.** The somewhat gradual expansion of human knowledge exploded after the burgeoning of agriculture in the Middle Eastern region of the Levant around 12,000 years ago. Societies at this time manipulated their environment for food-crop cultivation for the first time, inventing sophisticated activities like irrigation and logging.

This nascent field of agriculture created more food and thereby lead to a rapid increase in population size. Yet human expansion also resulted in the increased degradation of the environment. Experts theorise that the mass extinction of megafauna across North America and Australasia was the result of humans rather than environmental factors, while the Mayans were also at fault for causing widespread deforestation and a severe drought through excessive logging, a mistake that brought their eventual demise.

The exploration and proliferation of new technologies is the **inevitable result of human intelligence**, and the consequences thereof have always been difficult to avoid. Yet our awareness of this damage places humanity in a position of knowledge outside the standard predator-prey relationship that otherwise dominates the world and results in starvation for animals that overeat their food sources.

The current technological dilemmas that we face today are similar to those of ancient time**. Overuse of a resource for immediate human benefit risks longer-term negative influence**. A report conducted by Greenpeace found that Internet data centres have incredibly large carbon footprints, accounting for 3% of global electricity use, much of it in locations that offer cheap, but dirty, electricity. Likewise, the minerals that are found in electronic devices like mobile phones, such as tantalum and gold, often originate from unregulated mining that releases harmful substances into the surrounding soil, air and water. Mining also contributes hugely to **deforestation**, which is responsible for 15% of global greenhouse gas emissions.

The negative impacts of technological innovation are increasing and action needs to be **taken soon to resolve this crisis for the sake of future generations.** The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report last month warned that we have just 12 years to reduce the rate of global warming before widespread flooding and droughts become unavoidable. The demand for minerals and energy brought about by technological advancements shows no sign of slowing down, painting a worrying picture for the future of the planet.

Faced with the consequences of our intelligence, humanity now has to use its **incredible versatility** to overcome the challenges it has created for itself. For example, wind and solar power are increasingly becoming economically-viable sources of unlimited, free electricity and provide us with the opportunity to reduce our dependence on harmful fossil fuels. Bioengineering should help us protect surface soils and the ecosystems that depend on them by maintaining healthy levels of nutrients and soil salinity. **Technological advancements will even help us prevent species extinction events** that would **otherwise destroy our Earth altogethe**r, with NASA already developing spacecraft to push approaching asteroids out of our orbit.

| **Topicality** |
| --- |

**Interp: The aff must defend that the appropriation of outer space by private entities in general is unjust.**

**“Private Entities” is a generic bare plural. Generics cannot be affirmed by particular instances, and bare plurals normally express generic generalization**

**Leslie 16–** (Sarah-Jane Leslie, Dean of the Graduate School and Class of 1943 Professor of Philosophy at Princeton University, where she is also affiliated faculty in the Department of Psychology, the University Center for Human Values, the Program in Gender and Sexuality Studies, and the Kahneman-Treisman Center for Behavioral Science and Public Policy. She is known for her work on the cognitive underpinnings of generic generalizations); "Generic Generalizations (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy),"<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics>. KD

Consider the following pairs of sentences:

* (1) a. Tigers are striped.
* b. Tigers are on the front lawn.
* **(2) a. A tiger is striped.**
* **b. A tiger is on the front lawn.**
* (3) a. The tiger is striped.
* b. The tiger is on the front lawn.

The sentence pairs above are *prima facie* syntactically parallel—both are subject-predicate sentences whose subjects consist of the same common noun coupled with the same, or no, article. However, the interpretation of first sentence of each pair is intuitively quite different from the interpretation of the second sentence in the pair. In the second sentences, we are talking about some particular tigers: a group of tigers in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), some individual tiger in ([2b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex2b)), and some unique salient or familiar tiger in ([3b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex3b))—a beloved pet, perhaps. **In the first sentences, however, we are saying something *general*.** **There is/are no particular tiger or tigers that we are talking about.**

The second sentences of the pairs receive what is called an existential interpretation. The hallmark of the existential interpretation of a sentence containing a bare plural or an indefinite singular is that it may be paraphrased with “some” with little or no change in meaning; hence the terminology “existential reading”. The application of the term “existential interpretation” is perhaps less appropriate when applied to the definite singular, but it is intended there to cover interpretation of the definite singular as referring to a unique contextually salient/familiar particular individual, not to a *kind*.

There are some tests that are helpful in distinguishing these two readings. For example, the existential interpretation is *upward entailing*, meaning that the statement will always remain true if we replace the subject term with a more inclusive term. Consider our examples above. In ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), we can replace “tiger” with “animal” *salva veritate*, but in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) we cannot. If “tigers are on the lawn” is true, then “animals are on the lawn” must be true. However, **“tigers are striped” is true, yet “animals are striped” is false. (**[**1a**](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)**) does not entail that animals are striped,** but ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) entails that animals are on the front lawn (Lawler 1973; Laca 1990; Krifka et al. 1995).

Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification with minimal change of meaning (Krifka et al. 1995). For example, inserting “usually” in the sentences in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) (e.g., “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) dramatically alters the meaning of the sentence (e.g., “tigers are usually on the front lawn”). (For generics such as “mosquitoes carry malaria”, the adverb “sometimes” is perhaps better used than “usually” to mark off the generic reading.)

**“private entities” is a generic bare plural that must be read with a generic interpretation -**

**a] Fails the Upward-Entailment Test--- “Private entities” doesn’t entail “all entities” since the topic doesn’t extend to public entities as well.**

**b] Adverb of Quantification Test— “most private entities” produces only a small change in meaning**

**Violation: They don’t**

**Vote neg—**

**1] Limits— hundreds of private entities and states that the aff can pick from and limitless combinations under limits the topic and destroys neg prep since there’s no unifying DA against OneWeb UK aff, SpaceX US aff, Airbus UK aff, Rocket Lab USA, Origin Space China aff, India, and Russia affs-- aff gets infinite prep and sets terms for debate so DAs and PICs are inherently reactive and its absurd to say potential neg abuse justifies the aff being flat-out non-T-- limits outweighs – reciprocal prep burden and allows for nuanced engagement**

**2] Textuality is an independent voter—it determines which interps your ballot can endorse by providing the only salient focal point for debates**

**3] Topic Lit – the literature always talks about private space companies in relation to the states where they’re based – the aff is an arbitrary constraint on the topic not based in the literature – means this turns functional limits because there’s no solvency advocates for exclusively banning single countries or companies from space**

**DTD on T – the debate shouldn’t have happened if they were abusive**

**Competing Interps on T since its binary and a question of models – Good enough isn’t good—there can be no reasonable interp of what the topic actually means**

**No RVIs on T – 1] Illogical—T is a gateway issue, winning T is meeting a baseline to have the debate to begin with 2] T is reactionary, they shouldn’t win for meeting their preround burden 3] Forcing the 1NC to go all in on theory kills substance education and neg flex—o/w on real world**