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#### Counterinterp: “Appropriation” means to take as property which includes mining

This definition is 100x better than any neg evidence – it’s contextual to space mining and the OST. It also conducts a common-use analysis of the word and a historical analysis of the OST’s writing and concludes that both support that appropriation includes mining

Leon 18 (Amanda M., Associate, Caplin & Drysdale, JD UVA Law) "Mining for Meaning: An Examination of the Legality of Property Rights in Space Resources." Virginia Law Review, vol. 104, no. 3, May 2018, p. 497-547. HeinOnline.

Appropriation. The term "appropriation" also remains ambiguous. Webster's defines the verb "appropriate" as "to take to oneself in exclusion of others; to claim or use as by an exclusive or pre-eminent right; as, let no man appropriate a common benefit."16 5 Similarly, Black's Law Dictionary describes "appropriate" as an act "[t]o make a thing one's own; to make a thing the subject of property; to exercise dominion over an object to the extent, and for the purpose, of making it subserve one's own proper use or pleasure."166 Oftentimes, appropriation refers to the setting aside of government funds, the taking of land for public purposes, or a tort of wrongfully taking another's property as one's own. The term appropriation is often used not only with respect to real property but also with water. According to U.S. case law, a person completes an appropriation of water by diversion of the water and an application of the water to beneficial use.167 This common use of the term "appropriation" with respect to water illustrates two key points: (1) the term applies to natural resources-e.g., water or minerals-not just real property, and (2) mining space resources and putting them to beneficial use-e.g., selling or manufacturing the mined resources could reasonably be interpreted as an "appropriation" of outer space. While the ordinary meaning of "appropriation" reasonably includes the taking of natural resources as well as land, whether the drafters and parties to the OST envisioned such a broad meaning of the term remains difficult to determine with any certainty. The prohibition against appropriation "by any other means" supports such a reading, though, by expanding the prohibition to other types not explicitly described.168

As illustrated by this analysis, considerable ambiguity remains after this ordinary-meaning analysis and thus, the question of Treaty obligations and property rights remains unresolved. In order to resolve these ambiguities, an analysis of preparatory materials, historical context, and state practice follows.

2. Preparatory Materials

A review of meeting reports of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and its Legal Sub-Committee regarding the Treaty reveals little to clear up the ambiguities of Articles I and II of the OST. In fact, the reports indicate that, despite several negotiating states expressing concern about the lack of clarity with respect to the meaning of "use" and the scope of the non-appropriation principle, no meaningful discussion occurred and no consensus was reached.16 9 Some commentators still conclude that the preparatory work does in fact confirm the drafters' intent for "use" to include exploitation. 170 These commentators do admit, however, that discussions of the term "exploitation" supporting their conclusion focused on remote sensing and communications satellites rather than on resource extraction.17 1 Further skepticism about such an intent for "use" to include "exploitation" also arises given the uncertainty amongst negotiating states about the meaning of these terms. A mere few months before the Treaty opened for signature in January 1967, negotiators were still asking questions about the meaning of "use" during the last few Legal Sub-Committee meetings. For example, in July 1966, the representative of France inquired: "Did the latter term ["use"] imply use for exploration purposes, such as the launching of satellites, or did it mean use in the sense of exploitation, which would involve far more complex issues?" 172 The representative noted that while some activities such as extraction of minerals were difficult to imagine presently, "[i]t was important for all States, and not only those engaged in space exploration, to know exactly what was meant by the term 'use.'173 In the same meeting, the representative from the USSR offered an interesting response to the question posed by the representative of France:

[A]dequate clarification was to be found in article II of the USSR draft, which specified that outer space and celestial bodies should not be subject to national appropriation by means of use or occupation, or by any other means. In other words no human activity on the moon or any other celestial body could be taken as justification for national appropriation. 174

This response implies that Article II acts as a qualification on Article I's broad provision for free exploration and use of outer space by all. Activity such as resource extraction would be viewed as national appropriation and such activity cannot be justified given Article II's prohibition, not even by falling within the ordinary meaning of "use." Despite this clarification, uncertainty appears to have remained, as lingering concerns were communicated in subsequent meetings by several other states, including Australia, Austria, and France."' Nevertheless, the committee put the Treaty in front of the General Assembly two months later without final resolution of the ambiguities regarding property rights arising from Articles I and II176 The preparatory materials ultimately fail to fully clarify the ambiguities of the meanings of "use" and "appropriation." The statement of the representative of the Soviet Union, one of the two main drafting parties, does, however, help push back on the interpretation of some academics that the nonappropriation principle fails to overcome the presumption of freedom of use.7

3. Historical Context

Two interrelated, major historical events cannot be ignored when considering the meaning of the OST: (1) the Cold War and (2) the Space Race. The success of Sputnik I in 1957 showed space travel and exploration no longer to be a dream, but a reality.7 While exciting, this news also brought fear in light of the world's fragile balance of power and tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union. 17 9 What if the Soviet Union managed to launch a nuclear weapon into space? What if the United States greedily claimed the Moon as the fifty-first state? To many, the combination of the Cold War and Space Race made the late 1950s and the 1960s a perilous time.so When viewed as a response to this perilous era, the OST begins to look much more like a nuclear arms treaty and an attempt to ease Cold War tensions than a treaty concerned with the issue of property rights in space."' The Treaty's emphasis on "peaceful purposes" supports this contextual interpretation. 1 82

On the one hand, as many suggest, this context leads to the conclusion that the vague nonappropriation principle of Article II does not prevent private property rights in space resources and the presumption of broad "use" prevails.1 83 Private property rights were simply not a concern of the Treaty drafters and therefore, the Treaty does not address-nor prohibit-such claims. On the other hand, the context surrounding the treaty's drafting does not necessarily lead to this conclusion. In fact, the emphasis on "peaceful purposes" and reducing international tension might instead suggest a stricter reading of Articles I and II. If things were so unstable and tense on Earth, the drafters may have instead intended Article II as a qualification on the general right to explore and use outer space in Article I, recognizing the simple fact that disputes over property, both land and minerals, have sparked some of history's bloodiest conflicts.

The Antarctic treaty experience evidences Cold War concern over potential resource rights disputes. Leading up to the finalization of the Antarctic Treaty of 1959,184 seven nations had already made official territorial claims over varying portions of the frozen landscape in hopes of laying claim to the plethora of resources thought to be located within the subsurface."' Although the Treaty itself did not directly address rights to mineral resources in the Antarctic,186 the treaty is interpreted to have frozen these claims in the interest of "[f]reedom of scientific investigation in Antarctica and cooperation toward that end.""' In a manner notably similar to the terms of Articles XI and XII of the OST, the Treaty promotes scientific exploration by encouraging information sharing of scientific program plans, personnel, and observations' and inspection of stations on a reciprocal basis.189 This Treaty along with several later treaties and protocols constitute the "Antarctic Treaty System," which as a whole manages the governance of Antarctica.1 9 0 In 1991, the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty 91 ("Madrid Protocol") settled the question of property rights for the fifty years following the Protocol's entry into force. 192 The Madrid Protocol provides for "the comprehensive protection of the Antarctic environment ... [and] designate[s] Antarctica as a natural reserve, devoted to peace and science."193 Article 7 explicitly-and simplystates "[a]ny activity relating to mineral resources, other than scientific research, shall be prohibited."1 94 Though Article 25 allows for the creation of a binding legal regime to determine whether and under what conditions mineral resource activity be allowed, no such international legal regime has been created to date. 195 The ban on mineral resource exploitation may only be amended by unanimous consent of the parties. 19 6 The United States signed and ratified both the Antarctic Treaty of 1959 and the Madrid Protocol. 197

The freezing of territorial claims in the Antarctic 98 by the Antarctica Treaty of 1959199 illustrates the existence of true concern over potential resource dispute and conflict during the Cold War, in addition to the major concerns posed by nuclear weapons.2 00 The drafting states also recognized the potential for conflict over property in outer space and drew on the language of the Antarctic Treaty of 1959 to draft the OST.2 01 Given these driving concerns, Article II could be reasonably read as qualifying Article I's general rule. Under this reading, Article II serves the same qualifying purpose as Article IV regarding military and nuclear weapon use in space. Some might push back on this interpretation by claiming that the drafters could have used language such as that in the Madrid Protocol to explicitly prohibit mining in space. However, this argument is flawed. The Madrid Protocol was not written until well after both the original Antarctic Treaty of 1959 and the OST. Furthermore, the timing of the Madrid Protocol perhaps provides further evidence that resources in space are not to be harvested until a subsequent agreement regarding rights over them can be agreed upon internationally. While the historical context does leave some ambiguity as to whether the OST permits property rights over space resources, the Antarctic experience provides a compelling analogy and suggests that the OST does not allow for property rights in space resources.

4. State Practice

In its Frequently Asked Questions released about the SREU Act, the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology forcefully asserted that the Act does not violate international law.20 2 in fact, according to the committee, the Act's provision of property rights "is affirmed by State practice and by the U.S. State Department in [c]ongressional testimony and written correspondence."2 03 Proponents of this view base their beliefs on several examples. One, "no serious objection" arose to the United States and the Soviet Union bringing samples of rocks and other materials from the Moon back by manned and robotic missions in the late 1960s, nor to Japan successfully collecting a small asteroid sample in 2010.204 Two, a practice of respecting ownership over such retrieved samples and a terrestrial market for such items exists, as illustrated by the fact that no one doubts that the American Museum of Natural History "owns" three asteroids found in Greenland by arctic explorer Robert E. Peary that are now part of the museum's Arthur Ross Hall of Meteorites. 205 Three, Congressmen also cite to a federal district court case, United States v. One Lucite Ball Containing Lunar Material,2 06 to illustrate state practice in favor of ownership over spaces resources. The case involved an Apollo lunar sample gifted to Honduras by the United States. The sample was stolen and sold to an individual in the United States.2 07 When caught during a sting operation intended to uncover illegal sales of imposter samples, the buyer was forced to forfeit the lunar sample after the court concluded the moon rocks had in fact been stolen, basing its decision in part on its recognition of Honduras having national property ownership over the sample. 208

These examples appear overwhelming, but they are not actually examples of activities of the same "form and content" that the SREU Act approves. 2 09 These examples all involve collection of samples in limited amounts and for scientific purposes, while the SREU Act approves large-scale collection and for commercial exploitation. The OST explicitly emphasizes a "freedom of scientific investigation in outer space," and the collection of scientific samples reasonably fall under this enumerated right. 2 10 Alternatively, the OST says nothing with respect to commercial exploitation, only discussing "benefits" of space in terms of sharing those benefits with all mankind.211 Furthermore, the American Museum of Natural History and Lucite Ball examples relied upon are misleading because they suggest that types of celestial artifacts found or gifted on Earth are subject to the same legal regime as resources mined or collected in space, which may not necessarily be true. The analogy of ownership over fish extracted from the high seas is also often cited in response to this pushback. Much like outer space, the high seas are open to all participants, yet the law of the seas still recognizes the right to title over fish extracted on the high seas by fishermen, who can then sell the fish.212 But again, this analogy has limited import because both the 1958 Geneva Convention on the High Seas and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea ("UNCLOS") explicitly recognize the right to fish, while the OST grants no such right to exploit space resources. 2 1 3

Furthermore, state practice relevant to the question of property rights under the OST goes beyond these examples and analogies of ownership of resources taken from commons. State practice regarding property rights in general must be considered. For example, Professor Fabio Tronchetti disagrees with the oft-cited notion that state practice affirms the SREU Act.2 14 According to the professor, "under international law, property rights require a superior authority, a State, entitled to attribute and enforce them." 2 15 By granting property rights in the SREU Act, the United States impliedly claims that it has the authority to confer property rights over space resources-an authority traditionally reserved for the owner of a resource. This notion clashes with the nonappropriation principles of the OST. Though there is no consensus regarding whether the nonappropriation principle prohibits claims of sovereignty over resources, a strong consensus at least exists that the principle prohibits states from claiming sovereignty over real property in space.216 In some traditional systems of mineral ownership, however, ownership over resources ran with ownership over land.217 For example, under Roman law, property rights over subsurface minerals belonged to the landowner. 2 18 Thus, if the United States cannot have title in space lands under the nonappropriation principle, it cannot have title to the space resources in those lands either. Without title to the resources, the United States cannot bestow such title to its citizens under traditional international property law; by claiming that it can bestow such title, the United States is abrogating Article II of the OST. One could also argue that the in situ resources the Act grants rights in are actually still part of the celestial bodies; thus, the resources are real property prior to their removal, and are off limits under the Treaty.2 19 Given the limited import of the cited examples of state practice (limited quantity and scientific versus large-scale and commercial), the traditional practice of property rights being conferred from a sovereign to a citizen become incredibly compelling and suggest the SREU Act may abrogate the United States' treaty obligations.

A final piece of evidence, however, again inserts ambiguity into the interpretation: the sweeping rejection of the Moon Agreement and its limitations on property rights by the international community discussed supra Part JJJ.A.2. On the one hand, the rejection may imply that the international community approved of property rights. On the other hand, however, there were other reasons for the sweeping rejection. For example, Professors Francis Lyall and Paul B. Larsen claim the "main area of controversy"2 2 0 actually surrounded the Agreement's proclamation of the Moon and celestial bodies and their natural resources as the "common heritage of mankind" in Article 11.1,221 rather than the Agreement's general property-right provisions. Many believed the invocation of the "common heritage of mankind" language would impart actual obligations upon parties to share extracted resources, whereas the "province of all mankind" and "for the benefit and interest of all" language of the OST did not.222 As with ordinary meaning, preparatory materials, and historical context, state practice leaves some ambiguities and state interpretations should also be considered.

5. State Interpretations

Much like the preparatory materials discussed supra Part IV.A.1, subsequent state interpretation of the OST fails to fully address the question of the legality of property rights in space resources. On the one hand, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations found that the drafters intended Articles I, II, and III of the Treaty to be general in nature when reviewing the Treaty,223 which perhaps suggests Article II's nonappropriation principle does not qualify Article I's general right to use or act as an exception. Yet, the committee also found the Treaty to be in response to the "potential for international competition and conflict in outer space." 2 24 To the committee, Articles I, II, and III stressed the importance of free scientific investigation, guaranteed free access to all areas of celestial bodies, and prohibited claims of sovereignty.225 Not only would property rights in natural resources potentially ignite and exacerbate conflict in space, but they also seemed somewhat incompatible with scientific investigation, free access, and the prohibition on sovereignty. During its hearing on the Treaty, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations focused a majority of its discussion of Article I on whether or not the language "province of all mankind" imparted strict obligations, while devoting little to no time to the issue of the meaning of "use." 22 6 Former Justice Arthur Goldberg, then U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, did note the goal of the article was to "cnot subject space to exclusive appropriation by any particular power." 227 Nevertheless, this statement fails to resolve whether natural resources may be exploited, as such exploitation could be carried out in an inclusive manner.

The committee's review of Article II consumes only eight lines of the hearing transcript, merely adding that the Article is complementary to Article I and that space cannot be claimed for the country (likely referring to land rather than resources).2 28 A different exchange between Ambassador Goldberg, Senator Lausche, and the Chairman leaves further ambiguity regarding the use of natural resources in space: Mr. Goldberg: We wanted to establish our right to explore and use outer space. Senator Lausche: Yes. That is, any one of the signatory nations shall have the right to the use of whatever might be found in one of the space bodies. Mr. Goldberg: No, no. It doesn't mean that. It means that they shall be free on their own to explore outer space. The Chairman: Or to use it. Mr. Goldberg: To use it. The Chairman: But not on an exclusive basis. Mr. Goldberg: Everyone is free.229

At first, Ambassador Goldberg appears to have refuted the notion that a signatory could simply "use" anything found in one of the space bodies, such as a mineral, implying Senator Lausche's example exceeded the scope of Article I. He then went on to emphasize exploratory activities. But then, Ambassador Goldberg backtracked and reasserted the right to use without clarifying his initial qualification.

This sense of ambiguity remains today despite Congress signing off on the SREU Act. While sponsors of the bill and statements from resource extraction companies emphasized the broad scope of the right to "use" outer space and state practice in support of the legality of 230 property rights, several expert witnesses expressed genuine concern that obligations under the Treaty remain unclear and require additional analysis.231

B. Compatibility

Employing the treaty interpretation tools of ordinary meaning, preparatory materials, historical context, state practice, and state interpretation offers many possible understandings of the obligations imparted by Articles I and II of the OST. For example, while the ordinary meaning of "use" could reasonably include the exploitation of materials, the meeting summaries of the Fifth Session of the U.N. Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space Legal Sub-Committee make clear that no consensus was ever reached regarding whether "use" includes large-scale exploitation of space resources, let alone fee-simple ownership and the ability to sell commercially. State practice dealing with extraterrestrial samples also sheds little light on the confusion, as the examples cited all deal instead with scientific samples of limited quantity. The international community's rejection of the Moon Agreement also fails to bring clarity. While on the one hand the rejection could be read as a rejection of the idea that the OST prohibits private property rights, it could also be read as a rejection of the common heritage of mankind doctrine. Finally, the prospect of privateventure space mining and extraterrestrial resource extraction remained far off and futuristic at the time of the Treaty's negotiation, making drawing legal conclusions about the legality of these revolutionary activities extremely difficult.

Overall, however, the Treaty's structure and its purposes (preserving peace and avoiding international conflict in outer space) ultimately indicate that private property rights in space resources are prohibited by Article II's non-appropriation principle, at least until future international delegation determines otherwise (like in the Antarctic). The Treaty's structure confirms this interpretation. Article I lays down a general rule for activity in space. Subsequent articles of the Treaty then lay out more specific requirements of and qualifications to this general rule. Much like Article IV restricts the use of nuclear weapons in space, Article II restricts the use of space in ways that might result in potentially controversial property claims. Historically, claims to mineral rights have resulted in just as contentious conflict as those over sovereign lands. Treaty efforts to avoid conflicts in Antarctica and the high seas reflect similar sentiments. The Soviet Union's representative even hinted at this structural relationship between Articles I and II during Treaty S1 232 negotiations.22 In light of the imminent need to ease Cold War tensions, the potential for conflict over property, and the final structure of the Treaty, this Note concludes that the large-scale extraction of space resources is incompatible with the non-appropriation principle of Article II of the OST.23 3 As a result, the United States' provision of property rights to its citizens to possess, own, transport, use, and sell space and asteroid resources extracted through the SREU Act contravenes its international obligations established by the OST.

\*\*READ NEBEL CI/STANDARDS IF THEIR INTERP SAYS SPEC BAD\*\*

#### Standards:

#### A] Clash—allows us to go in-depth on the topic which is largely about mining – the only other aff is space col which INVOLVES mining – literature and controversy should come first—in the context of literature right now, this topic would be useless if mining weren’t T since that’s what private entities are interested in.

#### Their interp:

1. **No limits explosion—including space mining doesn’t substantially increase the research burden since it’s a core part of private entities**
2. **No ground loss – make them explain what disads apply to other privatization but not mining – mining also has lots of neg articles which is proven by Elon and Bezos expanding into this market**
3. **Functional limits—advantage areas check cuz small affs lose to risk of a DA or Ks**

#### Reasonability—voting neg requires sacrificing substance which means abuse on T has to outweigh the abuse of voting on T—err towards overinclusion since this is the TOC topic – our definition above says it’s not definitive which proves

## Riders DA

### 1AR – Fiat

#### Fiat solves---normal means would be a limited convention that stays focused on the issue at hand and even if not, we fiat it. That’s good---it tests the intrinsicness of the disad, which isn’t a real opportunity cost, since a policymaker would always take the necessary step to avoid the problem.

### 1AR – No Link

#### Optional protocol solves.

Belinda Bragg 18, Principle Research Scientist at NSI, a multidisciplinary data-driven analytics firm, April 2018, “Governing in a Crowded Space – The Legal Regime for Space,” https://nsiteam.com/governing-in-a-crowded-space-the-ost-and-development-of-the-legal-regime-for-space/

Several argue that if the OST were opened to amendment, the process may be difficult to control,10 as amending one section of the treaty would put other sections “on the table” as well (Hertzfeld). This, as Major General (USAF ret.) James Armor of Orbital OTK puts it, may “encourage mischief” and be counter to US interests. Similarly, Joanne Gabrynowicz of the University of Mississippi School of Law and an Anonymous Contributor11 see opening the OST as inviting the potential loss of the prohibition on nuclear weapons and WMD in space. Although not in favor of altering the OST, Paul Meyer of Simon Fraser University notes12 that some see a potential for supplementing the OST without running the risks of opening up the treaty text itself. In multilateral diplomacy this is often accomplished through developing an “Optional Protocol” that can supplement the original treaty in some way (e.g., extend the ban on WMD to all space-based weapons, or provide for the type of institutional support such as annual meetings of states parties that is common now but which the OST lacks).

## Innovation DA

#### Mining isn’t needed – efficient usage and alternatives check

Dodd 18 [(Jan Dodd, Rethinking the use of rare-earth elements,” Wind Power Monthly, November 30, 2018, <https://www.windpowermonthly.com/article/1519221/rethinking-use-rare-earth-elements>]

Technological innovation

Another response to rising prices is to use less. In the wake of 2011, as well as moving away from offering PSMGs onshore, turbine manufacturers also started improving material efficiency.

The main target has been to reduce the dysprosium content. The metal, which allows the permanent magnets to operate at high temperatures, is used in relatively small quantities, but is significantly more costly than neodymium.

SGRE, for example, has worked with its suppliers to reduce the amount of dysprosium to "significantly below 1%", the company says. Improvements were made not only in the composition of the magnet, but also in the generators’ cooling systems.

Goldwind too has been upgrading its direct-drive PMSG turbines. "Some of the permanent magnets used in Goldwind wind turbines now contain no dysprosium, while others contain less than 1%," Cao states.

The high-temperature superconductor (HTS) generators currently under development also require very small amounts of REEs.

The HTS being developed under the EU-funded EcoSwing research project uses "much less than 1kg of REEs" — largely Yttrium — per megawatt, says Jürgen Kellers, managing partner of engineering firm ECO5. The world’s first superconducting generator was installed in an Envision turbine in Denmark this autumn (below).

Others are aiming to eliminate rare earths altogether. UK-based GreenSpur Renewables is developing a multi- megawatt direct-drive generator using cheap and plentiful ferrite magnets.

These are about one third the strength of neodymium-iron-boron magnets, but GreenSpur’s unique axial design means the overall weight of the generator is approximately the same, says Alex Freeman, the company’s operations director.

Recycling

Industry and research bodies have also been looking at recycling permanent magnets. Goldwind is already doing so, smelting old magnets to make new ones, Cao says.

"Due to their large size and standardised model, the permanent magnets used in wind turbines can be recycled more easily than those used in other rare-earth permanent magnet products," he notes.

#### 2 link turns:

#### 1] Turn– asteroid mining kills research incentive and decks innovation

Bharmal 18- Bharmal, Zahaan, “The Case against Mars Colonisation.” *The Guardian*, The Guardian, 28 Aug. 2018, www.theguardian.com/science/blog/2018/aug/28/the-case-against-mars-colonisation. VS

If humans do eventually land on Mars, they would not arrive alone. They would carry with them their earthly microbes. Trillions of them.

There is a real risk that some of these microbes could find their way onto the surface of Mars and, in doing so, confuse – perhaps irreversibly so – the search for Martian life. This is because we wouldn't be able to distinguish indigenous life from the microbes we'd brought with us. Our presence on Mars could jeopardise one of our main reasons for being there – the search for life.

Furthermore, there is no one way of knowing how our microbes may react with the vulnerable Martian ecosystem. In [Cosmos, the late Carl Sagan](https://www.theguardian.com/science/2012/mar/26/science-writing-cosmos-carl-sagan) wrote, “If there is life on Mars, I believe we should do nothing with Mars. Mars then belongs to the Martians, even if the Martians are only microbes … the preservation of that life must, I think, supersede any other possible use of Mars.”

#### 2] Turn- asteroid mining kills public interest in space exploration and makes innovation a lower priority

Skibba 18- Skibba, Ramin. “Mining in Space Could Lead to Conflicts on Earth - Facts so Romantic.” Nautilus, 2 May 2018, https://nautil.us/blog/-mining-in-space-could-lead-to-conflicts-on-earth. VS

But it’s not clear that a pact between the commercial space mining industry and NASA would align with the public’s interest. NASA’s increasing collaboration with space mining companies could distort and divert efforts previously focused on space exploration and basic research, and discourage public interest and engagement in astronomy.

For example, Seager advocated for space mining at a science writing conference I attended in 2015. She’s part of a motley group of advisors for Planetary Resources, including the movie director James Cameron, a lawyer for a prominent Washington D.C. firm, and Dante Lauretta, another astronomer whom I respect. Seager seems to believe that encouraging private space mining will lead to more investments and technological innovation that would enable more scientific research. In a 2012 interview with The Atlantic, for instance, she said, “The bottom line is that NASA is not working the best that it could for space science right now, and so in order for people like me to succeed with my own research goals, the commercial space industry needs to be able to succeed independently of government contracts.”

But if the U.S. and U.S.-based companies lay claim to the richest and most easily accessible prospecting sites, not allowing other companies and nations to share in the wealth, economic and political relations could be damaged. That’s why this seems to be a dangerous path for space explorers. Once you’re on board with the commercial space industry, then you as a researcher must accept, if not support, everything that comes with it. Seager and a few other researchers may be willing to take this risk, but what about the rest of the space science community? Moreover, to succeed, these businesses will seek profitable missions, while science, exploration, and discovery—goals that stimulate public interest—will inevitably have lower priority. (Other commercial spaceflight companies, like Elon Musk’s SpaceX, do generate public interest, but they’re not directly involved in mining asteroids.) NASA may have its shortcomings, but at least its missions and research goals answer to the public. It’s not exactly a welcome thought to imagine more and more of our presence and activity in space being ceded, with NASA’s help, to private industry.

# 1AC

## 1AC—Plan

#### Plan: The appropriation of outer space through asteroid mining by private entities should be banned.

#### We’ll defend normal means as the signatories of the OST adding an optional protocol under Article II.

Tronchetti 7[Fabio Tronchetti is a professor at the International Institute of Air and Space Law, Leiden University, The Netherlands, 2007, <https://iislweb.org/docs/Diederiks2007.pdf>, 12-15-2021 amrita]

ARTICLE II OF THE OUTER SPACE TREATY: A MATTER OF DEBATE The legal content of Article II of the Outer Space Treaty is one of the most debated and analysed topic in the field of space law. Indeed, several interpretations have been put forward to explain the meaning of its provisions. Article II states that: “Outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means”. **The text of Article II represents** the final point of a process, formally initiated with Resolution 1721, aimed at conferring to outer space the status of res communis omnium, namely a thing open for the **free exploration** and use by all States **without the possibility of being appropriated**. By prohibiting the possibility of making territorial claims over outer space or any part thereof based on use or occupation, Article II **makes clear that** the customary procedures of **i**nternational **law allowing** subjects to obtain **sovereignty rights over un-owed lands**, namely discovery, occupatio and effective possession, **do not apply to** outer **space.** This prohibition was considered by the drafters of the Outer Space Treaty the best guarantee for preserving outer space for peaceful activities only and for stimulating the exploration and use of the space environment in the name of all mankind. What has been the object of controversy among legal scholars is the question of whether both States and private individuals are subjected to the provisions of Article II. Indeed, **while Article II forbids** expressis verbis the national **appropriation by** claims of **sovereignty**, by means of use and occupation or other means of outer space, **it does not** make **a**ny explicit **mention** **to** its **private** appropriation. Relying on this consideration, some authors have argued that the private appropriation of outer space and celestial bodies is allowed. For instance, in 1968 Gorove wrote: “Thus, at present an individual acting on his own behalf or on behalf of another individual or private association or an international organisation could lawfully appropriate any parts of outer space…”6 . The same argument is used today by the enterprises selling extraterrestrial acres. They base their claim to the Moon and other celestial bodies on the consideration that Article II does not explicitly forbid private individuals and enterprises to claim, exploit or appropriate the celestial bodies for profit7 . However, it must be said, that nowadays there is a general consensus on the fact that **both national appropriation and private** property rights **are denied** under the Outer Space Treaty. Several way of reasoning have been advanced to support this view. Sters and Tennen affirm that the argument that Article II does not apply to private entities since they are not expressly mentioned fails for the reason that they do not need to be explicitly listed in Article II to be fully subject to the non-appropriation principle8 . **Private entities are allowed to carry out** space **activities but**, according to Article VI of the Outer Space Treaty, they **must be authorized** to conduct such activities **by the** appropriate **State** of nationality. But if the State is prohibited from engaging in certain conduct, then it lacks the authority to license its nationals or other entities subject to its jurisdiction to engage in that prohibited activity. Jenks argues that “States bear international responsibility for national activities in space; it follows that what is forbidden to a State is not permitted to a chartered company created by a State or to one of its nationals acting as a private adventurer”9 . It has been also suggested that **the prohibition of national** appropriation **implies prohibition of private** appropriation because the latter cannot exist independently from the former10. In order to exist, indeed, private property requires a superior authority to enforce it, be in the form of a State or some other recognised entity. In outer space, however, this practice of State endorsement is forbidden. Should a State recognise or protect the territorial acquisitions of any of its subjects, this would constitute a form of national appropriation in violation of Article II. Moreover, it is possible to use some historical elements to support the argument that both the acquisition of State sovereignty and the creation of private property rights are forbidden by the words of Article II. During the negotiations of the Outer Space Treaty, the Delegate of Belgium affirmed that his delegation “had taken note of the interpretation of the non-appropriation advanced by several delegations-apparently without contradiction-as covering both the establishment of sovereignty and the creation of titles to property in private law”11. The French Delegate stated that: “…there was reason to be satisfied that three basic principles were affirmed, namely: the prohibition of any claim of sovereignty or property rights in space…”12. The fact that the accessions to the Outer Space Treaty were not accompanied by reservations or interpretations of the meaning of Article II, it is an evidence of the fact that this issue was considered to be settled during the negotiation phase. Thus, summing up, we may say that **prohibition of appropriation of outer space** and its parts is a rule which **is valid for both private and public entity**. The theory that private operators are not subject to this rule represents a myth that is not supported by any valid legal argument. Moreover, it can be also added that if any subject was allowed to appropriate parts of outer space, the basic aim of the drafters of the Treaty, namely to prevent a colonial competition in outer space and to create the conditions and premises for an exploration and use of outer space carried out for the benefit of all States, would be betrayed. Therefore, **the need to protect the non-appropriative nature o**f outer **space emerges** in all its relevance.

## 1AC—Advantages

### Advantage – Collisions

#### Unregulated mining is existential and causes collisions – multiple scenarios

#### Scenario 1 is deflection

#### Unregulated mining causes asteroid deflection and astroterror

Drmola and Mareš 15 - Jakub Drmola is a PhD student and Miroslav Mareš professor, at the Divison of Security and Strategic Studies, Masaryk University, Czech Republic, "Revisiting the deflection dilemma", *Astronomy & Geophysics*, Volume 56, Issue 5, October 2015, Pages 5.15–5.18, <https://academic.oup.com/astrogeo/article/56/5/5.15/235650>

There are two basic ways to go about moving the resources contained within a given asteroid to the Earth. They can be extracted from the asteroid during its natural orbit and then transported to the Earth, or the entire asteroid might be moved closer to a more convenient location before starting mining. Thus repositioned, it might even be used as a shielded habitat, once hollowed out (Ostro 1999). There are different speculative costs and benefits associated with either option, which would vary with the size, orbit and composition of the asteroid. But, crucially, the second option would entail putting asteroids into orbit around the Earth, the Moon or possibly at one of the Earth’s Lagrangian points. Indeed, NASA has already planned a mission to capture a small asteroid and place it in a high cislunar orbit, where it would serve as a destination for future manned missions and experiments. This “Asteroid Redirect Mission” is to take place in the next decade and is being pitched mainly as a stepping stone towards a future mission to Mars (see box “NASA’s Asteroid Redirect Mission”; Brophy et al. 2012, Burchell 2014, Gates et al. 2015). Programmes to redirect asteroids and, especially, plans to mine asteroids on an industrial scale essentially resurrect the deflection dilemma. But it is no longer a matter of superpowers intentionally misusing technology designed to prevent dangerous impacts. It becomes an issue of proliferation among private entities. Once private mining companies acquire the technical ability to redirect suitable NEOs (Baoyin et al. 2011) in order to extract platinum or water from them, perilous inflections become more likely. The probability of accidents will rise with the number of asteroids whose trajectories we decide to manipulate. Such accidents might be very unlikely, but even a tiny technical or human error in the execution of an inflection meant to place an asteroid into the lunar or geocentric orbit might send it crashing into the Earth with potentially devastating consequences. And while we might find solace in the low probabilities associated with such an accident, even contemporary industries which are considered very safe suffer from unlikely tragedies. Despite being dependable and reliable, airliners do crash; there are a lot of them flying and very improbable accidents do happen if the dice are rolled often enough. Undoubtedly, we will not be steering as many asteroids as we steer planes any time soon, but industries tend to be more accident-prone during their infancy. Furthermore, a single asteroid can do a lot more damage than a single plane. And who is to say how much metal or water we are going to need in space over the course of the 21st century, or the next? The second source of risk is the intentional misuse, similar to the original deflection dilemma. But the entry barrier for asteroid weaponization gets much lower if mining them and moving them around becomes a common industrial activity. This is in stark contrast to the original scenario which envisioned this technology to be used solely for planetary defence and under control of a very small number of the most powerful countries (Morrison 2010). If such a powerful technology becomes widely and commercially available, even rogue states and wellfunded terrorist groups might be tempted to use it for an unexpected and devastating attack. In addition, an active asteroid mining industry would make it more difficult to detect any hostile inflection attempts among the number of legitimate and benign ones. Policy implications Considering these possible future dangers, it seems prudent to consider what to do about them sooner rather than later. The most obvious “solution” would be a blanket ban on the development of any technology that might lead to artificially inflected asteroids crashing into the Earth. However, such a ban would be incompatible with the dream of increased presence of humans in the solar system. It would stymie both scientific exploration and economic development here on Earth, which is increasingly dependent on precious metals and spacebased technologies. Furthermore, this approach would leave us more vulnerable to natural impacts which, in the long view, seems less than desirable. Another approach might be similar to the current regime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, aiming to support peaceful civilian use of nuclear power while at the same time prohibiting the spread of weapons of mass destruction. The regime mostly works (with caveats, see Wood et al. 2008) because these applications require different infrastructures and fissile materials enriched to different levels of purity. This makes it possible, at least in principle, to tell apart operations meant for the production of electricity and those designed to create weapons. Unfortunately, the difference between legitimate and hostile trajectory modification would lie only in the acceleration imparted on the asteroid and not in the technical means to do it. As the spacecraft launched with the intent to cause impact with the Earth might be identical to those sent off to retrieve resources, telling them apart would be nearly impossible, until it was too late. And this approach makes no difference to the chances of an industrial accident. If monitoring equipment on Earth is unhelpful, the focus changes to space. In other words, all asteroid movement missions should be constantly monitored. For an attacker, it would make most sense to delay the final course adjustment for as long as possible in order to give the least warning and make the timeframe for reaction as short as possible. So an asteroid might head towards a safe orbit fit for resource extraction for most of its altered flight time, but be further accelerated at the last possible moment onto an impact trajectory, perhaps mere days before it hits a major city. Our current programmes cataloguing NEOs (such as CSS or Pan-STARRS), which look for new, previously unknown objects, are not ideally suited for the task of constantly tracking a number of different, already known asteroids. New instruments would be needed to track them in order to immediately detect any hazardous inflection, whether intentional or accidental. Once such a detection is made, emergency measures to evacuate the population or, preferably, to “re-deflect” the incoming object can be executed right away, regardless of the cause. Accidents and hostilities could be treated the same way and countered by the same system (initially, at least). Such a system would be more akin to an air traffic control than a non-proliferation regulation, offering security through vigilance, rather than absence. Additionally, development of a system able to deflect incoming objects at relatively short notice would be beneficial in case of an impending natural impact. Conclusion Perhaps none of these concerns will become relevant. Maybe the idea of asteroid mining will soon fizzle out because we will discover cheaper and more efficient local alternatives. Maybe humanity will lose the will or the capability to explore space any further. Or perhaps manipulating asteroid trajectories will prove impractical or too costly. Certainly, it would not be the first time that a promising and seemingly obvious future does not come about. In the 1960s it seemed almost self-evident that by the second decade of the 21st century we would have flying cars and a base on the Moon. Yet we do not. Asteroid mining might be a similar case of unfulfilled promises and misplaced visions. On the other hand, there are examples of industries that developed surprisingly fast despite being considered unrealistic, not too long ago: air travel, nuclear power generation, or commercial satellites. The spread of the internet and the accompanying digital information revolution is another example; hardly anyone anticipated having virtually the entire repository of human knowledge at our fingertips at all times (except Douglas Adams). Whether the deflection dilemma forever remains an unmaterialized threat or it becomes a palpable problem, it is something to be mindful of now, as the foundations of the prospective asteroid mining industry are being laid. In the end, the purpose of this paper is not to predict the future. Instead it aims to merely update a conscientious warning which called for our diligence more than 20 years ago. While the world has changed somewhat, the basic idea remains valid. Whether the danger comes from warring superpowers, terrorists or negligent corporations, we must be aware of the realistic risks in order to avoid being either stumped by unforeseen catastrophes or paralysed by unwarranted fear. Either extreme would be harmful for our future.●

#### Scenario 2 is satellite collisions

#### An increase in space debris and dust from mining collides with key defense satellites

Scoles 15 Sarah Scoles [Freelance science writer, and a contributing writer at WIRED Science, with articles in places like Popular Science, the New York Times, Scientific American, Vice, Outside, and others.], 5-27-2015, "Dust from asteroid mining spells danger for satellites," New Scientist, <https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg22630235-100-dust-from-asteroid-mining-spells-danger-for-satellites/> DD AG

IF THE gold mine is too far from home, why not move it nearby? It sounds like a fantasy, but would-be miners are already dreaming up ways to drag resource-rich space rocks closer to home. Trouble is, that could threaten the web of satellites around Earth.

Asteroids are not only stepping stones for cosmic colonisation, but may contain metals like gold, platinum, iron and titanium, plus life-sustaining hydrogen and oxygen, and rocket-fuelling ammonia. Space age forty-niners can either try to work an asteroid where it is, or tug it into a more convenient orbit.

NASA chose the second option for its Asteroid Redirect Mission, which aims to pluck a boulder from an asteroid’s surface and relocate it to a stable orbit around the moon. But an asteroid’s gravity is so weak that it’s not hard for surface particles to escape into space. Now a new model warns that debris shed by such transplanted rocks could intrude where many defence and communication satellites live – in geosynchronous orbit.

According to Casey Handmer of the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena and Javier Roa of the Technical University of Madrid in Spain, 5 per cent of the escaped debris will end up in regions traversed by satellites. Over 10 years, it would cross geosynchronous orbit 63 times on average. A satellite in the wrong spot at the wrong time will suffer a damaging high-speed collision with that dust.

The study also looks at the “catastrophic disruption” of an asteroid 5 metres across or bigger. Its total break-up into a pile of rubble would increase the risk to satellites by more than 30 per cent (arxiv.org/abs/1505.03800).

That may not have immediate consequences. But as Earth orbits get more crowded with spent rocket stages and satellites, we will have to worry about cascades of collisions like the one depicted in the movie Gravity.

#### Laundry list of impacts – compromised communication, loss of military capability and more

Divorsky 15 George Divorsky [George P. Dvorsky (born May 11, 1970) is a Canadian bioethicist, transhumanist and futurist. He is a contributing editor at io9[1] and producer of the Sentient Developments blog and podcast. He was Chair of the Board for the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies (IEET)[2][3] and is the founder and chair of the IEET's Rights of Non-Human Persons Program], 6-4-2015, "What Would Happen If All Our Satellites Were Suddenly Destroyed?," Gizmodo <https://gizmodo.com/what-would-happen-if-all-our-satellites-were-suddenly-d-1709006681> DD AG

Given these grim prospects, it’s fair to ask what might happen to our civilization if any of these things happened. At the risk of gross understatement, the complete loss of our satellite fleet would instigate a tremendous disruption to our current mode of technological existence—disruptions that would be experienced in the short, medium, and long term, and across multiple domains.

Compromised Communications

Almost immediately we’d notice a dramatic reduction in our ability to communicate, share information, and conduct transactions.

“If our communications satellites are lost, then bandwidth is also lost,” Jonathan McDowell tells io9. He’s an astrophysicists and Chandra Observatory scientist who works out of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics.

McDowell says that, with telecommunication satellites wiped out, the burden of telecommunications would fall upon undersea cables and ground-based communication systems. But while many forms of communication would disappear in an instant, others would remain.

All international calls and data traffic would have to be re-routed, placing tremendous pressure on terrestrial and undersea lines. Oversaturation would stretch the capacity of these systems to the limit, preventing many calls from going through. Hundreds of millions of Internet connections would vanish, or be severely overloaded. A similar number of cell phones would be rendered useless. In remote areas, people dependent on satellite for television, Internet, and radio would practically lose all service.

“Indeed, a lot of television would suddenly disappear,” says McDowell. “A sizable portion of TV comes from cable whose companies relay programming from satellites to their hubs.”

It’s important to note that we actually have a precedent for a dramatic—albeit brief —disruption in com-sat capability. Back in 1998, there was a day in which a single satellite failed and all the world’s pagers stopped working.

The sudden loss of satellite capability would have a profound effect on the military.

The Marshall Institute puts it this way: “Space is a critical enabler to all U.S. warfare domains,” including intelligence, navigation, communications, weather prediction, and warfare. McDowell describes satellite capability as as the “backbone” of the U.S. military.

And as 21st century warfare expert Peter W. Singer from New America Foundation tells io9, “He who controls the heavens will control what happens in the battles of Earth.” Singer summarized the military consequences of losing satellites in an email to us:

Moreover, and as McDowell explains to io9, the loss of satellite capability would have a profound effect on arms control capabilities. Space systems can monitor compliance; without them, we’d be running blind.

“The overarching consideration is that you wouldn’t really know what’s going on,” says McDowell. “Satellites provide for both global and local views of what’s happening. We would be less connected, less informed—and with considerably degraded situational awareness.”

One great thing satellites have done for us is improve our ability to forecast weather. Predicting a slight chance of cloudiness is all well and good, but some areas, like India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh, are dependent on such systems to predict potentially hazardous monsoons. And in the U.S., the NOAA has estimated that, during a typical hurricane season, weather satellites save as much as $3 billion in lives and property damage.

There’s also the effect on science to consider. Much of what we know about climate change comes from satellites.

As McDowell explains, the first couple of weeks without satellites wouldn’t make much of a difference. But over a ten-year span, the lack of satellites would preclude our ability to understand and monitor such things as the ozone layer, carbon dioxide levels, and the distribution of polar ice. Ground-based and balloon-driven systems would help, but much of the data we’re currently tracking would suddenly become much spottier.

#### That escalates – extinction

Johnson 14 Les Johnson [science fiction author, popular science writer, and NASA technologist]. “Living without satellites”. 2014 https://www.baen.com/living\_without\_satellites.

Satellite imagery is used by the military and our political leaders to maintain the peace. When your potential adversaries can’t hide what they’re doing, where their armies are moving and what they are doing with their civilian and military infrastructure, then the danger of surprise attack is diminished. In our nuclear age with instant death only minutes away by missile attack, the doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) only works if both sides know whether or not they are being attacked. The launch of missiles or a bomber fleet can easily be seen from space far in advance of either reaching their potential targets halfway around the globe. The danger of surprise attack is therefore small, making an accidental war far less likely.

So what does all this mean? And what do we do about it?

First of all, it means that the advocates of space development, exploration and commercialization have succeeded far beyond their initial expectations and dreams. The economies and security of countries in the developed world are now dependent on space satellites. We space advocates should celebrate our success and be terrified of it at the same time. Should we lose these fragile assets in space, our economy would experience a disruption like no other: ship, air and train travel would stop and only restart/operate in a much-reduced capacity for years (GPS loss). Many banking and retail transactions would cease (VSAT loss). Distribution of news and vital national information would be crippled (communications satellite loss). Lives would be put at risk and the productivity of our farming would dramatically decrease (weather satellite loss). The risk of war, including nuclear war, would increase (loss of spy satellites) and our military’s ability to react to crises would be significantly reduced (loss of military logistics and intelligence gathering satellites).

### Advantage – US/Russia

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

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

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

#### American private appropriation of outer space is a core issue that tanks our relations- specifically asteroid mining.

Taichman 21 [Elya Taichman is currently obtaining his J.D. at Temple University Beasley School of Law where he is a Beasley Scholar, a Law and Public Policy Scholar, and a Staff Editor on the Temple Law Review. Elya Taichman is the former Legislative Director for Congresswoman Michelle Lujan Grisham (current Governor of New Mexico). Elya advised the Congresswoman on foreign policy, national security, space, and economic issues., 2021, The Artemis Accords: Employing Space Diplomacy to De-Escalate a National Security Threat and Promote Space Commercialization,https://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1131&context=nslb, 12-15-2021 amrita]

U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act of 2015 (“Space Act”): The Dawn of the Second Space Age **Until recently, it did not matter that the OST was unclear**, and the Moon Treaty failed to garner support. Space exploration remained the province of state actors like NASA because the sheer expense of rocketry and other technologies remained beyond the reach of private corporations and investors throughout the twentieth century.61 However, over the last two decades the industry has changed rapidly. **In the U**nited **S**tates alone, several of the most **innovative companies have invested in space exploration tech**nology.62 As the research accelerates, costs have decreased, and the potential for profits is tremendous – in 2018 the space economy was $360 billion.63 By 2040, its estimated worth is anywhere between $1.1 trillion and $1.7 trillion.64 However, investors demand certainty, and the uncertainty surrounding OST interpretation was reason to pause.65 After all, no investor or company wanted to pour millions, or even billions, into a company designed to mine liquid ice on the Moon only to discover that this violated international law and that the United States had decided to stop licensing such ventures. Just as President Eisenhower feared, the military-industrial complex, augmented by private industry, lobbied Congress heavily to reduce regulatory hurdles and legal uncertainty in space investment.66 In 2015, their efforts bore fruit **when Congress passed the Space Act**, which President Obama signed into law.67 Chapter 513 of Subtitle V – “Space Resource Commercial Exploration and Utilization” – was the shift **that enabled the** American **private** space **industry to flourish**. This **affirmed tha**t American **citizens could own and sell any “space resources”** that were **obtained through “commercial recovery**.”68 In one stroke, **Congress guaranteed property rights to American** citizens and **companies on a “first come, first served basis.”**69 Moreover, American courts would not permit foreign lawsuits accusing entrepreneurs and businesses of violating the OST.70 The law also required the executive branch to “discourage government barriers” to development and for regulation to “facilitate commercial utilization” in space.71 Finally, it required the President to promote the interest of the American space industry.72 Ever wary of the ambiguities of the OST, and likely out of concern that the Space Act might violate the treaty, the law included a disclaimer that it was the sense of Congress that nothing in the Space Act asserted American sovereignty over any celestial body.73 This disclaimer should be read as opinio juris of American interpretation of the OST. In 1967, the United States and the Soviet Union shared a concern that other nations would challenge their technological preeminence in space.74 In 2015, this proved no different, except, this time, the United States was alone in its preeminence. **Russia**, in fact, **strongly objected and claimed that the Space Act violated i**nternational **law.**75 Russia **submit**ted **an objection to** the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (“**COPUOS**”), claiming the Space Act demonstrated “total disrespect for international law order [sic].”76 **Russia** went on to **declare that this law manifested a “doctrine of domination in outer space**.”77 Nonetheless, a careful reading of Russia’s complaint to COPUOS elucidates that Russia never actually asserted that the United States violated the OST.78 To be sure, **Russia came as close as possible** to this, but never outright said it.79 Indeed, the Russians lag behind in investment in outer space and technology and fear American exploitation of space’s vast resources in space without their participation.80 American private investment has accelerated this gap with NASA paying companies like SpaceX $55 million per seat to ferry astronauts to the ISS instead paying the Russians more than $90 million to do the same.81 In fact, in its objection to the Space Act, **Russia stated that the U**nited **S**tates “**could propose** discussing the possibility to reach **uniform understanding** of the status of resources and set forth the structure of the doctrine that would include safety and security aspects.”82 It seems Russia is pining for its prior role of crafting space law with the United States. This also suggests that if Russia had the same capabilities as the United States, its policy would likely be comparable.83

#### US asteroid mining pushes Russia to do the same despite it violating international law- increases the likelihood for tensions to escalate.

Mallick and Rajagopalan 19 [Senjuti Mallick and Rajeswari Pillai Rajagopalan, If space is ‘the province of mankind’, who owns its resources?, 1-24-2019,ORF,https://www.orfonline.org/research/if-space-is-the-province-of-mankind-who-owns-its-resources-47561/, 12-16-2021 amrita]

Meanwhile, **a few other countries**—**which have been critical of the US and** Luxembourg, **at the forefront of** the **space mining** efforts—**have** also **decided to join** the field. **The increasingly competitive and contested nature** of outer space activities is spurring major spacefaring nations to **push the boundaries in** their **space exploration**. **Asteroid mining** could possibly become the next big thing and **is** already **seeing a race** among the space powers. The US and Luxembourg are at the forefront in space resource extraction in terms of the policy frameworks and funding.[xxxvi] **Even as the US has clarified that the** US Space **Act** 2015 **is** being **misunderstood** and that there is no change in the US policy towards national appropriation of space, **the reality** is that it has already **spurred a** major **debate**.[xxxvii] China and Russia are among those countries that are following on the path of the US and Luxembourg in undertaking mining missions in space. According to media reports, Ye Peijian, chief commander and designer of China’s lunar exploration programme has stated that China would send the first batch of asteroid exploration spacecraft around 2020.[xxxviii] Speaking to China’s Ministry of Science and Technology-run newspaper, Science and Technology Daily, Ye said that these asteroids have a high concentration of precious metals, which could rationalise the huge cost and risks involved in these activities as their economic value could run into the trillions of US dollars. Therefore, extraction, mining and transporting them back to Earth through robotic equipment will be a significant activity. Chinese scientists are working on missions to “bring back a whole asteroid weighing several hundred tonnes, which could turn asteroids with a potential threat to Earth into usable resources.”[xxxix] Ye was also quoted as saying that China has plans of “using an asteroid as the base for a permanent space station.”[xl] Helium mining on the moon is also part of China’s goals.[xli] **Russia,** for its part, **is** also **responding to the space-mining developments** of the last decade. For one, it plans to have a permanent lunar base somewhere between 2015 and 2020 for possible extraction of Helium.[xlii] **Even as** Russia’s **official position** on asteroid mining **is that it is forbidden** under the 1967 OST—which states that space is the “province of mankind”—the Russian **industry players** are of the view that they **must follow the** lead taken by the **US** and Luxembourg.[xliii] In early 2018, the director of the Scientific-Educational Center for Innovative Mining Technologies of the Moscow-based National University of Science and Technology MISIS (NUST MISIS), Pavel Ananyev, spoke about the Russian ambitions and proposed activities including space drilling rigs, water extraction on the Moon and 3D printers at space stations.[xliv] **Russia’s private space companies** including Dauria Aerospace, one of the first Russian private space companies, also **hold the opinion that they must go forward** in the same direction and call for a larger space to private sector to engage in extracting space resources.[xlv] **Moscow may not have** yet **actively pursued space mining** and resource extraction, **but it is likely to pick up pace** in the coming years alongside global efforts. Moscow clearly has a capacity gap in terms of funding because its earlier plans to have a permanent base in the Moon by 2015 is yet to happen.

#### Rocky relations with Russia on space issues cause China-Russian alliances—a recommitment is needed.

Taichman 21 [Elya Taichman is currently obtaining his J.D. at Temple University Beasley School of Law where he is a Beasley Scholar, a Law and Public Policy Scholar, and a Staff Editor on the Temple Law Review. Elya Taichman is the former Legislative Director for Congresswoman Michelle Lujan Grisham (current Governor of New Mexico). Elya advised the Congresswoman on foreign policy, national security, space, and economic issues., 2021, The Artemis Accords: Employing Space Diplomacy to De-Escalate a National Security Threat and Promote Space Commercialization,https://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1131&context=nslb, 12-15-2021 amrita]

The Artemis **Accords are a culmination of American space policy to enable commercialization** of outer space. However, they pose a variety of problems. To start, any future agreements under the accords **may violate** international law – both **the OST** and the VCLT. While the Trump Administration appears willing to ignore this issue, violating international law **is a dangerous precedent and should be avoided**.118 Further, the dual nature of all space technology means that **any commercial activity in space** that the Artemis Accords enable **could** readily **be converted for belligerent purposes**.119 This would both violate international law and threaten national security. Despite these inherent dangers, the **Trump** Administration has **maintained a bellicose rhetoric** on its space policy.120 Although American technology and investments surpass those of Russia and China, such rhetoric serves **to inflame** already **tense relations.** **Russia and China are** each **pursuing** their own space **programs which threaten national security** interests, but the United States has engaged neither in Artemis Accords diplomacy.121 A. Violations of International Law? **At best**, future Artemis Accords agreements **exist in a gray area** of international law. After all, the Moon Treaty failed to update and clarify the gaps in the OST on space exploration and resource exploitation by non-state actors. The Space Act and the Artemis Accords together represent American state practice and opinio juris as to the meaning of the OST. At worst, the Trump Administration would be blatantly and knowingly violating international law, in particular the ban on national appropriation. Certainly, the Artemis Accords **signal a willingness to push i**nternational **law to the limit**, if not to step over the line. In addition to potentially violating the OST, the Artemis Accords may also violate the VCLT. Though the United States has not ratified the VCLT, the “treaty on treaties” is customary international law and thus binding on all states. Article 41 of the VCLT permits two or more parties to a treaty to make bilateral, inter-se agreements or to modify a treaty among themselves.122 Yet, if these side deals are “incompatible with the effective execution of the object and purpose of the treaty as a whole” then the VCLT forbids them.123 NASA made clear that bilateral Artemis Accords agreements with other nations will be “grounded in the Outer Space Treaty” and that resource utilization will be conducted under the “auspices of the Outer Space Treaty.”124 Therefore, the United States appears ready to create bilateral, inter-se agreements every time it signs an Artemis Accords agreement. **Because Article II** of the OST clearly **bans national appropriation, licensing non-state actors** to create mining colonies on the Moon in safety zones **verges on appropriation**, especially when coupled with Article VI’s responsibility clause based on national activity.125 Overall, the Administration advances on very uneven legal footing, which is further **compounded by** the fact that **space tech**nologies **are** inherently **dual purpose**. B. Dual Purpose Any technology – from rocketry, to satellites, to mining equipment – introduced into space is inherently dual purpose. That is, it may readily be converted to military uses. The OST makes clear that nuclear weapons are prohibited in space. It also completely demilitarizes the Moon, under Article IV.126 However, military **personal may** **participate in** scientific research or other peaceful purposes – i.e., **commercial ones**.127 Hence, from a national security standpoint it would be legal for other rival nations, namely Russia and China, to create lunar bases or asteroid mines. But **should conflict arise, such tech**nology and infrastructure could readily **be turned hostile** and harnessed against American infrastructure in space. **This is troubling because for** a country like **China there is no** obvious **distinction between public and private** industry.128 And from China’s perspective, NASA is still teaming up with SpaceX in public-private partnerships and the DoD has many of similar agreements as well. In fact, in its 2020 Defense Space Strategy, the DoD proclaimed its eagerness to “[l]everage commercial technological advancements and acquisition processes.”129 An incident with Russia highlights the dangers of dual-purpose space technologies. On November 26, 2019, Russia launched what appeared to be a single satellite.130 Eleven days later the single satellite “birthed” a second.131 In mid-January the pair floated near KH-11, a multi-billion- dollar U.S. military reconnaissance satellite. The United States complained to Moscow, which moved the satellites away from KH-11. However, on July 15, 2020, the “birthed” satellite launched a missile into outer space. This is the first time the United States has alleged a space-based anti-satellite missile test.132 Although Russia claimed that the satellites are peaceful, it proved that even a so-called peaceful satellite could be secretly armed with military capabilities. Ironically, in a speech that same day to his counterparts in Brazil, India, China, and South Africa, Dmitry Rogozin, head of Russia’s space program, called for a “space free of weapons of any type, to keep it fit for long-term and sustainable use as it is today.”133 It requires little imagination to envision a Chinese or Russian base on the Moon doubling as a commercial mining post and as a secret military garrison. After all, when the Soviets feared American ICBM superiority and a first-strike capability in the early 1960s they chose to place missiles in Cuba.134 Nowadays, a similar dynamic exists, with the US enjoying a comparable advantage. C. Bellicose American Rhetoric The Trump Administration has provided mixed signals to rivals about American intentions in outer space. In 2017, Vice President Mike Pence declared that “America must be as dominant in the heavens as it is on Earth.”135 Citing the fear that Sputnik instilled in Americans, Pence later warned that Russia and China were racing to pass the United States in space technology, especially with respect to the military.136 In its 2020 Defense Space Strategy, the DoD pronounced, “China and Russia present the greatest strategic threat due to their development, testing, and deployment of counterspace capabilities and their associated military doctrine for employment in conflict extending to space.”137 More modestly, however, Stephen Kitay, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Space Policy, made clear that the United States is still superior in space capabilities; however, the gap is rapidly diminishing.138 Still, this rhetoric is somewhat misleading. American public investment in space dwarfs Russian and Chinese investments combined: in 2018, the United States invested $41 billion whereas China invested $5.8 billion, and Russia invested $4.2 billion.139 Moreover, this spending does not account for private investment in space. Unfortunately, this author has been unable to procure aggregate data on total U.S. private investment. However, for reference, Jeff Bezos has claimed he invests $1 billion each year of Amazon stock to finance Blue Origins.140 Elon Musk spent $100 million to found SpaceX in 2002.141 In 2019, the company raised $1.33 billion in three rounds of funding.142 Additionally, SpaceX has estimated its broadband satellite project, Starlink, will cost at least $10 billion to build and deploy.143 Finally, Bryce Technology reported that start up space ventures raised $5.7 billion in funding in 2019.144 Whatever the total number is, it is quite large and likely in the tens of billions a year. Russia and China simply do not have the same level of private investment. This is not to say that the Administration is wrong for taking foreign threats in outer space seriously. It should, precisely **because the Russians and Chinese take these threats seriously**. The **U**nited **S**tates **should not**, however, **start a space race** when it is already light years ahead of its rivals, **as this would** repeat the mistake of the first space race – **permit**ting **private industry**, which Eisenhower warned against, **to dictate** American **policy and** thereby **create a technocracy**.145 Naturally, this talk of competition begs the question, what do the Russians and Chinese actually want in outer space? D. Engagement with Russia and China? i. Russia **Russia has** strongly **rejected the** Artemis **Accords as a violation of** **i**nternational **law**.146 After the United States excluded Russia from the Artemis Accords, Dmitry Rogozin, Chief of Roscosmos, fumed, “The principle of invasion is the same, whether it be the Moon or Iraq. The creation of a ‘coalition of the willing’ is initiated. Only Iraq or Afghanistan will come out of this.”147 More recently, he called the Artemis Accords a “political project,” and compared it to NATO.148 When asked if Russia would partner with NASA on Artemis, Rogozin answered, “Frankly speaking, we are not interested in participating in such a project.”149 **Ominously**, Rogozin signaled **a Russian shift towards partnering with the Chinese**, “We respect their results…[China] is definitely our partner.”150 In a sign **of how quickly this partnership is forming**, just a few weeks later, Rogozin announced that he and the Director of the China National Space Administration, Zhang Kejian, had agreed to “probably” build a lunar research base together.151 On March 9, 2021, **Russia and China** signed an agreement to **build** **this base** together.152 This partnership is dripping with irony. Recall that, in 2016, Russia issued a complaint about the Space Act before COPUOS.153 But that complaint walked a fine line and never directly claimed that American resource exploitation in space violated the OST.154 Indeed, the Russians appeared more interested in signaling to the United States their interest in “discussing the possibility to reach uniform understanding of the status of resources and set forth the structure of the doctrine that would include safety and security aspects.”155 As discussed, the Russians care less about complying with international law than being able to shape it to suit their own interests. Though they may lack the level of investment and advanced technologies of the United States, they appear willing to join the Chinese who have a long-term plan to achieve space supremacy. Of course, **the creation of Russo-Chinese partnership** and system in space to challenge the Artemis Accords **would render** Rogozin’s **fear of NATO a self-fulfilling** prophecy.

#### A strong Sino-Russian alliance sets the stage for the replacement of the ILO and a new hegemonic era.

Kevin 3-25 [Tony Kevin, Russia and China are sending Biden a message: don't judge us or try to change us. Those days are over, 3-25-2021,Conversation,https://theconversation.com/russia-and-china-are-sending-biden-a-message-dont-judge-us-or-try-to-change-us-those-days-are-over-157771, 12-15-2021 amrita]

Putin’s message to the new US president The tense test of strength began when Biden was asked about Putin in an interview with ABC News’ George Stephanopoulos and agreed he was “a killer” and didn’t have a soul. He also said Putin will “pay a price” for his actions. Putin then took the unusual step of going on the state broadcaster VGTRK with a prepared five-minute statement in response to Biden**. In an unusually pointed manner, Puti**n recalled the US history of genocide of its Indigenous people, the cruel experience of slavery, the continuing repression of Black Americans today and the unprovoked US nuclear bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the second world war. He **suggested states should not judge others by their own standards:** Whatever you say about others is what you are yourself. Some American journalists and observers have reacted to this as “trolling”. It was not. It was the preamble to Putin’s most important message in years to what he called the American “establishment, the ruling class”. He said the US leadership is determined to have relations with Russia, but only “on its own terms”. Although they think that we are the same as they are, we are different people. We have a different genetic, cultural and moral code. But we know how to defend our own interests. And we will work with them, but in those areas in which we ourselves are interested, and on those conditions that we consider beneficial for ourselves. And they will have to reckon with it. They will have to reckon with this, despite all attempts to stop our development. Despite the sanctions, insults, they will have to reckon with this. **This is new** for Putin. He has **for years made the point**, always politely, **that Western powers need to deal with Russia on a basis of correct diplomatic protocols and mutual respect** for national sovereignty, if they want to ease tensions. But never before has he been as blunt as this, saying in effect: do not dare try to judge us or punish us for not meeting what you say are universal standards, because we are different from you. Those days are now over. **China pushing back against the US**, too Putin’s forceful statement is remarkably similar to the equally firm public statements made by senior Chinese diplomats to US Secretary of State Antony Blinken in Alaska last week. Blinken opened the meeting by lambasting China’s increasing authoritarianism and aggressiveness at home and abroad - in Tibet, Xinjiang, Hong Kong and the South China Sea. He **claimed** such **conduct was threatening “the rules-based order that maintains global stability**”. Yang Jiechi, Chinese Communist Party foreign affairs chief, responded by denouncing American hypocrisy. He said The US does not have the qualification to say that it wants to speak to China from a position of strength. The US uses its military force and financial hegemony to carry out long-arm jurisdiction and suppress other countries. It abuses so-called notions of national security to obstruct normal trade exchanges, and to incite some countries to attack China. He said the US had no right to push its own version of democracy when it was dealing with so much discontent and human rights problems at home. **Russia and China drawing closer together** Putin’s statement was given added weight by two diplomatic actions: Russia’s recalling of its ambassador in the US, and Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov’s meeting in China with his counterpart, Wang Yi. Beijing and Moscow agreed at the summit to stand firm against Western sanctions **and boost ties between their countries to reduce** their **dependence on the US** dollar in international trade and settlements. Lavrov also said, We both believe the US has a destabilising role. It relies on Cold War military alliances and is trying to set up new alliances to undermine the world order. Though Biden’s undiplomatic comments about Putin may have been unscripted, the impact has nonetheless been profound. Together with the harsh tone of the US-China foreign ministers meeting in Alaska — also provoked by the US side — **it is** clear there has been **a major change** in the atmosphere of US-China-Russia relations. What will this mean in practice? Both Russia and China are signalling they will only deal with the West where and when it suits them. Sanctions no longer worry them. The two powers are also showing they are increasingly comfortable working together as close partners, if not yet military allies. They will step up their cooperation in areas where they have mutual interests and the development of alternatives to the Western-dominated trade and payments systems.**Countries** in Asia and further afield **are closely watching** the development of **this alternative international order**, led by Moscow and Beijing. And they **can also recognise** the **signs of increasing US econ**omic and political **decline**. It is a new kind of Cold War, but not one based on ideology like the first incarnation. It is **a war for international legitimacy**, a struggle for hearts and minds and money in the **very large part** of the world **not aligned to the US** or NATO. The US and its allies will continue to operate under their narrative, while Russia and China will push their competing narrative. This was made crystal clear over these past few dramatic days of major power diplomacy. **The global balance of power is shifting**, and for many nations, the smart money might be on Russia and China now.

#### Extinction- stability collapses :/

Rebecca Friedman Lissner & Mira Rapp-Hooper 18, \*Lissner: a Research Fellow at Perry World House, the University of Pennsylvania’s global policy research center, \*\*Rapp-Hooper: a Senior Fellow at the Paul Tsai China Center and Senior Research Scholar at Yale Law School, “The Liberal Order Is More Than a Myth,” Foreign Affairs, July 31, 2018, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/world/2018-07-31/liberal-order-more-myth>

Eighteen months into U.S. President Donald Trump’s administration, domestic and foreign policy analysts alike are in the midst of a bitter awakening: U.S. policy, whether social, economic, or international, may never be the same again. Among the most common refrains from the foreign policy cognoscenti is the warning that Trump has imperiled the liberal international order—the norms, rules, laws, and institutions that have supported U.S. power since 1945. The president’s vengeful unilateralism, we are told, is dismantling a cherished system that has brought peace and stability to the world. In his recent Foreign Affairs article (“The Myth of the Liberal Order,” July/August 2018), Graham Allison provides a useful corrective to this baleful narrative, joining a chorus of contrarian foreign policy thinkers who decry the “myth of the liberal order.” Defenders of the myth, Allison argues, mistakenly credit the liberal order with 70 years of great power peace and misattribute the motivations behind U.S. overseas engagement. The post–World War II system led by the United States was never fully liberal, international, rules based, or orderly. At its core, it was driven by a struggle for global dominance between the United States and the Soviet Union. It was the balance of power between these two nuclear behemoths—and U.S. hegemony in more recent decades—that prevented another world war. For Allison, Trump’s disregard for liberal values may be worrisome, but rather than dreaming of a bygone era of unrivaled liberal hegemony, the United States should focus on rebuilding a robust democracy at home. Although a welcome antidote to the many reverent paeans to the liberal international order and attendant calls for its pristine preservation, Allison’s critique does not fully rhyme with his conclusions. Liberal order may not have been the sole determinant of 70 years of geopolitics, but that does not warrant a wholesale dismissal of the concept as a matter of statecraft or scholarship. And although a restoration of the same liberal system propped up by an indispensable United States is a fantasy, U.S. grand strategy should not discard altogether the notion of international order, even if the world becomes more multipolar and the United States focuses on the defense of democracy at home. MORE THAN A MYTH Critics of the liberal international order are right to draw attention to this often praised but rarely scrutinized concept. Far from a single crystalline structure with ubiquitous reach, the post–World War II order emerged and evolved gradually over the course of the twentieth century. It was initially created as a largely Western project designed for postwar rehabilitation and flourished during the Cold War. It diffused into Asia, Africa, and Latin America following decolonization, cracked and listed during the economic stagnation of the 1970s, and claimed universalism only with its competitors’ demise in the 1990s. To obscure this often disjointed, 70-plus-year evolution by appealing to some monolithic ideal does little justice to the liberal order’s complex history. Yet this labyrinthine trajectory does not obviate the notion of liberal order writ large, whether as an analytic construct or as a grand strategic goal. Granted, the phrase “liberal international order” has always been shorthand for U.S. global leadership—a structure sustained by American power in service of largely Western preferences. As the most powerful state in the system, the United States has disproportionately shaped its rules while reserving the right to periodically flout them. But acknowledging this relationship does not imply that the international liberal system order is purely a reflection of raw power. Even as the U.S.-Soviet Cold War rivalry emerged from bipolarity, the United States’ embrace of liberal internationalism guided its approach to international institutions and structured cooperation within the Western bloc. Unrivaled in the unipolar moment, U.S. grand strategy has been more remarkable for its restraint than its unfettered exercise of coercive power, despite a slew of regrettable excesses. Indeed, the concept of international order is relevant even in a hard power world precisely because it is not reducible to unilateral U.S. interests or to the global distribution of military and economic might. Rather, it emerged and endured through many states’ collective efforts. Where rules are institutionalized in organizations or legal regimes, they reflect painstaking diplomatic efforts to identify convergent interests and codify standards of state behavior. Where rules develop organically, in norms or customary law, they reflect decades of strategic interaction, during which repeated patterns of conflict and cooperation have generated predictability. By design, the U.S.-led liberal system incorporated such attributes. As a result, it offered both stability and considerable political, economic, and security gains to other states. When Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, German Chancellor Angela Merkel, Japanese Premier Shinzo Abe, and other U.S. allies invoke the beleaguered liberal order today, it is because they want to preserve those advantages. Far from dismissing the order as a mere euphemism for U.S. hegemony, they see their own national interests at stake in it. They also recognize that those interests cannot be protected without a powerful—and committed—United States. Even China, the order’s most formidable challenger-in-waiting, finds value in selectively embracing its tenets. THE COMING ENTROPY? The liberal international order is a useful frame for understanding the contours and endurance of U.S. grand strategy over the past 70 years, but it will not persist immutably for another seven decades. Never having achieved the universal acceptance to which post–Cold War triumphalists aspired, the present order is threatened by adverse shifts in the balance of power: China is revisionist in its ascent, and Russia is revanchist in its decline. Global influence is shifting eastward, pushing the United States and Europe into second place. The formal and informal arrangements that govern interstate interaction—which is to say, the international order—must adapt to this new reality if it is to avoid abject decay. But changing power balances alone do not make the order’s demise a foregone conclusion. For the next several decades, the United States will still remain the world’s most powerful state in military, economic, and diplomatic terms. No other country will have the same capacity to shape international order, even as Washington will wield its authority on fundamentally different terms. Put differently, the twilight of the unipolar moment is not the same as the end of U.S. global leadership or preeminence. Given this, how the United States adapts its grand strategy to domestic turmoil and considerable flux abroad will matter a great deal for the future of global order. Other states, chief among them China, will cement their own power in regional and global rules and institutions. This trend is well under way, and some aspects of it are nonthreatening, such as when Beijing requests a greater voting share at the International Monetary Fund. Elsewhere, however, Beijing is fashioning new institutions governed by rules that are decidedly illiberal, as with its Belt and Road Initiative. It would be a grave mistake for the United States to abandon the idea of international order as an empty grand strategic ambition and settle for regional influence over its own neighborhood. Spheres of influence are a form of balance-of-power order but have historically been a fundamentally less stable one and would certainly degrade U.S. security and prosperity. Instead of letting rivals carve out spheres of influence, the United States needs a novel grand strategic vision that rejects both radical retreat and creativity-numbing nostalgia. Any new approach must account for rapidly shifting power relations and technological change. It should also reflect more critically on the universalist ambitions of post–Cold War U.S. grand strategy and may require a greater tolerance for regime diversity than liberal triumphalists could have possibly imagined at the apex of U.S. power. For the United States to lead abroad, it must also confront the dysfunction that is hollowing out support for internationalism at home. As we have argued, and as Allison rightly points out, Trump may be more avatar than architect of the United States’ domestic unraveling. To be sure, Trump’s transactional and visceral approach to foreign policy is itself wreaking havoc on the predictability underlying the postwar order and will require global recompense of epochal proportions from any new leader. But we cannot assess the extent or endurance of his destructiveness just 18 months into his term. What we do know is that Trump’s victory was not an isolated political shock—a fact that many analysts miss by fixating on Trump’s heterodox administration and anticipating his eventual exit. In some ways, Trump’s policies are merely a modern projection of old impulses, most notably the deep unilateralism of the Jacksonian school of foreign policy. Trump’s contemporary version, however, rests on populist and nativist impulses activated in part by socioeconomic dislocation that will only intensify. Automation and the changing nature of work, inequality, political and media polarization, and demographic changes are likely to intersect with an increasingly turbulent international environment, making it more difficult still to articulate a coherent foreign policy built around age-old liberal values and institutions. These domestic undercurrents must be faced squarely—not only for the sake of restoring a sustainable U.S. social compact but in order to build a consensus on the United States’ role in the world. NEW ORDER Less than halfway through Trump’s first term, the U.S. foreign policy establishment, cut off from the levers of power, watches in a state of shock as the country stumbles from one international indignity to another. But the domestic and international forces that carried Trump to power will accelerate with his presidency and outlast his tenure. The United States, in other words, is only just commencing a strategic reckoning, the likes of which it has not undertaken since the years immediately following World War II. In the new strategic environment, the old liberal order built on unrivaled U.S. power will no doubt prove obsolete and untenable. But that should not imply giving up on the system altogether—particularly since it has advanced U.S. interests at a lower cost than any known alternative. As in previous eras, the United States’ global power position will condition, but not predetermine, Washington’s strategic choices. In this process of reorientation, domestic renewal and international restoration are not, as Allison suggests, mutually exclusive. In fact, they are complements, and any serious reevaluation of U.S. strategy must address them simultaneously. The liberal international order may be less foundational than often argued, but it serves more than just narrative purposes. In its hour of duress, a new vision for U.S. strategy must assess threats and advantages at home and abroad and adapt the institutions that have been the foundation of American power. If successful, the United States will navigate an epoch of disruptive change, both domestic and international, in a manner that is peaceful and redounds to U.S. interests. It is a formidable task to be sure, but this moment demands no less.

## 1AC — FW

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing.

#### Prefer it:

#### 1] Actor specificity:

#### A] Aggregation – every policy benefits some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action.

#### B] No act-omission distinction – choosing to omit is an act itself – governments decide not to act which means being presented with the aff creates a choice between two actions, neither of which is an omission

#### 2] Lexical pre-requisite: threats to bodily security preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis that inhibits the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose

#### 3] Extinction comes first!

**Pummer 15** [Theron, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. “Moral Agreement on Saving the World” Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] AT

**There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now**, whatever general moral view we adopt**: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war.** How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that **we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world.** According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. **Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here.** If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how **reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people.** Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, **this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But that is a huge mistake.** **Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don’t matter.** Even John Rawls wrote, “**All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.**” **Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view.** **They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk**, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. **Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk.** It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). **To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being.** To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – **suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being**, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But **once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk.** Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. **We should also take into account moral uncertainty.** **What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts?** I’ve just argued that **there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree.** But **even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one** (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), **they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk.** Perhaps most disturbingly still, **even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world.** Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. **It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if**, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, **all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world.** While there are some non-crazy **views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness**, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless **seem to be fairly implausible views.** And **even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve.** Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. **Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast.** We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. **If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period.** Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. **Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.**” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)