## 1AC - Framing

### 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

#### C] No intent-foresight distinction – If we foresee a consequence, then it becomes part of our deliberation which makes it intrinsic to our action since we intend it to happen

## 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.

Tronchetii 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 – Asteroid Mining

#### Countries and their companies are making their own rules through patchwork which creates conflict—an international body is key

Foster 16 – Craig, J.D., University of Illinois College of Law, “EXCUSE ME, YOU’RE MINING MY ASTEROID: SPACE PROPERTY RIGHTS AND THE U.S. SPACE RESOURCE EXPLORATION AND UTILIZATION ACT OF 2015”, *JOURNAL OF LAW, TECHNOLOGY & POLICY*, No. 2, page 428-430, http://illinoisjltp.com/journal/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Foster.pdf

There are many reasons to be excited about the prospect of mining resources from space. Hopes are high that these mining efforts will provide an economic boon by producing jobs and injecting more money into the economy. 214 Additionally, the negative impact of mining natural resources on Earth is widely reported215 and might be mitigated by space mining. If mining precious resources from space can minimize the burden on Earth, then this would lend even greater support for asteroid mining. Finally, little enchants the human mind and propels innovation more than sending people and manmade objects into space. For good reason, there is much enthusiasm about the prospect of space mining. On the other hand, it is troublesome to some that private, commercial entities will be paving the way and making up many of the rules as they go. Might this lead to repeating many of the mistakes humans have made on Earth? Might there be unforeseen problems that could spell trouble if mining efforts are not properly regulated? The answer to these questions is likely “yes” as well. It will be important in the coming years to balance the former excitement against the latter caution. Space might seem limitless and impossible to affect in any significant fashion; but, history must be a major voice for the spacemining industry.216 It must be remembered that humans can make an impact that will be felt for generations to come. Thus, it will be important that lawmakers and the international community be as proactive as possible—both in outlining property rights and protecting the final frontier from being harmed by an industry that might become overzealous if left unchecked. Specifically, it will be vital for countries to enter into some sort of international agreement. One option is to create an agreement similar to UNCLOS, which would regulate how individual states and their citizens interact with resources mined from space.217 Such an agreement should recognize not only the property rights of the extracting commercial entities but also the rights of non-spacefaring countries to benefit from the minerals as well. This might include the creation of an international body, much like the ISA, that will ensure that the interests of all nations are maintained by distributing funds and technology to less wealthy or non-spacefaring nations. The U.S. would do well to help create and ratify such an agreement— something they have failed to do with UNCLOS. If the U.S. and other countries are uneasy about entering into such a restrictive agreement, they might also consider an international regulatory body and scheme much like the one used for satellites. The International Telecommunications Union (ITU) is a United Nations agency that, among other services, provides the international community with uniform satellite orbit oversight and regulatory guidance.218 Currently, 193 countries follow the ITU regulations and utilize their services, which have been likened to domain name registration.219 In the same way, spacefaring countries could form an international body that helps create and maintain a uniform space-mining legal framework.220 Without some sort of international framework as described above, the U.S. and other space-mining countries leave themselves open to great conflict and will be required to patch together a multitude of treaties between themselves as problems inevitably arise.221 V. CONCLUSION The idea of mining resources from celestial bodies is something that has always been relegated to video games and sci-fi movies. But as technology continues to progress at an exponential rate, such mining is starting to come within the realm of possibility. A number of companies are currently creating prospecting technologies that will allow them to determine exactly what an individual asteroid holds. They hope to eventually harvest these resources and sell them for lucrative profits. Fortunately for these companies, the current legal regime governing property rights to space resources is undergoing rapid change at the national level. The U.S. recently passed the Space Resource Exploration and Utilization Act of 2015, which explicitly entitles U.S. citizens to property rights over any space resources they obtain. This is certain to induce confidence in U.S. investors. The situation at the international level is different. Current international space agreements are vague, lacking in consensus, and provide little precedent for ownership of space resources. This has led the international community to move in the direction of creating a better regulatory framework, but this movement is still in discussion stages and is likely to take a while to come to fruition.

#### Current space treaties have zero authority and lack clarity—which creates ineffective regulations

MacWhorter 16 – Kevin, J.D from William and Mary College and Contributor to the William & Mary Environmental Law and Policy Review, “Sustainable Mining: Incentivizing Asteroid Mining in the Name of Environmentalism”, *William & Mary Environmental Law and Policy Review,* 2016, <https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1653&context=wmelpr>

Although an academic debate at this point, the legal status of property in space is necessary for any future exploration and exploitation of natural resources in space. Until then, private exploration is severely disincentivized. Further, the technology behind asteroid mining is fast becoming a reality.108 The law must respond. In order to evaluate what the international community needs to accomplish to ensure future exploration, one must explore the international agreements already in place that speak to the issue of property rights. To begin, the United Nations (UN) established the UN Office of Outer Space Affairs (UNOOSA) in 1958 109 to promote international cooperation in space and promote its peaceful use.110 UNOOSA oversees the UN’s Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS) and implements its decisions.111 The UN founded COPUOS to avoid international rivalries in space.112 The OST, the Liability Convention,113 and the Moon Agreement114 are all within the jurisdiction of COPUOS. There are five international agreements that lay a framework of space law and, more importantly, ownership of objects and celestial bodies in space: • The Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (OST); 115 • The Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, the Return of Astronauts and the Return of Space Objects Launched into Outer Space(ARRA); 116 • The Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects (Liability Convention); 117 • TheConvention on RegistrationofObjectsLaunched intoOuterSpace (Registration Convention); 118 and • The Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (Moon Treaty). 119 As with all international law, however, the actual authority of these treaties is debatable, because countries often ignore their precepts or disagree on the meaning of their substance.120 International custom, therefore, is the major indication of what international law exactly is.121 The Law of the Sea is an instructive analogy on that point, and as Lyall and Larsen explain, The practice need not be wholly uniform, but must be undertaken in the belief it is binding and required by law as opposed to being merely convenient or mutually beneficial. 122 Further, international law in general was conceived to deal with relations between States, not to deal with private claims of property. 123 International.

#### Specifically, private entities are scarcely covered by treaties and those that do apply lack enforcement – means zero enforcement

Wrench 20 John Wrench [Editor in Chief of CWRU Journal of ILaw], 12/2/2020, “Non-Appropriation, No Problem: The Outer Space Treaty Is Ready for Asteroid Mining”, Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law, Vol. 51, 2019, <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3707815> DD AG

Despite this foundation of international space law, a plethora of issues within this framework allows private actors the ability to escape enforcement. Part II.A argues that ambiguities in the law allow private actors to avoid enforcement entirely. Part II.B contends that, even if private actors do fall under the purview of the law, international space law lacks the enforcement capabilities to actually serve any effective regulatory or adjudicative purpose for these private actors. As stated supra, the space treaties primarily address the rights and obligations of states, and thus they are heavily “state-oriented.”113 While the purview of the law may have also intended to extend to intergovernmental organizations as well,114 private entities were mostly considered to have “no independent legal status in international space law.”115 Because the drafters of the five international space treaties did not primarily intend to elaborate on the rights and duties of private actors, regulation of private actors from these treaties has been ambiguous at best. Along with this state-centered approach to drafting this body of international space law, many provisions of these treaties, namely the Outer Space Treaty, were left broad for elaboration by future treaties.116 The general manner in which these provisions were drafted has left loopholes for private parties to potentially exploit to avoid enforcement. This section reviews three such ambiguous terms: “national activities,” “non-governmental entities,” and “damage.” The term “national activities” is mentioned multiple times in the Outer Space Treaty and the Moon Agreement but is not defined. This leaves open to interpretation whether the activities conducted by private actors in outer space are included in the Outer Space Treaty. Specifically, Article VI of the Outer Space Treaty states that “State Parties . . . shall bear international responsibility for national activities in outer space, whether such activities are carried on by governmental agencies or by non-governmental entities.”117 Article 14 of the Moon Agreement states that “State Parties . . . shall bear international responsibility for national activities on the Moon, whether such activities are carried on by governmental agencies or by non-governmental entities . . . .”118 At least two different interpretations of “national activities” exist, each allowing avenues for non-enforcement for private actors. The first interpretation is that “national activities” relate only to state activities and thus exclude private and commercial activities entirely.119 Another interpretation of “national activities” refers to space activity within the country. 120 This ambiguous definition of “national activities” may present regulatory gaps over commercial activities in outer space.121 Even if international activities were included under the purview of the treaty, there lies the issue of which state is responsible for the activity. Article VII states that non-governmental entities “require authorization and continuing supervision by the appropriate State Party to the Treaty,” but never elaborates on what state is deemed “appropriate.”122 One scholar contends that the “appropriate State” includes “both the State whose nationality the [space object] has and the State or States on whose territory its activities are done.”123 This standard still implicates at least two states, which may make enforcement of international activities difficult. Uncertainty relating to the definition of “national activities” may “lead to uncertainty as to which state should regulate which private activities” in outer space,124 and has allowed States Parties to “define [national activities] as they see fit and to act accordingly.”125 A more concrete definition of “national activities” is required to provide more clarity on the exact activities that would be covered under these treaties. Similar to the lack of definition for “national activities,” neither the Outer Space Treaty nor the Moon Agreement define “non-governmental entities.” Because the treaty does not explicitly mention private actors, Article VI’s discussion of “non-governmental entities” provides the most plausible argument that private actors are covered under the treaty**.** It is entirely possible that the drafters of the treaty intended “non-governmental entities” to only include inter-governmental organizations, since “sovereign states and inter-governmental organizations have been the exclusive subjects of international space law.”126 Another interpretation is that “non-governmental entities” was intentionally kept broad to cover other entities and individuals, including private entities. In summary, because the Outer Space Treaty and the Moon Agreement “do[] not offer detailed provisions on the involvement of private entities in space activities,”127 the treaties may cover private entities only to the extent that such an interpretation can be implicated, and such implications are ambiguous at best. These ambiguities alone may allow private entities or the activities of private entities to avoid enforcement under the Outer Space Treaty and the Moon Agreement. Even if private actors did fall under the purview of international space law, international space law has inadequate enforcement mechanisms to actually implement these laws. **Much like how the treaties generally were intended to outline a framework for the rights and obligations of States Parties specifically,** the enforcement mechanisms of these treaties also intend that states be the only entities allowed to submit or defend claims. The five international space treaties for the most part lack any sort of dispute resolution organ at all. The two treaties that do have these organs are riddled with inadequacies that allow private actors to avoid being subject to these dispute resolution frameworks. Part B.1 discusses the dispute resolution framework within the international space law treaties themselves. Part B.2 analyzes the regulatory enforcement mechanisms established outside the treaties, with a focus on UNCOPUOS and other key intergovernmental organizations. Part B.3 evaluates the adjudicative and arbitral enforcement mechanisms that exist outside of the treaties, with a particular focus on the Permanent Court of Arbitration and the adjudicative capabilities of key intergovernmental organizations. Finally, Part B.4 focuses on domestic space law and its enforcement capabilities upon private actors.

#### Disputes and misperceptions create cascading effects towards space weaponization and an arms race—an international framework solves BUT unilateral action causes escalating space wars

Mallick & Rajagopalan 19 - Law Researcher at the High Court of Delhi from 2016 to 2018 and is currently pursuing LL.M in International Law at The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, USA, \*\*Distinguished Fellow and Head of the Nuclear and Space Policy Initiative at Observer Research Foundation. She is also the Technical Adviser to the UN Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Prevention of Arms Race in Outer Space (PAROS). (Rajeswari Pillai Rajagopalan, Senjuti Mallick, “If Space is ‘the Province of Mankind’, Who Owns its Resources? The Potential of Space Mining and its Legal Implications”, ORF Occasional Paper No. 182, January 2019, Observer Research Foundation., <https://www.orfonline.org/research/if-space-is-the-province-of-mankind-who-owns-its-resources-47561/>) NAR

The first concern is establishing clear regulations regarding asteroid mining. With an intent to establish clear regulations with respect to asteroid mining and to legalise material extraction from the moon and other celestial bodies by private companies in the US, the US government legalised space mining in 2015 by introducing the US Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act, 2015.[xxvii] This move was heartily welcomed by the private companies as it provided legitimacy to their planned activities. Subsequently in 2017, Luxembourg followed suit.[xxviii] While the US has been a spacefaring nation for many decades now, Luxembourg aspires to become a global leader in the nascent race to mine resources in outer space. In the 1980s the tiny European nation arose out of almost nowhere to become a leader in the satellite communications industry; today it is looking to the skies again, hoping to be the Silicon Valley of asteroid mining.[xxix] In the backdrop of a thriving steel industry that faced trade recession during the oil crisis of 1973, Luxembourg is trying to capitalise on the potential of space mining. As Prime Minister Xavier Bettel put it, “We realized it wouldn't be forever, the steel, so we decided to do other things.”[xxx] Similarly, looking beyond oil, the UAE is framing its policy approaches to make advances in two key areas: human space exploration, and commercial activities of resource extraction through mining.[xxxi] The two formal pieces of legislation (passed by the US and Luxembourg) provide an answer to the complex question of ownership in outer space; the two-word answer appears to be, “finders, keepers”. The US Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act, 2015 states: “A US citizen engaged in commercial recovery of an asteroid resource or a space resource shall be entitled to any asteroid resource or space resource obtained.”[xxxii] This legislation gives US space firms the right to own, keep, use, and sell the spoils of the cosmos as they deem fit. Luxembourg’s legislation is fairly analogous to the US Act, giving mining companies the right to keep their plunder. However, unlike the US law, Luxembourg’s does not require a company’s major stakeholders to be based in the country to enjoy its safeguards; the only requirement is for that company to have an office in the country.[xxxiii] In 2017, Japan entered into a five-year agreement with Luxembourg for mining operations in celestial bodies. Japan today appears a step closer to realising its objective of asteroid mining with two Japanese rovers, Minerva II-1, of JAXA landing on the surface of the asteroid named Ryugu in September 2018.[xxxiv] Earlier, Portugal and the UAE signed similar cooperation agreements with Luxembourg.[xxxv] 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. India, too, has ambitions in extraterrestrial resource extraction. In fact, a year after the US legislation, Prabhat Ranjan, executive director of Technology Information, Forecasting and Assessment Council (TIFAC), a policy organisation within the Department of Science and Technology, made a case for India to push ahead with lunar and asteroid mining. He said, “Moon is already being seen as a mineral wealth and further one can go up to the asteroids and start exploiting this. This can be a big game changer and if India doesn’t do this, we will lag behind.”[xlvi] More recently, Dr. K Sivan, Chairman of the country’s civil space organisation, Indian Space Research Organisation (ISRO), talked about ISRO’s plans for helium-3 extraction and said, “the countries which have the capacity to bring that source from the moon to Earth will dictate the process. I don’t want to be just a part of them, I want to lead them.”[xlvii] However, gaining proficiency in such missions is not easy – the NASA and ESA (the European Space Agency) have been discussing these possibilities for a longer time, albeit quietly. The ISRO Chairman’s response was characterised by an Indian commentator as “aspirational” and “emotional”, clearly conceding that the country’s technological wherewithal is yet to be adequate.[xlviii] Importantly, it is not clear how the legal and regulatory aspects of space mining operations are being dealt with. There was one instance, though, when Luxembourg and Japan in a joint press statement said, “The exchange of information may cover all the issues of the exploration and commercial utilization of space resources, including legal, regulatory, technological, economic, and other aspects.”[xlix] Whether such legalisation is truly legal is arguable. Space Mining: Legal or Not? The Outer Space Treaty (OST) of 1967, considered the global foundation of the outer space legal regime, along with the other four associated international instruments have provided the fundamental basis for outer space activities by prohibiting certain activities and emphasising aspects such as the “common heritage of mankind”. These agreements have been useful in highlighting the global common nature of outer space. At the same time, however, they have been insufficient and ambiguous in providing clear regulations to newer space activities such as asteroid mining. Based on the premise of ‘res communis’, the magna carta of space law, the OST, illustrates outer space as “the province of all mankind”.[l] Under Article I, States are free to explore and use outer space and to access all celestial bodies “on the basis of equality and in accordance with international law.”[li] Although the OST does not explicitly mention “mining” activities, under Article II, outer space including the Moon and other celestial bodies are “not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty” through use, occupation or any other means.[lii] Furthermore, the Moon Agreement, 1979, not only defines outer space as “common heritage of mankind” but also proscribes commercial exploitation of planets and asteroids by States unless an international regime is established to govern such activities for “rational management,” “equitable sharing” and “expansion of opportunities” in the use of these resources.[liii] Slipping conveniently through the loophole in the OST, both the US and Luxembourg have authorised companies to claim exclusive ownership over extracted resources (but not of the asteroid itself). Proponents argue that since no sovereign nation is actually asserting rights over an area of outer space, instead, it is only a private unit claiming rights over singular resources, the treaty norm, “national appropriation by claim of sovereignty”, is not being violated. In the words of renowned space lawyer, Frans von der Dunk, “In terms of the law, yes it’s true that no country can claim any part of outer space as national territory — but that doesn’t mean private industry can’t mine resources.”[liv] Quoting reference from maritime law, Luxembourg regards space resources as appropriable akin to fish and shellfish, but celestial bodies and asteroids are not, just like the high sea. It is noteworthy that out of the only 18 nations that have ratified the Moon Agreement,[lv] none are major spacefaring nations, thereby giving themselves a convenient leeway to not abide by the same. These unilateral initiatives have set off a critical response from the international community. Applying literal interpretation of the OST, there is certainly room to construe that space mining may be legal, compared to the Moon Agreement whose prohibition is absolute. However, taking into consideration the letter and spirit of the OST, strengthened by the Moon Agreement, the argument that “national appropriation” only extends to appropriation of territory and not appropriation of resources is a far reach. That resource extraction is contemplated, albeit implicitly, in the OST, is nothing but logical. Not only have such claims of possessory rights not been recognised in the past, there is also global consensus regarding its illegality.[lvi] It therefore forms a part of customary international law, despite the Moon Agreement not having been widely ratified. In this light, the legalisation of space mining is a sheer violation of the elemental principles of international space law. Yet, there is no clarity on what activity is allowed and what is prohibited in outer space under the existing law.[lvii] There is ambiguity around most issues—from “who would license and regulate asteroid mining operations” to the legality of these activities as per the existing international space law.[lviii] When comparing it to the law of the seas, resource appropriation in the high seas and deep seabed is governed by the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), 1982, and that in Antarctica, as per the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, 1991. While the former is strictly regulated under Part XI of UNCLOS, the latter is completely forbidden but for scientific purposes. The law of the sea argument—“owning the fish, not the sea”—cannot be applied to outer space primarily because fish are living resources that can reproduce and therefore are renewable. Outer space resources, on the other hand, are depletable: once harvested, they cannot be replenished. The analogy with fish and seas, therefore, is not a fair one and its transposition to outer space and celestial bodies would be inaccurate. Perhaps a more comparable regime is the deep seabed, which contemplates property rights over mineral extraction. The utilisation and ownership of the deep seabed’s resources are exclusively structured around the International Seabed Authority (ISA), which is responsible for organising, carrying out and controlling all activities in the seabed.[lix] Not only must State parties seek sanction from the ISA before beginning resource exploitation, but the fiscal benefits from seabed mining must also be shared among all.[lx] Evidently, even the UNCLOS upholds State ownership and fair distribution over individual ownership and self-centred gains.[lxi] By allowing private ownership, the US and Luxembourg are once again in contravention of the very same law they are relying on. The touchstone principle, “province of all mankind” is also being defeated. Therefore, to even reap the limited benefits as under UNCLOS, at least the derivation must be made alike. This argument too falls flat. The Way Ahead Undoubtedly, growing technological adeptness has made space mining inevitable and, therefore, the question is no longer “if” but “when”. Nevertheless, a scenario where companies can, solely based on domestic laws, steadily exploit mineral resources in outer space, would be universally unacceptable. Minus regulations, the realisation of space exploitation will create great disparity between nations and disrupt dynamics of the world economy. Regulations are particularly important in the context of the space debris problem. We definitely do not wish for a future, befittingly described by renowned engineer and inventor Graham Hawkes, thus: “Space exploration promised us alien life, lucrative planetary mining, and fabulous lunar colonies. News flash, ladies and gents: Space is nearly empty. It’s a sterile vacuum, filled mostly with the junk we put up there.”[lxii] Therefore, it is extremely important that resource appropriation is carried out in an ethical manner, without interrupting safe and secure access to outer space, simultaneously allowing all countries a share in the proceeds. Technological advances and financial readiness are pushing both, states and non-state players towards new ventures in outer space. Yet, the rules of engagement especially dealing with the new commercial activities are far from ideal. There is a clear and urgent need to debate and come up with either a new regulation or accommodate the space mining activities within the existing international legal measures. Experts have articulated that these could possibly be addressed under the existing property law principles or old mining law principles.[lxiii] However, given the scale of activities that states and non-state parties will engage in, the ability of the existing regime to address space mining could be highly inadequate. The second option would be to develop a new instrument including an institutional architecture that would set out the parameters for activities related to resource extraction and space mining. Since there are a good number of commercial players playing a formidable role in asteroid mining, there has to be space for commercial players in the new gig, which might be a big departure from the earlier era institutions that saw states being the sole authority in regulating activities in outer space. A clear role for commercial players has been articulated for some time but the global space community has yet to reach a consensus in how they can be incorporated into the global governance debates. The apprehension on the part of a number of states is driven by the fact that private sector participation is still largely a western phenomenon. This trend may be undergoing change in other parts of the world but until there is a sizeable private sector community in other major spacefaring powers, there is a fear that the western bloc of countries may stand to gain from the industry being represented in the global governance debates. A third possible option is to get a larger global endorsement of the Moon Treaty, which highlights the common heritage of mankind. The Moon Treaty is important as it addresses a “loophole” of the OST “by banning any ownership of any extraterrestrial property by any organization or private person, unless that organization is international and governmental.”[lxiv] But the fact that it has been endorsed only by a handful of countries makes it a “failure” from the international law perspective.[lxv] Nevertheless, efforts must be made to strengthen the support base for the Moon Agreement given the potential pitfalls of resource extraction and space mining activities in outer space. Signatories to the Moon Treaty can take the lead within multilateral platforms such as the UN to debate the usefulness of the treaty in the changed context of technological advancements and new geopolitical dynamics, and potentially find compromises where there are disagreements. Pursuing a collective approach is ideal. An example is UNCLOS, which demonstrates that the international society possesses the capability of regulating mining quarters deemed to be the “province of mankind”. However, a sui generis legal framework must be crafted because the difference between the marines and outer space and their resources is wide, and the regulations are too region-specific to permit a superimposition of the oceanic regime to outer space. A sound legal environment will protect both the company performing operations and its beneficiaries, while ensuring even-handed resource allocation. In addition, regulations spelling out safety standards and identifying safety zones around mining operations could be useful in ensuring safe and secure operations in outer space. It would be wrong, however, to say that the international community has not debated over this. In fact, one of the main agenda points of the fifty-seventh session of UNCOPUS Legal Committee held in April 2018, was especially devoted to “general exchange of views on potential legal models for activities in the exploration, exploitation and utilization of space resources.”[lxvi] Upon evaluation, it is clear that countries are not against space mining as such; rather the contentious points are vis-à-vis authorisation, regulation, and where to place responsibility. There also appears to be concurrence regarding the need for international coordination efforts of some sort. Over the last two years, The Hague Space Resources Governance Working Group,[lxvii] established with the purpose of “assess[ing] the need for a regulatory framework for space resource activities, has identified 19 “building blocks”,[lxviii] encompassing subject matters that could be included in such a regulatory framework. Although this leaves a lot of hope for the legitimate mining of space resources, its status is still pending. Also, several questions need to be agreed upon by the global space policy community before the establishment of a framework. First, there must be an agreement among all the space powers on the need for a global governance framework for the use of space resources. This must be followed by detailed deliberations on the scope, mandate and objectives of such a framework. Can and should there be safety zones and exclusive rights be recognised under such a framework and how one can ensure equitable sharing of the resources, and lastly, the role of industries and how the interests of the industry as pioneers in this area can be secured. These are all pertinent questions that need to be considered and debated before an international regime for extraction and use of space resources can be established.[lxix] Even legal space mining activity could have serious impacts in two ways. For instance, any technological spinoffs that a country might have could add to the space weaponisation debate. Two, the erosion of norms with regard to space mining could have a cascading effect on other norms in the same issue area such as weaponisation of space. It is imperative for nations to actively combine their efforts to ensure that this activity transpires in the most globally acceptable manner and not one which stirs anarchism. The ancient Roman maxim, ‘Quod omnes tangit ab omnibus approbatur’ (What touches all must be approved by all) gains due traction in this kind of a scenario. Therefore, a universal activity like space exploration mandates an international guideline; or else, the first haul from mining, instead of earning admiration and exultation, will only be enmeshed in litigation.

#### 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.●

#### Major collisions cause extinction

Sagan 94 – Carl, Astrophysicist PhD University of Chicago and president of the International Astronomical Union's commission on "Physical Studies of Planets and Satellites, “The Long-Range Consequences of Interplanetary Collisions”, *The Long-Range Consequences of Interplanetary Collisions,*, 1/1/1994, <https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1994IST....10...67S/abstract>

It is a straightforward consequence of orbtal mechanics and probability theory that, through its long history, the earth will be struck, at typical velocities of 20 kilometers per second, many times by these objects. Collisions with the larger members of this population are catastrophic. The greatest danger is from impacts pacts energetic enough to inject so much pulverized soil and rock into the stratosphere as to darken and cool most of the Earth. Regardless of the impact location location. unlike most familiar hazards, the impact threat works on many different time scales, ail mach longer than a human lifetime. On average, every millenium there will be a collision event as energetic as the highest-yield nuclear weapon ever detonated (the result of an impact of an object a few tens of meters in di- ameter); every 10,000 years, one that may have global climatic effects (the result of an impact of an object 200 meters in diameter); and every million years, an impact event tens of times more encrgetic than the aggregate yield of the world's current nuciear arsenal (the result of an impact of an object 2.5 kilometers in diameter)—cnough to cause a global catastrophe and kill a significant fraction of the humaa species. The evolution of life on Earth seems to have been profoundly altered by collixions wish such bodies. The best-attested such event, and the single-most important teason that interplanctary collision hazards are being taken seriously today, is the Cretaccous-Testiary (K-T) catastrophe of about 66 million years ago, in which all the dinosaurs and about 75 percent of the other species of life on Earth were rendered extinct. The events attendant to that impact are thought to include a global immolation of land plant life, widespread tsunamis, chaotic ocean mixing, a decline in light levels toward and below the compensation point of photosyathesis (bclow which plants burn more chemical energy than they store). short-term average global temperature dectines of 10°C or more, global acid rain. significant depletion of the protective ozone Layer, and prolonged carbon-dioxide-induced global warming. The relative hazards pro- vided by each of these factors is unknown, but it seems likely that a quick succession of enviromental catas- tophes is nonlinearly more dangerous, because organ- isms immune to of only weakened by one assault may be finished off by the next. Even an impact much less severe than the K-T event would pose a serious threat to our global civilization. A conservative rough threshold for the diameter of a colliding asteroid that would cause a global cates- tophe (and not just local devastation) és set at about 1.5 kilometers. Such a collision would release an en- ergy equivalent to 100,000 megatons of TNT, dis- rupt the ecosphere, terminate agriculture, and likely kill more than a billion people. Refining current assessments of the impact hazard is therefore well worth doing. Especially because, compared with many other activities of our civilization, it is so cheap.

### 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

#### Scenario 1: Rocky relations with Russia on asteroid mining 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.