# T Permanent

### NC Shell – Space Debris – T Appropriation

#### Interpretation: Appropriation is permanently taking property for exclusive use. Gorove 69:

Stephen Gorove, Interpreting Article II of the Outer Space Treaty, 37 Fordham L. Rev. 349 (1969). Available at: https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr/vol37/iss3/2

With respect to the concept of appropriation the basic question is what constitutes "appropriation," as used in the Treaty, especially in contradistinction to casual or temporary use. The term "appropriation" is used most frequently to denote the taking of property for one's own or exclusive use with a sense of permanence. Under such interpretation the establishment of a permanent settlement or the carrying out of commercial activities by nationals of a country on a celestial body may constitute national appropriation if the activities take place under the supreme authority (sovereignty) of the state. Short of this, if the state wields no exclusive authority or jurisdiction in relation to the area in question, the answer would seem to be in the negative, unless, the nationals also use their individual appropriations as cover-ups for their state's activities.5 In this connection, it should be emphasized that the word "appropriation" indicates a taking which involves something more than just a casual use. Thus a temporary occupation of a landing site or other area, just like the temporary or nonexclusive use of property, would not constitute appropriation. By the same token, any use involving consumption or taking with intention of keeping for one's own exclusive use would amount to appropriation.

#### Violation: space debris is not appropriation. Williams 95:

Christopher D. Williams, Space: The Cluttered Frontier, 60 J. Air L. & Com. 1139 (1995) https://scholar.smu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1384&context=jalc

Article II of the treaty allows for a more interesting argument. This article states, "[o] uter space.., is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means." 68 In a sense, space debris may constitute a form of appropriation of outer space. Because two objects cannot occupy the same space (orbit) at the same time, placing debris in space removes the possibility of another object using that location.69 This approach is related to the view of outer space as a commons. Some argue that Articles I and II of the Outer Space Treaty provide a structure for use of outer space similar to a terrestrial commons, thus encouraging spacefaring nations to take maximum advantage of the resource of space in the shortest time possible. 70 As with a terrestrial commons, the use or consumption of the resource by one party necessarily precludes that use by another member of the commons. Thus, the placement of debris in orbit may in fact constitute an appropriation. However, as in the case of accidental fragmentary debris, this appropriation may be entirely out of the control of any party. In addition, if the premise of the argument is valid, then any space object, not just space debris, would constitute an appropriation of outer space in violation of Article II. This clearly was not intended by the drafters of the treaty.

#### Vote neg – two impacts:

#### Limits. Expanding the topic to anything that involves merely launching something into the atmosphere expands the topic into numerous new tech areas which undermines core neg prep.

#### Topic literature. Our definition has intent to define and exclude in the context of the OST, which is the core of all topic research and the only predictable source.

#### Drop the debater to preserve fairness and education – use competing interps – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation. No RVIs – they don’t get to win for following the rules.

# T appropriation

#### Interpretation—the aff may not defend a subset of appropriation.

#### Appropriation is a generic indefinite singular. Cohen 01

Ariel Cohen (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev), “On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars,” Journal of Semantics 18:3, 2001 <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/188590876.pdf>

\*IS generic = Indefinite Singulars

French, then, expresses the two types of reading differently. In English, on¶ the other hand, generic BPs are ambiguous between inductivist and normative¶ readings. But even in English there is one type of generic that can express only¶ one of these readings, and this is the IS generic. While BPs are ambiguous¶ between the inductivist and the rules and regulations readings, ISs are not. In¶ the supermarket scenario discussed above, only (44.b) is true:¶ (44) a. A banana sells for $.49/lb.¶ b. A banana sells for $1.00/lb.¶ The normative force of the generic IS has been noted before. Burton-Roberts¶ (1977) considers the following minimal pair:¶ (45) a. Gentlemen open doors for ladies.¶ b. A gentleman opens doors for ladies.¶ He notes that (45.b), but not (45.a), expresses what he calls “moral necessity.”7¶ Burton-Roberts observes that if Emile does not as a rule open doors for ladies, his mother could utter [(45.b)] and thereby successfully imply that Emile was not, or was¶ not being, a gentleman. Notice that, if she were to utter. . . [(45.a)] she¶ might achieve the same effect (that of getting Emile to open doors for¶ ladies) but would do so by different means. . . For [(45.a)] merely makes a¶ generalisation about gentlemen (p. 188).¶ Sentence (45.b), then, unlike (45.a), does not have a reading where it makes¶ a generalization about gentlemen; it is, rather, a statement about some social¶ norm. It is true just in case this norm is in effect, i.e. it is a member of a set of¶ socially accepted rules and regulations.¶ An IS that, in the null context, cannot be read generically, may receive a¶ generic reading in a context that makes it clear that a rule or a regulation is¶ referred to. For example, Greenberg (1998) notes that, out of the blue, (46.a)¶ and (46.b) do not have a generic reading:¶ (46) a. A Norwegian student whose name ends with ‘s’ or ‘j’ wears green¶ thick socks.¶ b. A tall, left-handed, brown haired neurologist in Hadassa hospital¶ earns more than $50,000 a year.¶ However, Greenberg points out that in the context of (47.a) and (47.b),¶ respectively, the generic readings of the IS subject are quite natural:¶ (47) a. You know, there are very interesting traditions in Norway, concerning the connection between name, profession, and clothing. For¶ example, a Norwegian student. . .¶ b. The new Hadassa manager has some very funny paying criteria. For¶ example, a left-handed. . .¶ Even IS sentences that were claimed above to lack a generic reading, such¶ as (3.b) and (4.b), may, in the appropriate context, receive such a reading:¶ (48) a. Sire, please don’t send her to the axe. Remember, a king is generous!¶ b. How dare you build me such a room? Don’t you know a room is¶ square?

#### Their plan violates. Rules readings are always generalized – specific instances are not consistent. Cohen 01

Ariel Cohen (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev), “On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars,” Journal of Semantics 18:3, 2001 https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/188590876.pdf

In general, as, again, already noted by Aristotle, rules and definitions are not relativized to particular individuals; it is rarely the case that a specific individual¶ forms part of the description of a general rule.¶ Even DPs of the form a certain X or a particular X, which usually receive¶ a wide scope interpretation, cannot, in general, receive such an interpretation in the context of a rule or a definition. This holds of definitions in general, not¶ only of definitions with an IS subject. The following examples from the Cobuild¶ dictionary illustrate this point:¶ (74) a. A fanatic is a person who is very enthusiastic about a particular¶ activity, sport, or way of life.¶ b. Something that is record-breaking is better than the previous¶ record for a particular performance or achievement.¶ c. When a computer outputs something it sorts and produces information as the result of a particular program or operation.¶ d. If something sheers in a particular direction, it suddenly changes¶ direction, for example to avoid hitting something.

#### outweighs—only our evidence speaks to how indefinite singulars are interpreted in the context of normative statements like the resolution. This means throw out aff counter-interpretations that are purely descriptive

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Precision –any deviation justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 2] Limits—specifying a type of appropriation offers huge explosion in the topic since space is, quite literally, infinite.

#### Drop the debater to preserve fairness and education – use competing interps –reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation

#### Hypothetical neg abuse doesn’t justify aff abuse, and theory checks cheaty CPs

#### No RVIs—it’s their burden to be topical.

# US PIC

#### CP Text: The appropriation of outer space through the production of space debris by private entities is unjust else than the US

#### Space regulation scares investors away and spills over to other space activities. Freeland 05:

Steven Freeland (BCom, LLB, LLM, University of New South Wales; Senior Lecturer in International Law, University of Western Sydney, Australia; and a member of the Paris-based International Institute of Space Law). “Up, Up and … Back: The Emergence of Space Tourism and Its Impact on the International Law of Outer Space.” Chicago Journal of International Law: Vol. 6: No. 1, Article 4. 2005. JDN. <https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1269&context=cjil>

V. THE NEED FOR CELESTIAL PROPERTY RIGHTS? ¶ The fundamental principle of "non-appropriation" upon which the international law of outer space is based stems from the desire of the international community to ensure that outer space remains an area beyond the jurisdiction of any state(s). Similar ideals emerge from UNCLOS (in relation to the High Seas) as well as the Antarctic Treaty, 42 although in the case of the latter treaty, it was finalised after a number of claims of sovereignty had already been made by various States and therefore was structured to "postpone" rather than prejudice or renounce those previously asserted claims.43 In the case of outer space, its exploitation and use is expressed in Article I of the Outer Space Treaty to be "the province of all mankind," a term whose meaning is not entirely clear but has been interpreted by most commentators as evincing the desire to ensure that any State is free to engage in space activities without reference to any sovereign claims of other States. This freedom is reinforced by other parts of the same Article and is repeated in the Moon Agreement (which also applies to "other celestial bodies within the solar system, other than the earth")." Even though both the scope for space activities and the number of private participants have expanded significantly since these treaties were finalised, it has still been suggested that the nonappropriation principle constitutes "an absolute barrier in the realization of every kind of space activity., 4 ' The amount of capital expenditure required to research, scope, trial, and implement a new space activity is significant. To bring this activity to the point where it can represent a viable "stand alone" commercial venture takes many years and almost limitless funding. From the perspective of a private enterprise contemplating such an activity, it would quite obviously be an important element in its decision to devote resources to this activity that it is able to secure the highest degree of legal rights in order to protect its investment. Security of patent and other intellectual property rights, for example, are vital prerequisites for private enterprise research activity on the ISS, and these rights are specifically addressed by the ISS Agreement between the partners to the project and were applicable to the experiments undertaken by Mark Shuttleworth when he was onboard the ISS.46

#### Chinese investments are catching up and the US needs private companies to maintain space dominance – Chinese space heg risks extinction. Autry and Kwast 19:

Greg Autry, Steve Kwast {Greg Autry is a clinical professor of space leadership, policy, and business at Arizona State University’s Thunderbird School of Global Management. He served on the 2016 NASA transition team and as the White House liaison at NASA in 2017. He is the chair of the Safety Working Group for the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration’s Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee. Steve Kwast is a Lieutenant General and commander of Recruiting, Training, Educating and Development for the Air Force. He is an astronautical engineer and Harvard Fellow in Public Policy., }, 19 - ("America Is Losing the Second Space Race to China," Foreign Policy, 8-22-2019, https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/08/22/america-is-losing-the-second-space-race-to-china/)//marlborough-wr/

The current U.S. space defense strategy is inadequate and on a path to failure. President Donald Trump’s vision for a Space Force is big enough. As he said on [June 18](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-meeting-national-space-council-signing-space-policy-directive-3/), “It is not enough to merely have an American presence in space. We must have American dominance in space.” But the Air Force is not matching this vision. Instead, the leadership is currently focused on incremental improvements to existing equipment and organizational structures. Dominating the vast and dynamic environment of space will require revolutionary capabilities and resources far deeper than traditional Department of Defense thinking can fund, manage, or even conceive of. Success depends on a much more active partnership with the commercial space industry— and its disruptive capabilities. U.S. military space planners are preparing to repeat a conflict they imagined back in the 1980s, which never actually occurred, against a vanished Soviet empire. Meanwhile, China is executing a winning strategy in the world of today. It is burning hard toward domination of the future space markets that will define the next century. They are planning infrastructure in space that will control 21st-century telecommunications, energy, transportation, and manufacturing. In doing so, they will acquire trillion-dollar revenues as well as the deep capabilities that come from continuous operational experience in space. This will deliver space dominance and global hegemony to China’s authoritarian rulers. Despite the fact that many in the policy and intelligence communities understand exactly what China is doing and have been trying to alert leadership, Air Force leadership has convinced the White House to fund only a slightly better satellite command with the same leadership, while sticking a new label onto their outmoded thinking. A U.S. Space Force or Corps with a satellite command will never fulfill Trump’s call to dominate space. Air Force leadership is demonstrating the same hubris that Gen. George Custer used in convincing Congress, over President Ulysses S. Grant’s better experience intuition, that he could overtake the Black Hills with repeating rifles and artillery. That strategy of technological overconfidence inflamed conflict rather than subduing it, and the 7th Cavalry were wiped out at the Battle of the Little Bighorn. The West was actually won by the settlers, ranchers, miners, and railroad barons who were able to convert the wealth of the territory itself into the means of holding it. They laid the groundwork that made the 20th century the American Century and delivered freedom to millions of people in Europe and Asia. Of course, they also trampled the indigenous people of the American West in their wake—but empty space comes with no such bloody cost. The very emptiness and wealth of this new, if not quite final, frontier, however, means that competition for resources and strategic locations in cislunar space (between the Earth and moon) will be intense over the next two decades. The outcome of this competition will determine the fate of humanity in the next century. China’s impending dominance will neutralize U.S. geopolitical power by allowing Beijing to control global information flows from the high ground of space. Imagine a school in Bolivia or a farmer in Kenya choosing between paying for a U.S. satellite internet or image provider or receiving those services for free as a “gift of the Chinese people.” It will be of little concern to global consumers that the news they receive is slanted or that searches for “free speech” link to articles about corruption in Western democracies. Nor will they care if concentration camps in Tibet and the Uighur areas of western China are obscured, or if U.S. military action is presented as tyranny and Chinese expansion is described as peacekeeping or liberation. China’s aggressive investment in space solar power will allow it to provide cheap, clean power to the world, displacing U.S. energy firms while placing a second yoke around the developing world. Significantly, such orbital power stations have dual use potential and, if properly designed, could serve as powerful offensive weapons platforms. China’s first step in this process is to conquer the growing small space launch market. Beijing is providing nominally commercial firms with government-manufactured, mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles they can use to dump launch services on the market below cost. These start-ups are already [undercutting](https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/04/02/beijing-is-taking-the-final-frontier-space-china/) U.S. pricing by 80 percent. Based on its previous success in using dumping to take out U.S. developed industries such as solar power modules and drones, China will quickly move upstream to attack the leading U.S. launch providers and secure a global commercial monopoly. Owning the launch market will give them an unsurmountable advantage against U.S. competitors in satellite internet, imaging, and power. The United States can still build a strategy to win. At this moment, it holds the competitive advantage in every critical space technology and has the finest set of commercial space firms in the world. It has pockets of innovative military thinkers within groups like the [Defense Innovation Unit](https://www.diu.mil/news-events), under Mike Griffin, the Pentagon’s top research and development official. If the United States simply protects the intellectual property its creative minds unleash and defend its truly free markets from strategic mercantilist attack, it will not lose this new space race. The United States has done this before. It beat Germany to the nuclear bomb, it beat the Soviet Union to the nuclear triad, and it won the first space race. None of those victories was achieved by embracing the existing bureaucracy. Each of them depended on the president of the day following the only proven path to victory in a technological domain: establish a small team with a positively disruptive mindset and empower that team to investigate a wide range of new concepts, work with emerging technologies, and test innovative strategies. Today that means giving a dedicated Space Force the freedom to easily partner with commercial firms and leverage the private capital in building sustainable infrastructure that actually reduces the likelihood of conflict while securing a better economic future for the nation and the world.

# Salvage law CP

#### CP: Apply the maritime law of salvage to space debris.

Salter ’16 - Alexander William Salter [Assistant Professor of Economics, Rawls College of Business, Texas Tech University], “SPACE DEBRIS: A LAW AND ECONOMICS ANALYSIS OF THE ORBITAL COMMONS,” 19 STAN. TECH. L. REV. 221 (2016). <https://www-cdn.law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/19-2-2-salter-final\_0.pdf> AT

Assuming a nation-state, even under current international space law, wished to supervise a space debris removal mission, how would it do so? A crucial question concerns the division of responsibility between the private and public sectors. Some impetus would almost certainly fall on the public sector. At a minimum, the public sector’s role involves further clarification of the legal framework —the “rules of the game” —for space debris at the national level. Using the United States as an example, clarifying the framework may be as simple as announcing that the law of salvage, as it exists in current maritime law, will apply to its own space debris. In other words, any private party under the jurisdiction of the United States that wishes to remove US space debris may do so and is entitled to whatever value is recovered thereby.

Companies such as Deep Space Industries and Planetary Resources are planning long-term asteroid mining projects, which will probably require space infrastructure for in-situ manufacturing or, at least, repairs. Because much debris contains valuable material, the chance to access such material without bearing the costs ordinarily associated with bringing it into orbit can be a significant incentive. Building this infrastructure would involve moving existing debris to a parking orbit rather than destroying it, of course. Most important, those companies would be able to remove clearly identifiable US space debris only, and the US government would be liable for any accidents caused by removal operations that damage other nations’ space objects.

# Debris DA

#### It’s now or never to clean up debris- only private companies are actually making an effort.

Nitin **Sreedhar, 21** - ("The race to clean up outer space," Mintlounge, 16-01-2021, 10-10-2021https://lifestyle.livemint.com/news/big-story/the-race-to-clean-up-outer-space-111610719274127.html)//AW

Space debris poses a danger not only to exploration missions but also to newer activities such as private space tourism. In the near future, space travel will be open to individuals. Companies like Virgin Galactic hope to make space tourism affordable—but space junk presents a unique risk. “It’s getting bigger and bigger. Current data says there are some 3,000 dead satellites and a little over 30,000 pieces of junk which are larger than 10cm in size. The number is critical,” says Jahnavi Phalkey, science and technology historian and director of Science Gallery Bengaluru. “It’s dangerous also to newer missions. The speed at which these things travel, it could damage a new satellite, a manned-space mission or the International Space Station (ISS), where you actually have people living,” she says on the phone. There are very real fears that there may be so much space debris soon that it could inhibit new launches. In fact, the Kessler Syndrome, a term proposed by astrophysicist and former Nasa scientist Donald J. Kessler in 1978, describes a situation where the amount of man-made space debris reaches such a critical point that just one instance of collision between space debris could lead to a cascade of collisions—and ultimately, a runaway chain reaction. Think of it as a domino effect in space. The ESA’s Annual Space Environment Report, released in September, notes that while the amount of mission-related objects, such as payloads and rockets, released into space since the 1960s is declining steadily, the number of pieces, the debris’ combined mass and area has only grown. This has resulted in “involuntary collisions” between operational payloads and space debris. After a point, even limiting the number of new space launches will not help. Collisions between existing debris will continue to produce more pieces of space junk. In 1978, astrophysicist and former Nasa scientist Donald J. Kessler described a situation where the amount of man-made space debris could reach such a critical point that just one instance of collision between space debris could lead to a cascade of collisions. (Photo credit: ESA) This is something space missions in certain Earth orbits already have to factor in daily, says Stijn Lemmens, a senior space debris mitigation analyst at ESA’s Space Debris Office in Darmstadt, Germany. “In particular in low Earth orbits, i.e. orbits with an altitude below 2,000km above Earth’s surface, missions need to be prepared to receive, and in some cases act when the risk of collision is too high.... For example, in ESA’s fleet this implies on average one collision avoidance manoeuvre per satellite per year, and a 24 hours by 7 days monitoring of the risk,” Lemmens explains on email. The ISS, for instance, has had to make 28 collision avoidance manoeuvres since 1999, data from Nasa’s Orbital Debris Program Office shows; this includes three such manoeuvres last year. It’s almost like avoiding a rogue vehicle on a highway that might hit you head on. The fact that these have to be done more frequently now only highlights how severe the problem has become. Space-faring nations around the world have begun to acknowledge the issue, while some startups and private companies are devising technologies to deal with space waste. A different kind of race is unfolding now: a race to clean up space. ClearSpace SA, a Switzerland-based startup founded in 2018, is aiming to launch the world’s first active debris removal mission in collaboration with ESA by 2025. The mission, which actually hopes to remove a piece of space debris, will be the first of its kind. In India, a young Bengaluru-based space startup, Digantara Research and Technologies, is working on setting up orbit debris tracking and monitoring services. Japanese company Astroscale’s ELSA-d mission, all set to launch from Kazakhstan’s Baikonur Cosmodrome in March, hopes to demonstrate multiple ways of capturing and removing defunct objects from orbit. Another company from Japan, Sumitomo Forestry, working with researchers from Kyoto University, is hoping to develop and launch the world’s first wooden satellites, called LignoSat, by 2023 to cut down on space junk. They believe these satellites, made from wooden material that is highly resistant to temperature and harsh environments, will burn up during re-entry, without releasing harmful elements into the atmosphere. The Indian Space Research Organisation (Isro) has also firmed up its space situational awareness capabilities—knowing the exact location of your space assets, tracking and predicting any possible threats—in recent months, launching a dedicated centre and project to protect its space assets from debris. One of the worst space collisions occurred in February 2009 when two communications satellites collided approximately 800km above Siberia. One of them was a decommissioned Russian communications satellite, Cosmos (Kosmos) 2251, the other a still-functioning US commercial communications satellite, Iridium 33. Their combined weight was around 1,560kg. The collision produced around 2,000 pieces of space debris. While some of the trackable satellite fragments eventually re-entered Earth’s atmosphere and burnt up, this accidental hypervelocity, or high-speed collision of two orbiting satellites, became a prime example of the threat that space debris poses to functioning satellites and other spacecraft. Anti-satellite (Asat) testing, which involves intercepting and destroying a satellite, as well as destruction of spacecraft that are no longer operational, has contributed to the problem. China’s 2007 Asat test on one of its own old weather satellites, the Fengyun-1C, created some 3,000 fragments of space debris. In March 2019, India conducted a similar Asat test demonstration, dubbed Mission Shakti, using a ballistic missile to destroy its Microsat-R satellite. The demonstration reportedly created more than 400 pieces of debris, most of which re-entered the atmosphere. India currently has 100 active and defunct spacecraft in orbit and 121 spent rocket bodies and catalogued debris, according to Nasa’s November 2020 Orbital Debris Quarterly News, which publishes the latest in orbital debris research, including data from the US Space Surveillance Network. Figures from 2019 indicate that India had 163 rocket bodies and pieces of debris in space. Explosions caused by leftover batteries and energy sources in rockets and spacecraft too cause more fragments to scatter in space. (Photo credit: ESA) ESA has noted that explosions caused by leftover batteries and energy sources in rockets and spacecraft too cause more fragments to scatter in space. As is the case every year, hundreds of space missions and rocket launches are planned for 2021. China’s main space contractor, the China Aerospace Science and Technology Corporation, is aiming for 40 orbital launches this year. Isro is not only planning its Chandrayaan-3 launch this year, it also hopes to execute India’s first manned mission in December. Kessler’s “collision cascading” scenario becomes an important factor here. “It is difficult to predict when we will reach, or indeed if we have already crossed the point that certain regions (in space) become too cluttered with space debris to effectively use them,” says Lemmens. “However, it is clear that our current global practices of leaving too many objects stranded in orbit or at risk of explosion are not sustainable, and that once the point of ‘too much’ is reached, it will be very hard to undo it.” Cleaning up the mess There appears to be no single solution to the problem of exponential increase in space debris. But initiatives like ClearSpace SA are trying to tackle the problem. In December, ESA signed an €86 million (around ₹766 crore) contract with an industrial team of companies led by ClearSpace to purchase the world’s first active debris removal mission, ClearSpace-1, scheduled to be launched in 2025. Apart from the Swiss outfit, the industrial team includes companies from European countries like the Czech Republic,Germany, Sweden, Poland, Portugal and Romania. The UK too is part of the exercise. “ClearSpace’s goal is to bring in a solution to clean (space debris) and prevent this exponential (growth). We want to make sure that we never get to the full end of that exponential. Where we are today, collisions between space debris will keep on happening,” says Muriel Richard-Noca, co-founder of ClearSpace SA, in a video call from Lausanne. “We want to diminish that effect as much as we can. We are at the point where, if we don’t do anything today, there will be big consequences tomorrow. If we don’t start cleaning now, in a few decades it is going to be really hard for us to place more satellites in space.” The ClearSpace-1 chaser spacecraft will attempt to rendezvous and capture a piece of space debris with the help of four robotic arms. (Photo: ClearSpace SA) The ClearSpace-1 chaser spacecraft will initially be launched into a lower 500km orbit. It will then be raised to a target orbit of 660km, where it will attempt to rendezvous and capture the upper part of a Vespa (or Vega Secondary Payload Adapter), which was used for a rocket launch in 2013, with the help of four robotic arms. This object, which weighs around 112kg ( almost as much as a small satellite), has been in a “gradual disposal” orbit—where satellites or objects are placed when they are no longer operational. Once it has been captured, both the piece of debris and chaser spacecraft will de-orbit and burn up during re-entry. Studies conducted by ESA and Nasa have shown that active debris removal missions can be efficient in eventually stabilising the space environment. But planning a removal sequence—based on the size of the debris or object, the kind of collision threat it poses and whether it’s located in a densely populated orbit—will be crucial. Several active debris removal demonstrations—with mock pieces of debris—have been conducted in the past. The University of Surrey’s RemoveDEBRIS mission in 2018-19, which was led by researchers at the Surrey Space Centre, is a case in point. It successfully demonstrated multiple technologies that could be used to capture debris, including a tethered space harpoon and nets. Astroscale too is aiming to showcase multiple techniques of spotting and capturing pieces of orbital debris through its ELSA-d mission. "Technology-wise, ELSA-d is the first end-to-end debris removal demonstration mission. When the servicer satellite is up there, it first needs to identify and approach an object or piece of debris," says Nobu Okada, founder and CEO, Astroscale, in a video call from Tokyo. "After a synchronised capture, the object will then be stabilised and de-orbited. We will be carrying a mock object—a client satellite—which will be separated in space and then captured by the servicer using proximity-rendezvous technology and a magnetic docking mechanism," he explains. Capturing a moving piece of debris in space, however, is by no means easy. “There are two main challenges. What we are creating is a space robot that will reach the target debris, look at it and calculate how it is tumbling,” says Richard-Noca. “Objects in space are free-floating and they can tumble on every axis at quite high speeds or low speeds…. The intent here is to analyse and reconstruct the object’s movement once we get there with advanced image processing techniques such as deep-neural networks. These techniques will enable autonomous navigation around the debris and its capture. That is the image-processing challenge,” she adds. The second technological obstacle—how do you capture an object in space that is tumbling? “When a cargo mission goes to the ISS, both of them talk (or communicate) to each other and remain stable. In our case, the capture is what we call ‘uncooperative’. There is no signal coming from the debris to help us and we have to catch up with its tumbling. The capture is the most critical operational challenge,” says Richard-Noca. India's space debris horizon The race to tackle orbital debris has seen space agencies place greater emphasis on space situational awareness and traffic management. Today, we rely on satellites in low Earth orbit for a host of key services: telecommunications, the global positioning system, weather and meteorological data, among other things. In such a scenario, protecting space assets becomes all the more important. However, there are no safeguards against a piece of space debris generated by one country damaging the assets of another nation. “There are no natural boundaries in space,” says Phalkey. In December, Isro set up a dedicated directorate of space situational awareness and management (DSSAM), which includes the NEtwork for space object TRacking and Analysis project, also known as Netra. This project’s control centre, set up within the Isro Telemetry, Tracking and Command Network (Istrac) campus in Bengaluru, will act as a hub for space situational awareness activities in the country. A radar and optical telescope facility will help the organisation safeguard its operational assets and predict the atmospheric re-entry of derelict satellites and rocket bodies, a press note explains. S. Chandrashekar, a former Isro scientist and visiting chair professor at the National Institute of Advanced Studies, Bengaluru, says tracking space debris is a problem for every country. “All space-operating entities and agencies need such systems today,” he says. “Without knowing what’s happening in space, how can any space agency function? If it is a transmitting satellite, you can locate and track it easily. The moment a satellite starts drifting, and at some stage it may not transmit at all, then you have a problem... It’s going to take a long time to come down but you still need to know where it is,” says Chandrashekar, who was with Isro for almost 20 years, on the phone. “In the earlier days, space was much less populated. When I was at Isro, I never heard of a satellite colliding with another satellite. Even if two satellites were in the same orbit, it’s highly unlikely they were going to hit each other. It was not such a problem. But space is very crowded now.” While ground-based monitoring systems are good at tracking orbital debris, this activity can be executed with much more precision from space. Recently, Canadian firm NorthStar Earth & Space announced that it was partnering with French-Italian aerospace manufacturer Thales Alenia Space to develop a commercial satellite system that would help track objects, such as other satellites, from space. The “Skylark constellation” is expected to launch in 2022, with a full system of 12 satellites expected in 2024, NorthStar’s co-founder Stewart Bain was quoted as saying in a Reuters report. Digantara is working on a similar system that would rely on a constellation of 40 satellites and Lidar (light detection and ranging) technology to create a database and visualisation platform that will help track and map objects in low Earth orbit. “You can think of it as something like Google Maps, but for space,” says Anirudh Sharma, co-founder of Digantara. The firm, founded in 2018, also offers services like early-launch support and orbit determination to satellite operators and launch companies. “Ground-based monitoring systems (that track objects in space) have certain limitations when it comes to line of sight, range, atmospheric disruption… That is why we are building a space platform which uses Lidar,” he says. How long could it take to stabilise the situation? Internal studies done by ESA show that if continuous debris removal actions or missions start as late as 2060, they will only have a 75% beneficial effect compared to an immediate start—so it’s a case of now or never The company hopes to launch its first satellite payload in December to demonstrate its “in-orbit space debris monitor” technology. The eventual goal is to send out the 40 satellites across three phases. “We haven’t decided where we will launch from yet. That decision will be taken six months before launch but we are hoping that our timing matches with Isro’s PSLV launch. We are looking at a window between December 2021 to February 2022,” says Sharma. To ensure its own solution doesn’t add to or create more space junk, Sharma says Digantara’s satellites will use propulsion systems to de-orbit at the end of their lifespan. How long could it take to stabilise the situation? Internal studies done by ESA show that if continuous debris removal actions or missions start as late as 2060, they will only have a 75% beneficial effect compared to an immediate start—so it’s a case of now or never. Phalkey says: “We have to go as far as required and conduct space-cleaning activities for as long as it’s required. While we create new technologies to ensure that this doesn’t happen in the future, the past needs to be cleaned up.” The task at hand, however, remains enormous. Take Vanguard-1, for instance—launched in 1958, it’s the oldest human-made object still in space. It orbits Earth as space junk and even though it doesn’t pose any significant threat or collision risk, it won’t de-orbit before 2198. It’s a problem of our own making, says Phalkey. “Instead of looking spacewards, look inwards. What have we done to the planet, the resources on Earth.... We are making it unliveable.” Like our effort now to limit climate change, clean our polluted oceans and air, the effort to clean up space for future exploration will have to be a sustained one.

#### Under I-L, it is appropriation for private entities to remove space junk, means the aff severely limits private junk capture ability.

Ramin **Skibba, 21** - ("The US Space Force Wants to Clean Up Junk in Orbit," Wired11-17-2021, 1-2-2022https://www.wired.com/story/the-us-space-force-wants-to-clean-up-junk-in-orbit/)//AW

The answer lies in “remediation”: removing just five large objects per year, for example, could prevent a chain reaction. If governments attempt to clean up this mess themselves, the cost could run into the trillions. Intergovernmental organizations and space agencies alike are discussing the merits of active removal, which would see new spacecraft launched specifically to take other, redundant satellites out of orbit. Other options being discussed include the use of nets, harpoons, tethers, ion thrusters and lasers, all of which would be costly to build and tedious to implement. Even so, the international community needs to sort through the myriad legal issues that would currently frustrate attempts to clean up space. At the moment, international law permits only the launching nation or agency to come into contact with a specific object in orbit, something that would prevent, for example, commercial debris-removal activities. The framework for this international law began with the Outer Space Treaty, which was established in 1967. The treaty involves 96 state parties that are working to “limit activities on the Moon and other celestial bodies exclusively to those for peaceful purposes and forbids the development of military bases, installations, fortifications or weapons testing of any kind on any celestial body.” Therefore, it would be beneficial for a large international agency such as the United Nations to create an international space union that could coordinate all of the debris-removal activity and create a framework for equitable use of orbits among all countries engaged in space exploration. Another critical weakness in the international law on space debris lies in the fact that existing space law is related to the use of space and not to debris regulation itself. The rules within the Outer Space Treaty are helpful in facilitating boundaries in space use, but they do not directly apply to the space debris issue. Until the legal issues are sorted out, all proposed solutions will remain hypothetical, or at best, limited to a small number of debris pieces. In the meantime, the threat continues to grow. Government regulations covering orbital debris are still rudimentary. For now, the federal agencies that have authority over commercial launches are waiting to see if the private sector can deal with the problem on its own.

#### Space debris will inevitably set off a chain of collisions.

Chelsea **MuñOz-Patchen, 19** - ("Regulating the Space Commons: Treating Space Debris as Abandoned Property in Violation of the Outer Space Treaty," University of Chicago, 2019, 12-6-2021, https://cjil.uchicago.edu/publication/regulating-space-commons-treating-space-debris-abandoned-property-violation-outer-space)//AW

Debris poses a threat to functioning space objects and astronauts in space, and may cause damage to the earth’s surface upon re-entry.29 Much of the small debris cannot be tracked due to its size and the velocity at which it travels, making it impossible to anticipate and maneuver to avoid collisions.30 To remain in orbit, debris must travel at speeds of up to 17,500 miles per hour.31 At this speed even very small pieces of debris can cause serious damage, threatening a spacecraft and causing expensive damage.32 There are millions of these very small pieces, and thousands of larger ones.33 The small-to-medium pieces of debris “continuously shed fragments like lens caps, booster upper stages, nuts, bolts, paint chips, motor sprays of aluminum particles, glass splinters, waste water, and bits of foil,” and may stay in orbit for decades or even centuries, posing an ongoing risk.34 Debris ten centimeters or larger in diameter creates the likelihood of complete destruction for any functioning satellite with which it collides.35 Large nonfunctional objects remaining in orbit are a collision threat, capable of creating huge amounts of space debris and taking up otherwise useful orbit space.36 This issue is of growing importance as more nations and companies gain the ability to launch satellites and other objects into space.37 From February 2009 through the end of 2010, more than thirty-two collision-avoidance maneuvers were reportedly used to avoid debris by various space agencies and satellite companies, and as of March 2012, the crew of the International Space Station (ISS) had to take shelter three times due to close calls with passing debris.38 These maneuvers require costly fuel usage and place a strain on astronauts.39 Furthermore, the launches of some spacecraft have “been delayed because of the presence of space debris in the planned flight paths.”40 In 2011, Euroconsult, a satellite consultant, projected that there would be “a 51% increase in satellites launched in the next decade over the number launched in the past decade.”41 In addition to satellites, the rise of commercial space tourism will also increase the number of objects launched into space and thus the amount of debris.42 The more objects are sent into space, and the more collisions create cascades of debris, the greater the risk of damage to vital satellites and other devices relied on for “weather forecasting, telecommunications, commerce, and national security.”43 The Space Debris Mitigation Guidelines44 were created by UNCOPUOS with input from the IADC and adopted in 2007.45 The guidelines were developed to address the problem of space debris and were intended to “increase mutual understanding on acceptable activities in space.”46 These guidelines are nonbinding but suggest best practices to implement at the national level when planning for a launch. Many nations have adopted the guidelines to some degree, and some have gone beyond what the guidelines suggest.47 While the guidelines do not address existing debris, they do much to prevent the creation of new debris. The Kessler Syndrome is the biggest concern with space debris. The Kessler Syndrome is a cascade created when debris hits a space object, creating new debris and setting off a chain reaction of collisions that eventually closes off entire orbits.48 The concern is that this cascade will occur when a tipping point is reached at which the natural removal rate cannot keep up with the amount of new debris added.49 At this point a collision could set off a cascade destroying all space objects within the orbit.50 In 2011, The National Research Council predicted that the Kessler Syndrome could happen within ten to twenty years.51 Donald J. Kessler, the astrophysicist and NASA scientist who theorized the Kessler Syndrome in 1978, believes this cascade may be a century away, meaning that there is still time to develop a solution.52

#### Laundry list of impacts.

George **Dvorsky, 15** - ("What Would Happen If All Our Satellites Were Suddenly Destroyed?," 6-4-2015, 12-10-2021https://gizmodo.com/what-would-happen-if-all-our-satellites-were-suddenly-d-1709006681)//AW

Lastly, there’s the Kessler Syndrome to consider. This scenario was portrayed in the 2013 film Gravity. In the movie, a Russian missile strike on a defunct satellite inadvertently causes a cascading chain reaction that formed an ever-growing cloud of orbiting space debris. Anything in the cloud’s wake—including satellites, space stations, and astronauts—gets annihilated. Disturbingly, the Kessler Syndrome is a very real possibility, and the likelihood of it happening is steadily increasing as more stuff gets thrown into space. Given these grim prospects, it’s fair to ask what might happen to our civilization if any of these things happened. At the risk of gross understatement, the complete loss of our satellite fleet would instigate a tremendous disruption to our current mode of technological existence—disruptions that would be experienced in the short, medium, and long term, and across multiple domains. Compromised Communications Almost immediately we’d notice a dramatic reduction in our ability to communicate, share information, and conduct transactions. A visualization from the Opte Project showing the various routes through a portion of the Internet (Opte/cc) “If our communications satellites are lost, then bandwidth is also lost,” Jonathan McDowell tells io9. He’s an astrophysicists and Chandra Observatory scientist who works out of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics. McDowell says that, with telecommunication satellites wiped out, the burden of telecommunications would fall upon undersea cables and ground-based communication systems. But while many forms of communication would disappear in an instant, others would remain. All international calls and data traffic would have to be re-routed, placing tremendous pressure on terrestrial and undersea lines. Oversaturation would stretch the capacity of these systems to the limit, preventing many calls from going through. Hundreds of millions of Internet connections would vanish, or be severely overloaded. A similar number of cell phones would be rendered useless. In remote areas, people dependent on satellite for television, Internet, and radio would practically lose all service. Submarine cable map (TeleGeography) “Indeed, a lot of television would suddenly disappear,” says McDowell. “A sizable portion of TV comes from cable whose companies relay programming from satellites to their hubs.” It’s important to note that we actually have a precedent for a dramatic—albeit brief —disruption in com-sat capability. Back in 1998, there was a day in which a single satellite failed and all the world’s pagers stopped working. Get Out Your Paper Maps We would also lose the Global Positioning System. In the years since its inception, GPS has become ubiquitous, and a surprising number of systems have become reliant on it. Lockheed-Martin’s GPS-III-AHI satellite “Apart from the fact that everyone has forgotten to navigate without GPS in their cars, many airplanes use GPS as well,” says McDowell. Though backup systems exist, airlines use GPS to chart the most fuel-efficient and expeditious routes. Without GPS and telecomm-sats, aircraft controllers would have tremendous difficulty communicating with and routing airplanes. Airlines would have to fall back to legacy systems and procedures. Given the sheer volume of airline traffic today, accidents would be all but guaranteed. Other affected navigation systems would include those aboard cargo vessels, supply-chain management systems, and transportation hubs driven by GPS. But GPS does more than just provide positioning—it also provides for timing. Ground-based atomic clocks can perform the same function, but GPS is increasingly being used to distribute the universal time standard via satellites. Within hours of a terminated service, any distributing networks requiring tight synchronization would start to suffer from “clock drift,” leading to serious performance issues and outright service outages. Such disruptions could affect everything from the power grid through to the financial sector. A somewhat alarmist video produced by the Marshall Institute, but one that raises some relevant points. In the report, “A Day Without Space: Economic and National Security Ramifications,” Ed Morris, the Executive Director of the Office of Space Commerce at the Department of Commerce, writes: If you think it is hard to get work done when your internet connection goes out at the office, imagine losing that plus your cell phone, TV, radio, ATM access, credit cards, and possibly even your electricity. [...] Wireless services, especially those built to CDMA standard, would fail to hand off calls from one cell to the next, leading to dropped connections. Computer networks would experience slowdowns as data is pushed through finite pipelines at reduced bit rates. The same would be true for major networks for communication and entertainment, since they are all IP-based today and require ultra-precise timing to ensure digital traffic reaches its destination. The lack of effective synch would hit especially hard in banking, where the timing of transactions needs to be recorded. Credit card payments and bank accounts would likely freeze, as billions of dollars could be sucked away from businesses. A financial crash is not out of the question. The Loss of Military Capability The sudden loss of satellite capability would have a profound effect on the military. Useless without GPS: The U.S. Navy’s Harpoon missile (U.S. Navy) The Marshall Institute puts it this way: “Space is a critical enabler to all U.S. warfare domains,” including intelligence, navigation, communications, weather prediction, and warfare. McDowell describes satellite capability as as the “backbone” of the U.S. military. And as 21st century warfare expert Peter W. Singer from New America Foundation tells io9, “He who controls the heavens will control what happens in the battles of Earth.” Singer summarized the military consequences of losing satellites in an email to us: Today there are some 1,100 active satellites which act as the nervous system of not just our economy, but also our military. Everything from communications to GPS to intelligence all depend on it. Potential foes have noticed, which is why Russia and China have recently begun testing a new generation of anti-satellite weapons, which in turn has sparked the U.S. military to recently budget $5 billion for various space warfare systems. What would happen if we lost access to space? Well, the battles would, as one U.S. military officer put it, take us back to the “pre digital age.” Our drones, our missiles, even our ground units wouldn’t be able to operate the way we plan. It would force a rewrite of all our assumptions of 21st century high tech war. We might have a new generation of stealthy battleships...but the loss of space would mean naval battles would in many ways be like the game of Battleship, where the two sides would struggle to even find each other. Moreover, and as McDowell explains to io9, the loss of satellite capability would have a profound effect on arms control capabilities. Space systems can monitor compliance; without them, we’d be running blind. “The overarching consideration is that you wouldn’t really know what’s going on,” says McDowell. “Satellites provide for both global and local views of what’s happening. We would be less connected, less informed—and with considerably degraded situational awareness.” Compromised Weather Prediction and Climate Science One great thing satellites have done for us is improve our ability to forecast weather. Predicting a slight chance of cloudiness is all well and good, but some areas, like India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh, are dependent on such systems to predict potentially hazardous monsoons. And in the U.S., the NOAA has estimated that, during a typical hurricane season, weather satellites save as much as $3 billion in lives and property damage. Hurricane Ivan (NOAA) There’s also the effect on science to consider. Much of what we know about climate change comes from satellites. As McDowell explains, the first couple of weeks without satellites wouldn’t make much of a difference. But over a ten-year span, the lack of satellites would preclude our ability to understand and monitor such things as the ozone layer, carbon dioxide levels, and the distribution of polar ice. Ground-based and balloon-driven systems would help, but much of the data we’re currently tracking would suddenly become much spottier. Without satellites, you can say goodbye to maps like this (NOAA) “We’re quite dependent on satellites for a global view of what’s happening on our planet—and at a time when we really, really need to know what’s happening,” says McDowell. It’s also worth pointing out that, without satellites, we also wouldn’t be able to monitor space weather, such as incoming space storms. Time to Recover With all the satellites gone, both governmental and private interests would work feverishly to restore space-based capabilities. Depending on the nature of the satellite-destroying event, it could take decades or more to get ourselves back to current operational standards. It would take a particularly long time to recover from a Carrington Event, which would zap many ground-based electronic systems as well. The U.S. military is already thinking along these lines, which is why it’s working on the ability to quickly send up emergency assets, such as small satellites parked in Low Earth Orbit (LEO). Cube satellites are increasingly favored, as an easy-to-launch, affordable, and effective solution—albeit a short-term one. The U.S. Operationally Responsive State Office is currently working on the concept of emergency replenishment and the ability to “rapidly deploy capabilities that are good enough to satisfy warfighter needs across the entire spectrum of operations, from peacetime through conflict.” Cubesats in orbit (NASA) As for getting full-sized, geostationary satellites back into orbit, that would prove to be a greater challenge. It can take years to built a new satellite, which typically requires a big, costly rocket to get it into space. Lastly, if a Kessler Syndrome wipes out the satellites, that would present an entirely different recovery scenario. According to McDowell, it would take a minimum of 11 years for LEO to clear itself of the debris cloud; any objects below 500 km (310 miles) would eventually fall back to Earth. Thus, we would only be able to start re-seeding LEO in a little over a decade following a Kessler event. Unfortunately, the area above 600 km (372 miles) would remain out of touch for a practically indefinite period of time; objects orbiting at that height tend to stay there for a long, long time. We’d probably lose this band for good—unless we manually removed the debris field, using clean-up satellites or other techniques. It’s worth noting that a single Kessler event could hit the LEO zone or the GEO zone (geosynchronous orbit) but realistically not both; LEO debris could never reach GEO, and vice versa—though a spent rocket in GTO (geosynchronous transfer orbit) or SSTO (supersynchronous transfer orbit) passes through or near both zones and could potentially affect either of them. The spent rockets in GTO do not stay too close to the GEO arc for long due to orbital perturbations, so a GEO Kessler event is very unlikely to be triggered by one of them. Suffice to say, we should probably take the prospect of a Kessler Syndrome more seriously, and be aware of what could happen if we’re no longer able to use these spaces.

# Case

### Asteroid mining turn

#### Asteroid mining can happen with private sector innovation and is key to solve a laundry list of impacts--climate change, economic decline and asteroid collisions. Taylor 19

Chris Taylor [journalist], 19 - ("How asteroid mining will save the Earth — and mint trillionaires," Mashable, 2019, accessed 12-13-2021, https://mashable.com/feature/asteroid-mining-space-economy)//ML

How much, exactly? We’re only just beginning to guess. [Asterank](http://www.asterank.com/" \t "_blank), a service that keeps track of some 6,000 asteroids in NASA’s database, prices out the estimated mineral content in each one in the current world market. More than 500 are listed as “>$100 trillion.” The estimated profit on just the top 10 asteroids judged “most cost effective” — that is, the easiest to reach and to mine, subtracting rocket fuel and other operating costs, is around $1.5 trillion.¶ Is it ours for the taking? Well, here’s the thing — we’re taking it already, and have been doing so since we started mining metals thousands of years ago. Asteroid strikes are the only reason rare metals exist in the Earth’s crust; the native ones were all sucked into our planet’s merciless iron core millions of years ago. Why not go to the source?¶ As a side project, space mining can grab water from the rocks and comets — water which, with a little processing makes rocket fuel. Which in turn makes even more currently unimaginable space operations possible, including ones that could give the planet all the energy it needs to avert climate catastrophe. Cislunar space — the bit around us and the moon, the local neighborhood, basically — is about to get very interesting.¶ It’s hard, even for the most asteroid-minded visionaries, to truly believe the full scope of this future space economy right now. Just as hard as it would have been in 1945, when an engineer named Vannevar Bush first proposed [a vast library of shared knowledge that people the world over would access via personal computers](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Memex), to see that mushroom into a global network of streaming movies and grandmas posting photos and trolls and spies who move the needle on presidential elections. ¶ No technology’s pioneer can predict its second-order effects.¶ The space vision thing is particularly difficult in 2019. Not only do we have plenty of urgent problems with democracy and justice to keep us occupied, but the only two companies on the planet to have gone public with asteroid-mining business plans, startups that seemed to be going strong and had launched satellites already, were just bought by larger companies that are, shall we say, less comfortable executing on long-term visions.¶ Planetary Resources was founded in 2012 in a blaze of publicity. Its funding came from, among others, Larry Page, Eric Schmidt, Ross Perot, and the country of Luxembourg. It had inked an orbital launch deal with Virgin Galactic. And it was sold last October to a blockchain software company. (To 21st century readers, this paragraph would look like I’m playing tech world mad libs.)¶ In January, the other company, Deep Space Industries, also partly funded by Luxembourg (way to get in the space race, Luxembourg!), was sold to Bradford Space, owned by a U.S. investment group called the American Industrial Acquisition Corporation. Maybe these new overlords plan on continuing their acquisitions' asteroid mining endeavors rather than stripping the companies for parts. Both companies have been notably silent on the subject. “The asteroid mining bubble has burst,” [declared The Space Review](http://www.thespacereview.com/article/3633/1), one of the few online publications to even pay attention.¶ That’s also to be expected. After all, anyone trying to build Google in 1945 would go bankrupt. Just as the internet needed a half-dozen major leaps forward in computing before it could even exist, space industry needs its launch infrastructure.¶ Currently, the world’s richest person and its most well-known entrepreneur, Jeff Bezos and Elon Musk, respectively, are working on the relatively cheap reusable rockets asteroid pioneers will need. (As I was writing this, Bezos announced in an email blast that one of his New Shepherd rockets had flown to space and back five times like it was nothing, delivering 38 payloads for various customers while remaining entirely intact.) ¶ Meanwhile, quietly, Earth’s scientists are laying the groundwork of research the space economy needs. Japan’s Hayabusa 2 spacecraft has been in orbit around asteroid Ryugu for the last year and a half, learning everything it can. (Ryugu, worth $30 billion according to Asterank, is the website's #1 most cost-effective target.) The craft dropped [tiny hopping robot rovers](https://www.space.com/41941-hayabusa2-asteroid-rovers-hopping-tech.html) and a [small bomb](https://www.space.com/japan-hayabusa2-asteroid-bomb-video.html) on its target; pictures of the small crater that resulted were released afterwards.¶ Officially, the mission is to help us figure out how the solar system formed. Unofficially, it will help us understand whether all those useful metals clump together at the heart of an asteroid, as some theorize. If so, it’s game on for asteroid prospectors. If not, we can still get at the metals with other techniques, such as optical mining (which basically involves sticking an asteroid in a bag and drilling with sunlight; sounds nuts to us, but [NASA has proved it in the lab](https://www.nasa.gov/directorates/spacetech/niac/2017_Phase_I_Phase_II/Sustainable_Human_Exploration/)). It’ll just take more time.¶ Effectively, we’ve just made our first mark at the base of the first space mineshaft. And there’s more to come in 2020 when Hayabusa 2 returns to Earth bearing samples. If its buckets of sand contain a modicum of gold dust, tiny chunks of platinum or pebbles of compressed carbon — aka diamonds — then the Duchy of Luxembourg won’t be the only deep-pocketed investor to sit up and take notice.¶ The possibility of private missions to asteroids, with or without a human crew, is almost here. The next step in the process that takes us from here to where you are? Tell us an inspiring story about it, one that makes people believe, and start to imagine themselves mining in space. How would you explain the world-changing nature of the internet to 1945? How would you persuade them that there was gold to be mined in Vannevar Bush’s idea? You’d let the new economy and its benefits play out in the form of a novel.¶ As Hayabusa dropped a bomb on Ryugu, Daniel Suarez was making the exact same asteroid the target of his fiction. Suarez is a tech consultant and developer turned New York Times bestselling author. His novels thus far have been techno-thrillers: his debut, [Daemon](https://www.amazon.com/dp/B003QP4NPE/ref=dp-kindle-redirect?_encoding=UTF8&btkr=1), a novel of Silicon Valley’s worst nightmare, AI run rampant, made more than a million dollars.¶ So it was a telling shift in cultural mood that Suarez’s latest thriller is also a very in-depth description of — and thinly-disguised advocacy for — asteroid mining. In [Delta-v](https://www.amazon.com/Delta-v-Daniel-Suarez-ebook/dp/B07FLX8V84/ref=sr_1_1?crid=UMNUUSR3NCBX&keywords=delta-v&qid=1556930756&s=digital-text&sprefix=delta-v%2Cdigital-text%2C204&sr=1-1), published in April, a billionaire in the 2030s named Nathan Joyce recruits a team of adventurers who know nothing about space — a world-renowned cave-diver, a world-renowned mountaineer — for the first crewed asteroid mission.¶ Elon Musk fans might expect this to be Joyce’s tale, but he soon fades into the background. The asteroid-nauts are the true heroes of Delta-v. Not only are they offered a massive payday — $6 million each for four years’ work — they also have agency in key decisions in the distant enterprise. Suarez deliberately based them on present-day heroes. The mission is essential, Joyce declares, to save Earth from its major problems. First of all, the fictional billionaire wheels in a fictional Nobel economist to demonstrate the actual truth that the entire global economy is sitting on a [mountain of debt](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-247-trillion-global-debt-bomb/2018/07/15/64c5bbaa-86c2-11e8-8f6c-46cb43e3f306_story.html?noredirect=on&utm_term=.5fb3ff1155d9). It has to keep growing or it will implode, so we might as well take the majority of the industrial growth off-world where it can’t do any more harm to the biosphere.¶ Secondly, there’s the climate change fix. Suarez sees asteroid mining as the only way we’re going to build [solar power satellites](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Space-based_solar_power). Which, as you probably know, is a form of uninterrupted solar power collection that is theoretically more effective, inch for inch, than any solar panels on Earth at high noon, but operating 24/7. (In space, basically, it’s always double high noon). ¶ The power collected is beamed back to large receptors on Earth with large, low-power microwaves, which researchers think will be harmless enough to let humans and animals pass through the beam. A space solar power array like [the one China is said to be working on](https://www.forbes.com/sites/scottsnowden/2019/03/12/solar-power-stations-in-space-could-supply-the-world-with-limitless-energy/#2d3f78a54386) could reliably supply 2,000 gigawatts — or over 1,000 times more power than the largest solar farm currently in existence. ¶ “We're looking at a 20-year window to completely replace human civilization's power infrastructure,” Suarez told me, citing the report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change on the coming catastrophe. Solar satellite technology “has existed since the 1970s. What we were missing is millions of tons of construction materials in orbit. Asteroid mining can place it there.”¶ The Earth-centric early 21st century can’t really wrap its brain around this, but the idea is not to bring all that building material and precious metals down into our gravity well. Far better to create a whole new commodities exchange in space. You mine the useful stuff of asteroids both near to Earth and far, thousands of them taking less energy to reach than the moon. That’s something else we’re still grasping, how relatively easy it is to ship stuff in zero-G environments. ¶ Robot craft can move 10-meter boulders like they’re nothing. You bring it all back to sell to companies that will refine and synthesize it in orbit for a myriad of purposes. Big pharma, to take one controversial industry, would [benefit by taking its manufacturing off-world](https://medium.com/fitch-blog/why-is-big-pharma-interested-in-the-space-economy-c078ac1bf67c). The molecular structure of many chemicals grows better in microgravity.¶ The expectation is that a lot of these space businesses — and all the orbital infrastructure designed to support them — will be automated, controlled remotely via telepresence, and monitored by AI. But Suarez is adamant that thousands if not millions of actual human workers will thrive in the space economy, even as robots take their jobs in old industries back on Earth.¶ “Our initial expansion into space will most likely be unsettled and experimental. Human beings excel in such environments,” he says. “Humans can improvise and figure things out as we go. Robots must be purpose-built, and it's going to take time and experience for us to design and build them.”¶ Which is another way startups back on Earth will get rich in the new economy: designing and building those robots, the nearest thing to selling picks and shovels to prospectors in the space gold rush. Thousands of humans in space at any one time will also require the design and construction of stations that spin to create artificial gravity. Again, this isn’t a great stretch: Using centrifugal force to simulate gravity in space was first proposed by scientists in the 19th century. NASA has had workable designs for spinning cislunar habitats called [O’Neill cylinders](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/O%27Neill_cylinder) since the 1970s. We just haven’t funded them. ¶ But the trillionaires clearly will.¶ In short, Suarez has carefully laid out a vision of the orbital economy that offers something for everyone in our divided society. For Green New Deal Millennials, there’s the prospect of removing our reliance on fossil fuels at a stroke and literally lifting dirty industries off the face of the planet. For libertarians and other rugged individualists, there’s a whole new frontier to be developed, largely beyond the reach of government. ¶ For those who worry about asteroids that could wipe out civilization — though luckily, [this isn't likely to happen any time soon](https://mashable.com/article/armageddon-asteroid-threat) — here is a way for humanity to get proficient in moving them out of the way, fast. Indeed, the National Space Society has offered [a proposal](https://space.nss.org/technologies-for-asteroid-capture-into-earth-orbit/) to capture the asteroid Aphosis (which is set to miss Earth in the year 2029, but [not by a very comfortable margin](https://www.space.com/asteroid-apophis-2029-flyby-planetary-defense.html)), keep it in orbit, and turn it into 150 small solar-power satellites, as a proof of concept. ¶ For the woke folks who care about the bloody history of diamond production, there’s the likelihood that space mining would wipe out Earth’s entire diamond industry. “They will be found in quantities unattainable on Earth,” claims Suarez, with good reason. We are starting to discover that there is more crystalized carbon in the cosmos than we ever suspected. Astronomers have identified one [distant planet made entirely of diamond](https://www.nationalgeographic.com/science/phenomena/2014/06/24/diamond-the-size-of-earth/); there may be more, but they are, ironically, hard to see. ¶ We don’t have diamond planets in our solar system (and we can’t do interstellar missions), but we do have diamond-studded asteroids. Mine them for long enough and you will wear diamonds on the soles of your shoes.¶ For investors and entrepreneurs, there is the thrill of racing to be the first member of the four-comma club. ([Neil deGrasse Tyson believes that the first trillionaire will be an asteroid mining mogul](https://www.nbcnews.com/science/space/neil-degrasse-tyson-says-space-ventures-will-spawn-first-trillionaire-n352271); Suarez isn’t sure whether they’ll be the first, but he suspects that asteroid mining “will mint more trillionaires than any industry in history.”) ¶ For the regular guy or gal with a 401K, there’ll be a fast-rising stock market — inflated not by financial shenanigans this time, but an actual increase in what the world counts as wealth.¶ For workers, there is the promise of sharing in the untold riches, both legally and otherwise. It would be hard to stop miners attaining mineral wealth beyond their paycheck, under the table, when your bosses are millions of miles away. Then there’s the likelihood of rapid advancement in this new economy, where the miners fast gain the knowledge necessary to become moguls.¶ “After several tours in space working for others, perhaps on six-month or year-long contracts, it's likely that some workers will partner to set up their own businesses there,” says Suarez. “Either serving the needs of increasing numbers of workers and businesses in space, marketing services to Earth, or launching asteroid mining startups themselves.” All in all, it’s starting to sound a damn sight more beneficial to the human race than the internet economy is. Not a moment too soon. I’ve written encouragingly about asteroid mining several times before, each time touting the massive potential wealth that seems likely to be made. And each time there’s been a sense of disquiet among my readers, a sense that we’re taking our rapacious capitalist ways and exploiting space.¶ Whereas the truth is, this is exactly the version of capitalism humanity has needed all along: the kind where there is no ecosystem to destroy, no marginalized group to make miserable. A safe, dead space where capitalism’s most enthusiastic pioneers can go nuts to their hearts’ content, so long as they clean up their space junk. ¶ ([Space junk](https://mashable.com/category/space-junk) is a real problem in orbital space because it has thousands of vulnerable satellites clustered closely together around our little blue rock. The vast emptiness of cislunar space, not so much.)¶ And because they’re up there making all the wealth on their commodities market, we down here on Earth can certainly afford to focus less on growing our stock market. Maybe even, whisper it low, we can afford a fully functioning social safety net, plus free healthcare and free education for everyone on the planet.¶ It’s also clearly the area where we should have focused space exploration all along. If we settle on Mars, we may disturb as-yet-undiscovered native bacteria — and as the character Nathan Joyce shouts at a group of “Mars-obsessed” entrepreneurs in Delta-V, Mars is basically filled with toxic sand and is thus looking increasingly impossible to colonize. (Sorry, Mark Watney from The Martian, those potatoes would probably kill you.)

#### Warming causes extinction.

Bill McKibben 19, Schumann Distinguished Scholar at Middlebury College; fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; holds honorary degrees from 18 colleges and universities; Foreign Policy named him to their inaugural list of the world’s 100 most important global thinkers. "This Is How Human Extinction Could Play Out." Rolling Stone. 4-9-2019. https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/politics-features/bill-mckibben-falter-climate-change-817310/

Oh, it could get very bad. In 2015, a study in the Journal of Mathematical Biology pointed out that if the world’s oceans kept warming, by 2100 they might become hot enough to “stop oxygen production by phyto-plankton by disrupting the process of photosynthesis.” Given that two-thirds of the Earth’s oxygen comes from phytoplankton, that would “likely result in the mass mortality of animals and humans.” A year later, above the Arctic Circle, in Siberia, a heat wave thawed a reindeer carcass that had been trapped in the permafrost. The exposed body released anthrax into nearby water and soil, infecting two thousand reindeer grazing nearby, and they in turn infected some humans; a twelve-year-old boy died. As it turns out, permafrost is a “very good preserver of microbes and viruses, because it is cold, there is no oxygen, and it is dark” — scientists have managed to revive an eight-million-year-old bacterium they found beneath the surface of a glacier. Researchers believe there are fragments of the Spanish flu virus, smallpox, and bubonic plague buried in Siberia and Alaska. Or consider this: as ice sheets melt, they take weight off land, and that can trigger earthquakes — seismic activity is already increasing in Greenland and Alaska. Meanwhile, the added weight of the new seawater starts to bend the Earth’s crust. “That will give you a massive increase in volcanic activity. It’ll activate faults to create earthquakes, submarine landslides, tsunamis, the whole lot,” explained the director of University College London’s Hazard Centre. Such a landslide happened in Scandinavia about eight thousand years ago, as the last Ice Age retreated and a Kentucky-size section of Norway’s continental shelf gave way, “plummeting down to the abyssal plain and creating a series of titanic waves that roared forth with a vengeance,” wiping all signs of life from coastal Norway to Greenland and “drowning the Wales-sized landmass that once connected Britain to the Netherlands, Denmark, and Germany.” When the waves hit the Shetlands, they were sixty-five feet high. There’s even this: if we keep raising carbon dioxide levels, we may not be able to think straight anymore. At a thousand parts per million (which is within the realm of possibility for 2100), human cognitive ability falls 21 percent. “The largest effects were seen for Crisis Response, Information Usage, and Strategy,” a Harvard study reported, which is too bad, as those skills are what we seem to need most. I could, in other words, do my best to scare you silly. I’m not opposed on principle — changing something as fundamental as the composition of the atmosphere, and hence the heat balance of the planet, is certain to trigger all manner of horror, and we shouldn’t shy away from it. The dramatic uncertainty that lies ahead may be the most frightening development of all; the physical world is going from backdrop to foreground. (It’s like the contrast between politics in the old days, when you could forget about Washington for weeks at a time, and politics in the Trump era, when the president is always jumping out from behind a tree to yell at you.) But let’s try to occupy ourselves with the most likely scenarios, because they are more than disturbing enough. Long before we get to tidal waves or smallpox, long before we choke to death or stop thinking clearly, we will need to concentrate on the most mundane and basic facts: everyone needs to eat every day, and an awful lot of us live near the ocean. FOOD SUPPLY first. We’ve had an amazing run since the end of World War II, with crop yields growing fast enough to keep ahead of a fast-rising population. It’s come at great human cost — displaced peasant farmers fill many of the planet’s vast slums — but in terms of sheer volume, the Green Revolution’s fertilizers, pesticides, and machinery managed to push output sharply upward. That climb, however, now seems to be running into the brute facts of heat and drought. There are studies to demonstrate the dire effects of warming on coffee, cacao, chickpeas, and champagne, but it is cereals that we really need to worry about, given that they supply most of the planet’s calories: corn, wheat, and rice all evolved as crops in the climate of the last ten thousand years, and though plant breeders can change them, there are limits to those changes. You can move a person from Hanoi to Edmonton, and she might decide to open a Vietnamese restaurant. But if you move a rice plant, it will die. A 2017 study in Australia, home to some of the world’s highest-tech farming, found that “wheat productivity has flatlined as a direct result of climate change.” After tripling between 1900 and 1990, wheat yields had stagnated since, as temperatures increased a degree and rainfall declined by nearly a third. “The chance of that just being variable climate without the underlying factor [of climate change] is less than one in a hundred billion,” the researchers said, and it meant that despite all the expensive new technology farmers kept introducing, “they have succeeded only in standing still, not in moving forward.” Assuming the same trends continued, yields would actually start to decline inside of two decades, they reported. In June 2018, researchers found that a two-degree Celsius rise in temperature — which, recall, is what the Paris accords are now aiming for — could cut U.S. corn yields by 18 percent. A four-degree increase — which is where our current trajectory will take us — would cut the crop almost in half. The United States is the world’s largest producer of corn, which in turn is the planet’s most widely grown crop. Corn is vulnerable because even a week of high temperatures at the key moment can keep it from fertilizing. (“You only get one chance to pollinate a quadrillion kernels of corn,” the head of a commodity consulting firm explained.) But even the hardiest crops are susceptible. Sorghum, for instance, which is a staple for half a billion humans, is particularly hardy in dry conditions because it has big, fibrous roots that reach far down into the earth. Even it has limits, though, and they are being reached. Thirty years of data from the American Midwest show that heat waves affect the “vapor pressure deficit,” the difference between the water vapor in the sorghum leaf’s interior and that in the surrounding air. Hotter weather means the sorghum releases more moisture into the atmosphere. Warm the planet’s temperature by two degrees Celsius — which is, again, now the world’s goal — and sorghum yields drop 17 percent. Warm it five degrees Celsius (nine degrees Fahrenheit), and yields drop almost 60 percent. It’s hard to imagine a topic duller than sorghum yields. It’s the precise opposite of clickbait. But people have to eat; in the human game, the single most important question is probably “What’s for dinner?” And when the answer is “Not much,” things deteriorate fast. In 2010 a severe heat wave hit Russia, and it wrecked the grain harvest, which led the Kremlin to ban exports. The global price of wheat spiked, and that helped trigger the Arab Spring — Egypt at the time was the largest wheat importer on the planet. That experience set academics and insurers to work gaming out what the next food shock might look like. In 2017 one team imagined a vigorous El Niño, with the attendant floods and droughts — for a season, in their scenario, corn and soy yields declined by 10 percent, and wheat and rice by 7 percent. The result was chaos: “quadrupled commodity prices, civil unrest, significant negative humanitarian consequences . . . Food riots break out in urban areas across the Middle East, North Africa, and Latin America. The euro weakens and the main European stock markets lose ten percent.” At about the same time, a team of British researchers released a study demonstrating that even if you can grow plenty of food, the transportation system that distributes it runs through just fourteen major choke-points, and those are vulnerable to — you guessed it — massive disruption from climate change. For instance, U.S. rivers and canals carry a third of the world’s corn and soy, and they’ve been frequently shut down or crimped by flooding and drought in recent years. Brazil accounts for 17 percent of the world’s grain exports, but heavy rainfall in 2017 stranded three thousand trucks. “It’s the glide path to a perfect storm,” said one of the report’s authors. Five weeks after that, another report raised an even deeper question. What if you can figure out how to grow plenty of food, and you can figure out how to guarantee its distribution, but the food itself has lost much of its value? The paper, in the journal Environmental Research, said that rising carbon dioxide levels, by speeding plant growth, seem to have reduced the amount of protein in basic staple crops, a finding so startling that, for many years, agronomists had overlooked hints that it was happening. But it seems to be true: when researchers grow grain at the carbon dioxide levels we expect for later this century, they find that minerals such as calcium and iron drop by 8 percent, and protein by about the same amount. In the developing world, where people rely on plants for their protein, that means huge reductions in nutrition: India alone could lose 5 percent of the protein in its total diet, putting 53 million people at new risk for protein deficiency. The loss of zinc, essential for maternal and infant health, could endanger 138 million people around the world. In 2018, rice researchers found “significantly less protein” when they grew eighteen varieties of rice in high–carbon dioxide test plots. “The idea that food became less nutritious was a surprise,” said one researcher. “It’s not intuitive. But I think we should continue to expect surprises. We are completely altering the biophysical conditions that underpin our food system.” And not just ours. People don’t depend on goldenrod, for instance, but bees do. When scientists looked at samples of goldenrod in the Smithsonian that dated back to 1842, they found that the protein content of its pollen had “declined by a third since the industrial revolution — and the change closely tracks with the rise in carbon dioxide.” Bees help crops, obviously, so that’s scary news. But in August 2018, a massive new study found something just as frightening: crop pests were thriving in the new heat. “It gets better and better for them,” said one University of Colorado researcher. Even if we hit the UN target of limiting temperature rise to two degrees Celsius, pests should cut wheat yields by 46 percent, corn by 31 percent, and rice by 19 percent. “Warmer temperatures accelerate the metabolism of insect pests like aphids and corn borers at a predictable rate,” the researchers found. “That makes them hungrier[,] and warmer temperatures also speed up their reproduction.” Even fossilized plants from fifty million years ago make the point: “Plant damage from insects correlated with rising and falling temperatures, reaching a maximum during the warmest periods.”

### Top

### General

### Mistrust Turn – Stops Solvency

#### Transnational space corporations are k2 ADR – only they can overcome state mistrust

Frankowski 17 [(Paweł, assistant Professor at the Chair of International Relations and Foreign Policy, Institute of Political Science and International Relations, Jagiellonian University) “Outer Space and Private Companies: Consequences for Global Security,” 2017, pg. 144-145] TDI

To conclude, privatization of space security can develop in unexpected way, but in today’s space environment private actors would rather play the role of security regulators than security providers. When investment in space technologies is less profitable than other areas of economy, private actors would focus on soft law and conflict prevention in space, and new private initiatives will appear. For example, apart from important space companies, as SpaceX or Blue Origin active in outer space, other private actors as Secure World Foundation (SWF), who focus on space sustainability, will play more important role in crafting international guidelines for space activities.38 This path the way for future solutions and projects, as cleaning the space debris, extracting resources from asteroids and planetoids, refuelling satellites, providing payload capabili-ties for governmental entities on market-based logic, will be based on activity non-state actors, providing soft law and regulatory solutions, where space faring states are unable to find any compromise. Therefore private companies will be in fact global (or space) regulators, as part of UNCOPUS, being involved in space activities.39

The last argument for private involvement in space security comes from an approach based on common good and resilience of space assets, emphasized by the Project Ploughshares, as an important part of space security. As of 2017 there are more than 700,000 man-made objects on the Earth’s orbit bigger than 1 cm, while 17,000 of them are bigger than 10 cm.40 Some of them are traced by SSA systems, both American and European, but these systems are public-military owned, and private operators are not granted any access to this data. Any collision of space object with space debris, even with small particles, might result in a chain reaction, called Kessler’s syndrome, and not only private but public, and military assets will be destroyed or impaired. In such conditions, a reluctant cooperation between the public and private sector, and unwillingness to share vulnerable data by public actors seem to confirm that private space activity is more than necessary. This is an apparent case when logic of mistrust between state powers must be overcome by private actors, perhaps by suggesting common preferences for debris mitigation, and space situational awareness. In the case of space debris, Space Data Association, an initiative supported by private sector, with its main aim to enhance data sharing between commercial satellite operators, could be an example of nascent public good provided by private actors for the sake of global security.

1. **Space cooperation doesn’t lead to broader relations.**

**Sterner 15** (Eric Sterner is a fellow at the George C. Marshall Institute. He held senior staff positions for the U.S. House Science and Armed Services committees and served in DoD and as NASA’s associate deputy administrator for policy and planning, “Talk and Cooperation in Space” 8/6/2015 <https://spacenews.com/op-ed-china-talk-and-cooperation-in-space/>)

How might cooperation with China benefit the United States? Some hold that cooperation in space helps promote cooperation on Earth. Writing in SpaceNews in 2013, Michael Krepon argued “The more they cooperate in space, the less likely it is that their competition on Earth will result in military confrontation. The reverse is also true.” That sentiment is widespread and flows from the nobility of exploration. **If only it were so.** Unfortunately, a country’s space behavior appears to have little affect on its terrestrial actions. Russia’s multidecadal human spaceflight partnership with the United States did not prevent it from invading and destabilizing Ukraine when it moved toward a closer relationship with the European Union, many of whose members are Russian partners in the International Space Station. Space cooperation **has not, and will not**, prevent the continued worsening of the security environment in Europe, which flows from Russian behavior on Earth, not in space. **Space cooperation with China is similarly unlikely to moderate its behavior**. Tensions in Asia derive from China’s insistence on pressing unlawful territorial claims in the Pacific, most recently by transforming disputed coral reefs into would-be military bases. Ironically, civilian space technology has proved critical in documenting these aggressive moves. To further demonstrate the civil space cooperation does not promote cooperation on Earth, we need look no further than recent history. The NASA administrator’s visit to China in the fall of 2014 nearly coincided with China’s hacking of NOAA, with whom Beijing has a “partnership” in studying climate change. Military confrontation flows from the interaction of hard power in pursuit of competing national interests. Space cooperation falls into the realm of soft power. It has value in strengthening relationships among like-minded states with similar interests. China’s aggressiveness toward its neighbors, its human rights record and its cyberattacks on the United States strongly demonstrate that it and the United States are **not of like minds**. This is not the result of insufficient space cooperation, but of divergent national interests. The United States is a status quo power; China is not.

### Not Appropriation

#### The use of orbits is not categorized as appropriation of outer space

Elina Morozova {space policy expert, Executive Director of the Intersputnik International Organization of Space Communications} and Yaroslav Vasyanin {space policy expert, author}, 12/23/19 - ("International Space Law and Satellite Telecommunications," Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Planetary Science, accessed 1-13-2022, https://oxfordre.com/planetaryscience/oso/viewentry/10.1093$002facrefore$002f9780190647926.001.0001$002facrefore-9780190647926-e-75;jsessionid=99D12FDA48A8001990BA904013278ACE#acrefore-9780190647926-e-75-bibItem-0033 )//MS

One of the most fundamental principles of international space law states that outer space is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means (General Assembly Resolution 2222, [1966](https://oxfordre.com/planetaryscience/oso/viewentry/10.1093$002facrefore$002f9780190647926.001.0001$002facrefore-9780190647926-e-75;jsessionid=99D12FDA48A8001990BA904013278ACE#acrefore-9780190647926-e-75-bibItem-0033)). In legal terms, it means that outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, is declared to be res extra commercium and therefore states can neither own nor exercise any jurisdiction over any part of outer space. At the same time, placing a telecommunications satellite in the geostationary satellite orbit or deploying a constellation of satellites in other satellite orbits is not considered appropriation. When deploying satellite telecommunications systems, satellite operators do not get any proprietary rights on these orbits, which are essential parts of outer space and can only use them on a temporary basis and in accordance with international space law and the instruments of the International Telecommunication Union. Since the ITU legal regime does not prescribe any limits on how long an operator can use specific orbital slots and planes, their temporary utilization can actually last for decades provided that all the ITU requirements are met.

#### No impact & remediation’s not key—Nearly ZERO risk to any given satellite even ASSUMING cascades, Aff can’t solve it, and every other risk to spacecraft outweighs—Their ev makes several flawed assumptions

Wein 9 [Lawrence M. Wein, Professor & Senior Fellow at Stanford’s Center for International Security and Cooperation Jeffrey S. Skoll Professor of Management Science at Stanford University and Senior Fellow at Stanford’s Center for International Security and Cooperation, former DEC Leaders for Manufacturing Professor of Management Science at MIT, and Andrew M. Bradley, PhD-Institute for Computational and Mathematical Engineering at Stanford University, Space debris: Assessing risk and responsibility, Advances in Space Research 43 (2009) 1372–1390]

More importantly, while our numerical results mimic earlier results (Liou and Johnson, 2005; Walker and Martin, 2004) that stressed the importance of postmission deorbiting, we do not necessarily agree with the claim that the only way to prevent future problems is to remove existing large intacts from space (Liou and Johnson, 2006, 2008). The divergence between our views and those in Liou and Johnson (2006, 2008) is perhaps due to the different performance metrics used. The root causes for alarm in Liou and Johnson (2006, 2008) appear to be the growth rate of fragments and the small increase in the rate of catastrophic collisions over the next 200 years (Liou and Johnson, 2008, Fig. 2). However, the great majority of catastrophic collisions in the SOI do not involve operational spacecraft, and are hazardous only in the sense that the fragments generated from such a collision could subsequently damage or destroy operational spacecraft. Therefore, we introduced the notion of the lifetime risk of an operational spacecraft as the primary performance metric. Our model predicts that the lifetime risk is <5x10^-4 [less than .0005%] over the next two centuries, and always stays <10^-3 [less than .001%] than if there is very high (>98%) spacecraft deorbiting compliance. These risks appear to be low relative to the immense cost and considerable technological uncertainty involved in removing large objects from space, are dwarfed by the ~20% historical mission-impacting (but not necessarily mission-ending) failure rate of spacecraft (Frost and Sullivan, 2004), and could be overestimated if improved traffic management techniques lower future collision risks (Johnson, 2004). Hence, the need to bring large objects down from space does not appear to be as clear cut as suggested in Liou and Johnson (2006, 2008). Nonetheless, our model does not incorporate the possibility of intentional catastrophic collisions (ASAT tests, space wars) that could conceivably occur in the future. In addition, Fig. 5 considers only catastrophic collisions, whereas noncatastrophic intact-fragment collisions could easily disable an operational spacecraft. If the operational lifetime risk is modified to include noncatastrophic collisions with fragments >= 10cm, then the sustainable risk rises by ~50%: it increases from 2.19x10^-2 [.0219%] to 3.09x10^-2 in the base case, and increases from 4.91x10^-4 [.000491%] to 7.94x10^-4 in the full compliance case. Moreover, if fragments >= 1 cm (rather than >= 10 cm) are harmful to spacecraft (Johnson, 2004), then we (as well as other researchers) could be underestimating the risk.

1. **Probability – 0.1% chance of a collision.**

Alexander William **Salter**, **Economics Professor at Texas Tech**, **’16**, “SPACE DEBRIS: A LAW AND ECONOMICS ANALYSIS OF THE ORBITAL COMMONS” 19 STAN. TECH. L. REV. 221 \*numbers replaced with English words

The probability of a collision is currently **low**. Bradley and Wein estimate that the **maximum probability** in LEO of a collision over the lifetime of a spacecraft remains **below one in one thousand**, conditional on continued compliance with NASA’s deorbiting guidelines.3 However, the possibility of a future “snowballing” effect, whereby debris collides with other objects, further congesting orbit space, remains a significant concern.4 Levin and Carroll estimate the average immediate destruction of wealth created by a collision to be approximately $30 million, with an additional $200 million in damages to all currently existing space assets from the debris created by the initial collision.5 The expected value of destroyed wealth because of collisions, currently small because of the low probability of a collision, can quickly become significant if future collisions result in runaway debris growth.

1. **Time frame – Kessler effect 200 years away.**

Peter **Stubbe**, PhD in law @ Johann Wolfgang Goethe University Frankfurt, **’17**, State Accountability for Space Debris: A Legal Study of Responsibility for Polluting the Space Environment and Liability for Damage Caused by Space Debris, Koninklijke Brill Publishing, ISBN 978-90-04-31407-8, p. 27-31

The prediction of possible scenarios of the future evolution of the debris p o p ulation involves many uncertainties. Long-term forecasting means the prediction of the evolution of the future debris environment in time periods of decades or even centuries. Predictions are based on models84 that work with certain assumptions, and altering these parameters significantly influences the outcomes of the predictions. Assumptions on the future space traffic and on the initial object environment are particularly critical to the results of modeling efforts.85 A well-known pattern for the evolution of the debris population is the so-called Kessler effect’, which assumes that there is a certain collision probability among space objects because many satellites operate in similar orbital regions. These collisions create fragments, and thus additional objects in the respective orbits, which in turn enhances the risk of further collisions. Consequently, the number of objects and collisions increases exponentially and eventually results in the formation of a self-sustaining debris belt around the Earth. While it has long been assumed that such a process of collisional cascading is likely to occur only in a very long-term perspective (meaning a time 1 n of several hundred years),87 a consensus has evolved in recent years that an uncontrolled growth of the debris population in certain altitudes could become reality much sooner.88 In fact, a recent cooperative study undertaken by various space agencies in the scope of i a d c shows that the current l e o debris population is unstable, even if current mitigation measures are applied. The study concludes:

Even with a 90% implementation of the commonly-adopted mitigation measures [...] the l e o debris population is expected to increase by an average of **30% in the next 200 years.** The population growth is primarily driven by catastrophic collisions between 700 and 1000 km altitudes and such collisions are likely to occur every 5 to 9 years.89