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#### Plan - The United States federal government should substantially increase its space debris remediation with China.

#### Coop with China accounts for over 50% of debris—

Mosher and Lee 18, (Dave Mosher is a journalist with more than a decade of experience reporting and writing stories about space, science, and technology. Samantha Lee is the Senior Graphic Designer for Business Insider. “More than 14,000 hunks of dangerous space junk are hurtling around Earth — here's who put it all up there,” <https://www.businessinsider.com/space-junk-debris-amount-statistics-countries-2018-3>. 3-29-2018.)

Which countries launch the most stuff into space Most objects are in low-Earth orbit, roughly 25o miles above the planet. Fewer satellites are launched to geostationary orbits, or about 22,300 miles high. But what goes up usually comes down in space. Earth's outermost atmosphere drags and slows down objects over time, causing them to fall, burn up, and, in some cases, crash into the ocean or land. Publicly available orbital-tracking data from SSN is fed into the website Space-Track.org (registration required), which is contracted by the US Strategic Command. Here are the top 10 countries and organizations with the most objects in space and what they are, based on data downloaded on March 28, 2018: Russia has the most stuff in space, with 6,512 objects in orbit. The US is second with 6,262 objects. Considering that rocket bodies are a type of large space debris, Russia is arguably the messiest in space, with 4,994 uncontrolled objects. The US is a close second with 4,684 uncontrolled objects. China has only recently ramped up its space program, yet it's in a close third with 3,601 hunks of space junk; this is because the nation destroyed one of its own satellites in a 2007 anti-satellite weapons test. Satellite consortiums like Intelsat, SES, and Globalstar make the top 10, though they are relatively small space-junk contributors, since most of their objects are active satellites. Space-Track.org also shows which countries have had the most stuff fall from space: Russia is a clear historical winner, with 21,661 objects that have crashed to Earth. The US has deorbited about 12,453 about half as much deorbited stuff. China, which is a relative newcomer to space that launched its first satellite in 1970, has lost about 5,213 objects to a fiery doom. Everything Space-Track.org lists is just a small fraction of the total number of objects. According to the European Space Agency, there may be 670,000 bits of debris larger than a fingernail up there and perhaps 170 million pieces of debris larger than 1 millimeter — objects like flecks of paint and fragments of explosive bolts used on rockets. How to clean up outer space Getting old spacecraft out of orbit is key to preventing the formation of space junk, and many space agencies and corporations now build spacecraft with systems to de-orbit them. But Ailor and others are eager to push the development of new technologies and methods that can lasso, bag, tug, and otherwise remove the old, uncontrolled stuff that's already up there and continues to pose a threat. "I've proposed something like a XPRIZE or a Grand Challenge, where would you identify three spacecraft and give a prize to an entity to remove those things," he said. The biggest hurdle in defeating space debris, however, is likely human. "It's not just a technical issue. This idea of ownership gets to be a real player here," Ailor said. "No other nation has permission to touch a US satellite, for instance. And if we went after a satellite ... it could even be deemed an act of war." Ailor said someone needs to get nations together to agree on a treaty that spells out laws-of-the-sea-like salvage rights to dead or uncontrollable objects in space. "There needs to be something where nations and commercial authorities have some authority to go after something," he said.

#### It definitely competes – the aff uses a multilateral agreement AND restricts asteroid mining – the neg only uses the USA and China AND deals with debris

#### Solves first advantage – only companies going to space are from the USA – your own ev is heavily contextual to the USA

#### Solves second advantage – your Gallagher ev shows US Leadership will spill over and other countries will follow onto the norm
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#### Link and Uniqueness

#### US-Russia space coop is ending, preventing Russian space ventures and *great power status* --- new coop legitimizes Russia

Luzin 18 (Pavel Luzin – PhD in Political Science, Faculty in Political Science @ Perm U. <KEN> "Existential Problems Threaten U.S.-Russia Space Cooperation (Op-ed)," Moscow Times. October 12, 2018. DOA: 1/13/2020. https://www.themoscowtimes.com/2018/10/12/Existential-problems-threaten-US-Russia-Space-Cooperation-a63157)

The reported hole the Soysuz MS-09 spacecraft that caused an outcry last month and the emergency launch of Soyuz MS-10 this week should urge us to reconsider the state of Russia–U.S. space relations. Although this cooperation has weathered many existential crises, including the conflicts in Ukraine and Syria, the unpleasant truth is that space cooperation between Russia and the United States has been deteriorating for years now.

The lack of new joints projects since the late 2000s in combination with deepening mutual mistrust between the countries has thrown a shadow over cooperation. At the same time, Russia faces a crisis in its own space industry.

Russia is still the only U.S. partner capable of bringing its astronauts to the International Space Station, and Russian rocket engines enable the operation of the American Atlas V and Antares launch systems. Both countries, however, deal in interdependence, and Russia’s space agency, Roscosmos, is also heavily dependent on contracts from the United States.
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For example, the fees from American, European and Japanese astronauts that use Soyuz spacecrafts account for almost 25 percent of the annual Roscosmos budget (the remaining 75 percent comes from the Russian government).

Nevertheless, this interdependence is not going to last forever. The ISS, which currently operates as something of an international institution, will eventually go commercial or will end operation after 2025. In the meantime, NASA will go further into space with its own Gateway lunar orbital station and other projects.

Here, Russia faces an existential dilemma. It is crucial for Moscow to continue its space partnership with the United States. After all, aside from its nuclear arsenal, this space cooperation is what allows Russia to maintain its status as a great world power.

#### Impact

#### Great power status causes Russian expansionism and war

Rodríguez 15 (Joaquín Ferro Rodríguez – Strategic Studies and International Security Masters from the University of Granada. “Realism vs Realism. The Change of Approach in The Eastern Border,” June 30, 2015. http://www.seguridadinternacional.es/?q=es/content/realism-vs-realism-change-approach-eastern-border)

To begin with, I will explain why Russia can be considered as an offensive realist actor. It is not the aim of this paper to focus excessively on theoretical classifications or philosophical debates. However, due to its explicative power and its usefulness to better comprehend the Russian behaviour, it is worth mentioning three points belonging to the offensive realist theory: 1) great powers are rational actors whose main goal is to survive[1]; 2) all great powers are revisionist until the moment they become hegemonic[2]; and 3) for a great power, the only way to guarantee its security is to accumulate a bigger power quota than the rest[3]. Bearing in mind these characteristics, Russian position finds a coherent explanation. As Pierre Hassner puts it, “Russia’s foreign policy cannot be fully understood without taking into account the postimperial humiliation and resentment of the Russian people and the neoimperial ambition of its leaders”[4]. When the Cold War came to an end, Russian leaders regarded the presence of the United States (U.S.) and NATO in Europe positively as a way to keep a reunified Germany pacified. Nevertheless, they did not expect the subsequent NATO and EU enlargement, which included the ex-soviet Baltic countries in 2004[5]. This fact, added to the ‘colour revolutions’ taking place at the same time in Ukraine and Georgia, triggered a feeling of dissatisfaction within Russia and the desire of recovering its position as a great power[6]. The result is that, since 2004, Russia switched its - until that date - collaborative approach towards the West for a tougher one. Behaving as the offensive realist great power it wanted to become, Russia considers NATO/EU enlargements and their further relations with countries belonging to its ‘backyard’, especially Ukraine and Georgia, as a threat[7] to its survival. In order to face this threat, Moscow needs to accumulate more power and influence, above all in its direct neighbourhood, which explains why “Putin’s highest priority is to oppose ‘colour revolutions’”[8] as well as to avoid the promotion of the EU’s normative power in those countries. Consequently, he did not hesitate to show the Russian revisionist nature when he felt that national interests were at stake in Georgia and Ukraine. In the summer of 2008, after President Mikheil Saakashvili’s attempt to bring the separatist regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia back under Georgia’s control, Putin decided to send the army to maintain the Russian influence in those regions[9]. However, his goal was not uniquely to preserve the status quo, but rather to revise it. In that conflict, Putin showed for the first time his true intentions to seize any opportunity at his disposal to broaden his influence and to keep his neighbour countries weak and out of the West’s reach. In order to do so, Putin chose direct means, namely military intervention and war, to tackle the problem. On the other hand, indirect means have been used in the Ukraine crisis for the same purpose. After Viktor Yanukovych fled to Russia and a new pro-European government reached the power in Kiev in February 2014, Russia has promoted uprisings, funded separatist groups and militias in the eastern part of the country, annexed Crimea and sent arms and unidentified military staff to support the pro-Russian groups. These two different responses - direct and indirect - are the Russian tools to achieve its revisionist goals and not merely to defend the status quo, as demonstrated with the annexation of Crimea. These revisionist movements have not only benefited Putin abroad, but also within Russia, as his popularity has soared. This is a consequence of the powerful propaganda machinery of the Kremlin, which has been able to convince citizens of why Russia should be considered as a great power and, thus, to justify its international behaviour. The following points summarise Putin’s foreign policy and account for the theoretical base of the interventions in Georgia and Ukraine: Russia is a great power which shall preserve the sovereignty of the nation by all means. This has been translated into an increase of the military budget by 100% in the last 10 years, as well as in the presence of Russia in the most important international forums to enable them to participate in the decisions regarding other zones of the world[10]. “Russia and the Russian world constitute a ‘singular civilization’, neither Occidental nor Asian, which rests on the Christian values and a ‘historical mission’: to defend the traditional values against a materialist and decadent Occident”[11] (author’s translation). The Russian Diaspora, meaning that “the Russian people have become the largest people disperse worldwide”[12] (author’s translation). This situation implies an obligation for Russia to protect and defend Russian minorities wherever they are[13].

#### Expanded authoritarianism leads to great power war at the scale of world wars

Diamond 19 – PhD in Sociology, professor of Sociology and Political Science at Stanford University (Larry, “Ill Winds: Saving Democracy from Russian Rage, Chinese Ambition and American Complacency,” Kindle Edition)

In such a near future, my fellow experts would no longer talk of “democratic erosion.” We would be spiraling downward into a time of democratic despair, recalling Daniel Patrick Moynihan’s grim observation from the 1970s that liberal democracy “is where the world was, not where it is going.” 5 The world pulled out of that downward spiral—but it took new, more purposeful American leadership. The planet was not so lucky in the 1930s, when the global implosion of democracy led to a catastrophic world war, between a rising axis of emboldened dictatorships and a shaken and economically depressed collection of selfdoubting democracies. These are the stakes. Expanding democracy—with its liberal norms and constitutional commitments—is a crucial foundation for world peace and security. Knock that away, and our most basic hopes and assumptions will be imperiled. The problem is not just that the ground is slipping. It is that we are perched on a global precipice. That ledge has been gradually giving way for a decade. If the erosion continues, we may well reach a tipping point where democracy goes bankrupt suddenly—plunging the world into depths of oppression and aggression that we have not seen since the end of World War II. As a political scientist, I know that our theories and tools are not nearly good enough to tell us just how close we are getting to that point—until it happens.