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## OFF

#### Interp: The aff must defend the banning/unjust action of private appropriation in outer space, or a specification of the above statement. To clarify, defend the resolution or a subset.

#### Violation: Public vs private – their plan text refers to all types of outer space recognition because the noun is outer space

Global Common Alliance, ND, URL: <https://globalcommonsalliance.org/global-commons/>, KR

The global commons are the resources we all need to survive, thrive and prosper. These resources, which include the ocean and freshwater, the climate and biodiversity, and forests and wetlands, are being overused. But the global commons also represents a management approach based on systems thinking, transformation and self-organisation to bring out the best in people. We want to bring out the best in people, cities, companies and countries. This is the foundation for our plan for the planet.

There are two definitions of the global commons: One is based in geopolitics. In this definition the global commons are areas – and their potential economic resources – that lie beyond national jurisdiction: the atmosphere, the high seas, Antarctica and outer space.

#### 1AC Goehring says that “commons…shared ownership, public governance”

#### + Their ev also talks about other forms of commons that are public

1AC Silverstein & Panda ‘3/9 - Benjamin Silverstein [research analyst for the Space Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. MA, International Relations, Syracuse University Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs BA, International Affairs, George Washington University] and Ankit Panda [Stanton Senior Fellow in the Nuclear Policy Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. AB, Princeton University], “Space Is a Great Commons. It’s Time to Treat It as Such.” *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace* (Web). March 9, 2021. Accessed Dec. 13, 2021. <<https://carnegieendowment.org/2021/03/09/space-is-great-commons.-it-s-time-to-treat-it-as-such-pub-84018>> AT

BUILDING ON PRIOR MODELS FOR MANAGING COMMONS¶ The histories of other great commons provide lessons on how to manage shared space resources meaningfully and effectively. Efforts to minimize damage to other great commons—like the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution and subsequent protocols—offer guidance on how to resolve compliance issues. Notably, the negotiations on the original convention on air pollution involved, among others, the United States and the Soviet Union. This suggests that states can pursue mutual benefits in areas considered great commons even under competitive conditions. More recent negotiations on the convention’s accompanying protocols show that these competing states can even agree on financing a monitoring regime to support progress.¶ Existing conventions and implementing agreements indicate that states can reach valuable commitments to manage the Earth’s great commons. These governance models protect state interests and preserve the commons themselves. These principles apply to space, but progress on establishing more encompassing space governance principles, enforcement mechanisms, and dispute resolution procedures hinges on states sharing the fundamental view that space is a great commons. Reaching such a consensus is an important first step.¶ New leadership in prominent spacefaring states can revitalize efforts to recognize space as a commons and can build on established legal standards to pursue commons-related principles for governing Earth orbits. Space actors do not have to resolve all their competing interests based on the debris problem. But negligence, mismanagement, or poorly designed rules may spell disaster for Earth orbits. As a more diverse range of actors with space-based interests emerges, no single actor will be able to unilaterally impose universal rules. States can, however, negotiate agreements to manage commons areas to better pursue national objectives. The only way to effectively govern state and commercial space activities is to settle on and abide by common norms or rules.¶ New conventions or regulatory mechanisms for governing Earth orbits will not appear overnight, but states can build toward these goals by clarifying their commitments to treat space as a commons and pursuing governance arrangements that reflect this commitment. New policies in the United States should reflect that Earth orbits are a great commons.

#### Extra-t is a voting issue:

#### 1] Limits – their model allows an infinite number of affs that can specifically sidestep offense – this aff, specifically, would allow global commons in space to pre-empt war and sidestep conflict since it might increase multilateralism

#### 2] Clash – negs can’t engage with aff’s that define a new form of managing appropriation – today it’s the commons aff, tomorrow it adds a regulation to manage appropriation

#### Voters:

#### 1] Competing interps --- a) race to the bottom – reasonability prevents norm engagements that go back and forth to set rules which oweigh on future value b) arbitrary and judge intervention – no brightline for what constitutes good enough, turns their debatability warrants c) collapses – 2 brightlines of offense and defense also check meeting or not meeting the brightline

#### 2] DTD – abuse was in the 1ac and affected all later parts of the debate

## OFF

#### CP: Space ought to be treated as a global commons except for Active Debris Removal done by private entities. Governments ought to permit the appropriation of outer space for designated safety zones and tech stationing for active debris removal by private entities.

#### Solves the aff and avoids the link to a universal global commons – their ev says it’s about “shared ownership” and the cp helps modulate space.

#### Debris removal is necessary and only private entities have the incentive and capability to do it.

**Giordano 21** (David Giordano is the Vice President of Mentorship for CBLA. Elsewhere at Columbia Law School, he serves on the Columbia Journal of Transnational Law, and is the Treasurer of Columbia OutLaws. During his 1L Summer, David was an intern at the Securities and Exchange Commission’s Division of Corporation Finance. Prior to law school, David worked as a Corporate Paralegal at the New York office of Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP. David attended The George Washington University where he obtained a B.A. in psychology. “Space Debris: Another Frontier in the Commercialization of Space”. October 31, 2021.)

As **satellites** and other projectiles blast into orbit, upon collision they **can disintegrate into** shards, sometimes just centimeters wide, that remain in orbit, risking further collision. Hollywood captured the potential perils of **fairly large pieces of space debris** in the opening minutes of the 2013 film [*Gravity*](https://www.warnerbros.com/movies/gravity), where space junk threatens the lives of astronauts on a mission. Outside the realms of fictional space-thrillers, **even the smallest pieces of space junk can present real danger**. In 2016, a tiny piece of **space junk**, believed to be a paint chip or a piece of metal no more than a few thousandths of a millimeter across, [cracked the window of the International Space Station](https://www.popsci.com/paint-chip-likely-caused-window-damage-on-space-station/). In May 2021, a piece of space **debris** [punctured](https://www.nbcnews.com/science/space/space-junk-damages-international-space-stations-robotic-arm-rcna1067) **the robotic arm of the I**nternational **S**pace **S**tation. This is seriously concerning, as, [according to the European Space Agency](https://www.esa.int/Safety_Security/Clean_Space/How_many_space_debris_objects_are_currently_in_orbit), there are 670,000 pieces of space debris larger than 1cm and 170,000,000 between 1mm and 1cm in width. Unfortunately, **public action and policy struggles to keep up with these risks**. International law affords little clarity on the problem, as its control is a novel, [emerging field](https://www.technologyreview.com/2021/08/23/1032386/space-traffic-maritime-law-ruth-stilwell/) with many technical [tracking](https://www.space.com/space-situational-awareness-house-hearing-february-2020.html) and [removal](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/space-junk-removal-is-not-going-smoothly/#:~:text=There%20is%20no%20doubt%20that,antisatellite%20weapon%2C%E2%80%9D%20she%20says.) challenges. **None of the existing space treaties** [directly tackle the issue](https://oxfordre.com/planetaryscience/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190647926.001.0001/acrefore-9780190647926-e-70), rendering [responsibility for it](https://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/jil/vol41/iss1/6/) ambiguous. Absent such responsibility, [legal incentives are non-existent](https://www.courthousenews.com/lack-of-space-law-complicates-growing-debris-problem/)**.** [Guidelines are occasionally issued](https://www.unoosa.org/pdf/limited/l/AC105_2014_CRP14E.pdf) by international governing bodies, but provide little legal significance and are [more targeted at the practicalities of tracking and removal](https://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/jil/vol41/iss1/6/). The nation best positioned to notify space actors of collision risks is the United States, and the burden of that task currently falls on the [Department of Defense](https://www.govexec.com/media/d1-mission-space.pdf). However, the Trump administration issued a [directive in 2018](https://www.cnbc.com/2018/06/18/national-space-council-trump-signs-space-debris-directive.html), shifting the responsibility from the DoD to the Department of Commerce, and the [transition has yet to materialize](https://www.govexec.com/media/d1-mission-space.pdf), leaving DoD struggling to keep pace [with increasing commercial activity](https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/aerospace-and-defense/our-insights/look-out-below-what-will-happen-to-the-space-debris-in-orbit). In the face of public paralysis, **addressing the problem through industry looks more and more attractive.** This has led some to call for a new legal order that still leaves room for government, but reframes who the rules exist to serve. Rather than our current, rudimentary treaty regime designed to [prevent international conflict](https://www.theverge.com/2017/1/27/14398492/outer-space-treaty-50-anniversary-exploration-guidelines), [commentators](https://space.nss.org/wp-content/uploads/NSS-Position-Paper-Space-Debris-Removal-2019.pdf) have called for an additional regime resembling [maritime law](https://www.technologyreview.com/2021/08/23/1032386/space-traffic-maritime-law-ruth-stilwell/) that preserves the interests of a more diverse set of stakeholders, including those in the future that can bring technology and interests to space that may not yet exist. These commentators shun the common conception that space regulation should resemble air-traffic control, which is suited to a narrower set of uses (transport). Under such a “maritime” regime, the light touch of central regulatory bodies, and perhaps their non-existence, is preferred, just as it has been on the seas. This way, individual nations have a degree of flexibility in instituting controls they see fit while leaving room for industry to address problems and introduce new uses for space. Furthermore, **governments seem ready and willing to construct the legal and incentive framework in concert with such private action.** [In a joint statement this summer](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/g7-nations-commit-to-the-safe-and-sustainable-use-of-space), **G7 members expressed openness to resolving** the technical aspects of the **debris** problem **with private institutions, and there is** some **promising progress**. Apple co-founder [Steve Wozniak](https://www.space.com/apple-cofounder-steve-wozniak-space-junk-company) signaled his plans to address the problem through a new company with a telling name: Privateer Space. **Astroscale**, a UK-based company, successfully **launched a pair of satellites** in the Spring of 2021 [that will remove certain space debris from orbit](https://astroscale.com/astroscale-celebrates-successful-launch-of-elsa-d/)**.** Astroscale also [stated their desire](https://astroscale.com/space-sustainability/) to work with governments and international governing bodies to craft policy with private efforts to control the problem top of mind. In light of public policy’s silence on space debris, the initiative of actors like Astroscale involving themselves in policy may be advised, as it could [promote further private investment](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1NCO5Vvjf-kgoZLNfgaOn4bDj_CAfyD1Qhz2oW3TrcHc/edit) in technology for space **debris removal**. A popular [policy recommendation](https://reason.org/policy-brief/u-s-space-traffic-management-and-orbital-debris-policy/) among experts is the establishment of public-private partnerships, and Astroscale has entered several such agreements including with [Japan](https://www.satellitetoday.com/in-space-services/2021/07/27/space-clean-up-company-astroscale-signs-partnerships-with-mhi-and-japanese-government/) and the [European Space Agency](https://spacenews.com/astroscale-clearspace-aim-to-make-a-bundle-removing-debris/). Other **actors include** [ClearSpace](https://www.space.com/esa-startup-clearspace-debris-removal-2025)**,** [OneWeb](https://www.hou.usra.edu/meetings/orbitaldebris2019/orbital2019paper/pdf/6077.pdf)**, and** [D-Orbit](https://www.satellitetoday.com/in-space-services/2021/09/10/esa-awards-d-orbit-uk-contract-for-debris-removal-demonstration/)**.** Some may want to push back against further private involvement. The congestion of space is, in part, industry’s fault, and if we conceptualize orbital space as a common resource, it might be right to fear the effects of the [Tragedy of the Commons](https://www.britannica.com/science/tragedy-of-the-commons). Critics may seek to bolster international treaties, give legal teeth to the guidelines occasionally issued by the UN, and preserve the public posture of the heavens. These may be welcome adjustments, but unlike a pond that industry overfishes or a well that industry dries up, here industry is working to add more fish and water. Moreover, governments stand to benefit from this private decluttering, as well, as [they are expected](https://astroscale.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Reg-V-Development-of-Global-Policy-for-Active-Debris-Removal-Services-v2.0.pdf) to be major customers of some of these private actors. As for the public posture, space has long been a commercial place. Telecommunications companies and government contractors historically depend on space. As the number of commercial satellites set to launch skyrockets, it seems natural to craft policies that are responsive to their interests and provide incentives to remedy issues created in the course of spacefaring, such as space debris. **In light of the** long silence of international law on such issues and the demonstrated **motivation by private actors**, **space debris represents the latest frontier in the abdication of space from the public concern to the private.**

## OFF

#### CP: Space ought to be recognized as a global commons except for mining iniatives pursued by private companies.

#### Private companies are set to mine in space – new tech and profit motives make space lucrative

Gilbert 21, (Alex Gilbert is a complex systems researcher and PhD student in Space Resources at the Colorado School of Mines, “Mining in Space is Coming”), 4-26-21, Milken Institute Review, https://www.milkenreview.org/articles/mining-in-space-is-coming // MNHS NL

Space exploration is back. after decades of disappointment, a combination of better technology, falling costs and a rush of competitive energy from the private sector has put space travel front and center. indeed, many analysts (even some with their feet on the ground) believe that commercial developments in the space industry may be on the cusp of starting the largest resource rush in history: mining on the Moon, Mars and asteroids. While this may sound fantastical, some baby steps toward the goal have already been taken. Last year, NASA awarded contracts to four companies to extract small amounts of lunar regolith by 2024, effectively beginning the [era of commercial space mining](https://payneinstitute.mines.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/149/2020/09/Payne-Institute-Commentary-The-Era-of-Commercial-Space-Mining-Begins.pdf). Whether this proves to be the dawn of a gigantic adjunct to mining on earth — and more immediately, a key to unlocking cost-effective space travel — will turn on the answers to a host of questions ranging from what resources can be efficiently. As every fan of science fiction knows, the resources of the solar system appear virtually unlimited compared to those on Earth. There are whole other planets, dozens of moons, thousands of massive asteroids and millions of small ones that doubtless contain humungous quantities of materials that are scarce and very valuable (back on Earth). Visionaries including Jeff Bezos [imagine heavy industry moving to space](https://www.fastcompany.com/90347364/jeff-bezos-wants-to-save-earth-by-moving-industry-to-space) and Earth becoming a residential area. However, as entrepreneurs look to harness the riches beyond the atmosphere, access to space resources remains tangled in the realities of economics and governance. Start with the fact that space belongs to no country, complicating traditional methods of resource allocation, property rights and trade. With limited demand for materials in space itself and the need for huge amounts of energy to return materials to Earth, creating a viable industry will turn on major advances in technology, finance and business models. That said, there’s no grass growing under potential pioneers’ feet. Potential economic, scientific and even security benefits underlie an emerging geopolitical competition to pursue space mining. The United States is rapidly emerging as a front-runner, in part due to its ambitious Artemis Program to lead a multinational consortium back to the Moon. But it is also a leader in creating a legal infrastructure for mineral exploitation. The United States has adopted the world’s first spaceresources law, recognizing the property rights of private companies and individuals to materials gathered in space. However, the United States is hardly alone. Luxembourg and the United Arab Emirates (you read those right) are racing to codify space-resources laws of their own, hoping to attract investment to their entrepot nations with business-friendly legal frameworks. China reportedly views space-resource development as a national priority, part of a strategy to challenge U.S. economic and security primacy in space. Meanwhile, Russia, Japan, India and the European Space Agency all harbor space-mining ambitions of their own. Governing these emerging interests is an outdated treaty framework from the Cold War. Sooner rather than later, we’ll need [new agreements](https://issues.org/new-policies-needed-to-advance-space-mining/) to facilitate private investment and ensure international cooperation.

Back up for a moment. For the record, space is already being heavily exploited, because space resources include non-material assets such as orbital locations and abundant sunlight that enable satellites to provide services to Earth. Indeed, satellite-based telecommunications and global positioning systems have become indispensable infrastructure underpinning the modern economy. Mining space for materials, of course, is another matter. In the past several decades, planetary science has confirmed what has long been suspected: celestial bodies are potential sources for dozens of natural materials that, in the right time and place, are incredibly valuabl**e**. Of these, water may be the most attractive in the near-term, because — with assistance from solar energy or nuclear fission — H2O can be split into hydrogen and oxygen to make rocket propellant, facilitating in-space refueling. So-called “rare earth” metals are also potential targets of asteroid miners intending to service Earth markets. Consisting of 17 elements, including lanthanum, neodymium, and yttrium, these critical materials (most of which are today mined in China at great environmental cost) are required for electronics. And they loom as bottlenecks in making the transition from fossil fuels to renewables backed up by battery storage. The Moon is a prime space mining target. Boosted by NASA’s mining solicitation, it is likely the first location for commercial mining. The Moon has several advantages. It is relatively close, requiring a journey of only several days by rocket and creating communication lags of only a couple seconds — a delay small enough to allow remote operation of robots from Earth. Its low gravity implies that relatively little energy expenditure will be needed to deliver mined resources to Earth orbit. The Moon may look parched — and by comparison to Earth, it is. But recent probes have confirmed substantial amounts of water ice lurking in [permanently shadowed craters](http://lroc.sese.asu.edu/posts/1105) at the lunar poles. Further, it seems that solar winds have implanted significant deposits of helium-3 (a light stable isotope of helium) across the equatorial regions of the Moon. Helium-3 is a potential fuel source for second and third-generation fusion reactors that one hopes will be in service later in the century. The isotope is packed with energy (admittedly hard to unleash in a controlled manner) that might augment sunlight as a source of clean, safe energy on Earth or to power fast spaceships in this century. Between its water and helium-3 deposits, the Moon could be the resource stepping-stone for further solar system exploration. Asteroids are another near-term [mining target](https://foreignpolicy.com/2016/04/28/the-asteroid-miners-guide-to-the-galaxy-space-race-mining-asteroids-planetary-research-deep-space-industries/). There are all sorts of space rocks hurtling through the solar system, with varying amounts of water, rare earth metals and other materials on board. The asteroid belt between the orbits of Mars and Jupiter contains most of them, many of which are greater than a kilometer in diameter. Although the potential water and mineral wealth of the asteroid belt is vast, the long distance from Earth and requisite travel times and energy consumption rule them out as targets in the near term. The prospects for space mining are being driven by technological advances across the space industry. The rise of reusable rocket components and the now-widespread use of off-the-shelf parts are lowering both launch and operations costs. Once limited to government contract missions and the delivery of telecom satellites to orbit, private firms are now emerging as leaders in developing “NewSpace” activities — a catch-all term for endeavors including orbital tourism, orbital manufacturing and mini-satellites providing specialized services. The space sector, with a market capitalization of $400 billion, could grow to as much as $1 trillion by 2040 as private investment soars.

#### Squo private companies are willing to invest, but the plan crosses a perception barrier which destroys investment

Shaw 13 - Lauren E, J.D. from Chapman University School of Law, ”Asteroids, the New Western Frontier: Applying Principles of the General Mining Law of 1872 to Incentive Asteroid Mining”, JOURNAL OF AIR LAW AND COMMERCE, Volume 78, Issue 1, Article 2, <https://scholar.smu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1307&context=jalc> // recut MNHS NL

To some, the mining of asteroids might sound like the premise of a science fiction novel' or the solution to the heartwrenching, fictional scenario depicted in the film Armageddon.2 To others, it evokes a fantastical idea that may come to fruition in a distant reality. However, impressively funded companies have plans to send spacecraft to begin prospecting on asteroids within the next two years.' The issues associated with the mining of asteroids should be addressed before these plans are set in motion. Much has been written about the issues that might arise from allowing nations to own these space bodies and the minerals they contain; one such issue is the impact on international treaties.4 However, little has been written about the applicability of preexisting mining laws-which provide a basic property right scheme for the private sector-such as the General Mining Law of 1872 (Mining Law) to the management of asteroid mining.' The literature to date on how to legally address asteroid mining is minimal.' The articles that do address it propose the creation of different systems, such as a "property rights-based system that relies on the doctrine of first possession"7 or an international authority that would regulate mining operations.' Implementing a scheme that offers ownership of extracted resources without bestowing complete sovereignty is necessary to avoid an impending legal limbo-that is, an outer space "Wild West" equivalent where there is neither certainty nor security in who owns what.9 If private sector miners of asteroids know this right already exists, they will have more incentive to extract resources.' 0 This, in turn, would increase the chances of successful missions, resulting in numerous scientific and explorative benefits, along with the potential replenishment of key elements that are becoming increasingly depleted on Earth yet are still needed for modern industry. Scientists speculate that key elements needed for modern industry, including platinum, zinc, copper, phosphorus, lead, gold, and indium, could become depleted on Earth within the next fifty to sixty years." Many of these metals, such as platinum, are chemical elements that, unlike oil or diamonds, have no synthetic alternative.12 Once the reserves on Earth are mined to complete depletion, industries will be forced to recycle the existing supply of minerals, which will result in increased costs due to increased scarcity.' 3 However, evidence is accumulating that asteroids only a few hundred thousand miles away from Earth may be composed of an abundance of natural resources-including many of the minerals being mined to depletion on Earth-that could lead to vast profits." Most of the minerals being mined on Earth, including gold, iron, platinum, and palladium, originally came from the many asteroids that hit the Earth after the crust cooled during the planet's formation.'

#### Space mining is the only way to solve climate change

Duran 21, (Paloma Duran is a journalist and industry analyst at Mexico Business News, “Is Space Mining the Best Option to Face Climate Change?”), 11-03-21, Mexico Business News, https://mexicobusiness.news/mining/news/space-mining-best-option-face-climate-change // MNHS NL

Going to net zero means that more mining is needed. Experts have said that the current supply cannot support the necessary metals demand for the green transition. As a result, new mining alternatives have gained greater relevance, among them is space mining. Several countries, including Mexico, have shown their interest in this alternative, creating a new space race. “The solar system can support a billion times greater industry than we have on Earth. When you go to vastly larger scales of civilization, beyond the scale that a planet can support, then the types of things that civilization can do are incomprehensible to us … We would be able to promote healthy societies all over the world at the same time that we would be reducing the environmental burden on the Earth,” said Dr. Phil Metzger, Planetary Scientist at the University of Central Florida. Currently, there are several attempts to address global warming and transition to a net zero carbon economy. There has been an increasing interest in renewable energy and infrastructure, which has increased demand for various minerals, especially lithium, cobalt, nickel, copper and rare earth elements. However, according to experts, the world is close to entering a metals supercycle, where demand will exceed available supply, causing prices to skyrocket. Consequently, the mining industry has sought alternatives to achieve the required supply. Options include recycling and improved mine waste management, sea mining and space mining. The latter is considered one of the alternatives with the greatest potential. However, a regulatory framework is still lacking and there is almost no experience in this regard. Despite the lack of knowledge regarding space mining, it has become a very attractive option since the planet is running out of resources. While some people believe that land-based mining is cheaper than space mining, experts believe this may change in the long term. Furthermore, within the solar system there are countless bodies rich in minerals, ores and elements that will accelerate the fight against climate change. “There will come a point when there is nothing left to mine on the surface, prompting mines to reach even further below. But even those resources are destined to run out and so we will aim toward ocean mining, which already has specific technologies that are being developed. Nevertheless, even those mines are limited as well. The mine of the future, which today may seem unlikely, will no longer be on our planet. There will be a time when space mining will be as common as an open leach mine,” Eder Lugo, Minerals Head at Siemens, told MBN. More than 150 million asteroids measuring approximately 100m are believed to be in the inner solar system alone. In addition, astronomers have also identified abundant minerals near the Earth’s space and the Main Asteroid Belt. There are three main groups into which asteroids are divided: C- type, S- type, and M- type. The last two groups are the most abundant in minerals such as gold, platinum, cobalt, zinc, tin, lead, indium, silver, copper and rare earth metals. "Energy is limited here. Within just a few hundred years, you will have to cover all of the landmass of Earth in solar cells. So, what are you going to do? Well, what I think you are going to do is you are going to move out in space … all of our heavy industry will be moved off-planet and Earth will be zoned residential and light-industrial,” said Jeff Bezos, Founder of Amazon and the Space Launch Provider Blue Origin.

#### Anthropogenic warming causes extinction --- mitigation efforts now are key

Griffin, 2015 (David, Professor of Philosophy at Claremont, “The climate is ruined. So can civilization even survive?”, CNN, 4/14/2015, <http://www.cnn.com/2015/01/14/opinion/co2-crisis-griffin/> )

Although most of us worry about other things, climate scientists have become increasingly worried about the survival of civilization. For example, Lonnie Thompson, who received the U.S. National Medal of Science in 2010, said that virtually all climatologists "are now convinced that global warming poses a clear and present danger to civilization." Informed journalists share this concern. The climate crisis "threatens the survival of our civilization," said Pulitzer Prize-winner Ross Gelbspan. Mark Hertsgaard agrees, saying that the continuation of global warming "would create planetary conditions all but certain to end civilization as we know it." These scientists and journalists, moreover, are worried not only about the distant future but about the condition of the planet for their own children and grandchildren. James Hansen, often considered the world's leading climate scientist, entitled his book "Storms of My Grandchildren." The threat to civilization comes primarily from the increase of the level of carbon dioxide (CO2) in the atmosphere, due largely to the burning of fossil fuels. Before the rise of the industrial age, CO2 constituted only 275 ppm (parts per million) of the atmosphere. But it is now above 400 and rising about 2.5 ppm per year. Because of the CO2 increase, the planet's average temperature has increased 0.85 degrees Celsius (1.5 degrees Fahrenheit). Although this increase may not seem much, it has already brought about serious changes. The idea that we will be safe from "dangerous climate change" if we do not exceed a temperature rise of 2C (3.6F) has been widely accepted. But many informed people have rejected this assumption. In the opinion of journalist-turned-activist Bill McKibben, "the one degree we've raised the temperature already has melted the Arctic, so we're fools to find out what two will do." His warning is supported by James Hansen, who declared that "a target of two degrees (Celsius) is actually a prescription for long-term disaster." The burning of coal, oil, and natural gas has made the planet warmer than it had been since the rise of civilization 10,000 years ago. Civilization was made possible by the emergence about 12,000 years ago of the "Holocene" epoch, which turned out to be the Goldilocks zone - not too hot, not too cold. But now, says physicist Stefan Rahmstorf, "We are catapulting ourselves way out of the Holocene." This catapult is dangerous, because we have no evidence civilization can long survive with significantly higher temperatures. And yet, the world is on a trajectory that would lead to an increase of 4C (7F) in this century. In the opinion of many scientists and the World Bank, this could happen as early as the 2060s. What would "a 4C world" be like? According to Kevin Anderson of the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research (at the University of East Anglia), "during New York's summer heat waves the warmest days would be around 10-12C (18-21.6F) hotter [than today's]." Moreover, he has said, above an increase of 4C only about 10% of the human population will survive. Believe it or not, some scientists consider Anderson overly optimistic. The main reason for pessimism is the fear that the planet's temperature may be close to a tipping point that would initiate a "low-end runaway greenhouse," involving "out-of-control amplifying feedbacks." This condition would result, says Hansen, if all fossil fuels are burned (which is the intention of all fossil-fuel corporations and many governments). This result "would make most of the planet uninhabitable by humans." Moreover, many scientists believe that runaway global warming could occur much more quickly, because the rising temperature caused by CO2 could release massive amounts of methane (CH4), which is, during its first 20 years, 86 times more powerful than CO2. Warmer weather induces this release from carbon that has been stored in methane hydrates, in which enormous amounts of carbon -- four times as much as that emitted from fossil fuels since 1850 -- has been frozen in the Arctic's permafrost. And yet now the Arctic's temperature is warmer than it had been for 120,000 years -- in other words, more than 10 times longer than civilization has existed. According to Joe Romm, a physicist who created the Climate Progress website, methane release from thawing permafrost in the Arctic "is the most dangerous amplifying feedback in the entire carbon cycle." The amplifying feedback works like this: The warmer temperature releases millions of tons of methane, which then further raise the temperature, which in turn releases more methane. The resulting threat of runaway global warming may not be merely theoretical. Scientists have long been convinced that methane was central to the fastest period of global warming in geological history, which occurred 55 million years ago. Now a group of scientists have accumulated evidence that methane was also central to the greatest extinction of life thus far: the end-Permian extinction about 252 million years ago. Worse yet, whereas it was previously thought that significant amounts of permafrost would not melt, releasing its methane, until the planet's temperature has risen several degrees Celsius, recent studies indicate that a rise of 1.5 degrees would be enough to start the melting. What can be done then? Given the failure of political leaders to deal with the CO2 problem, it is now too late to prevent terrible developments. But it may -- just may -- be possible to keep global warming from bringing about the destruction of civilization. To have a chance, we must, as Hansen says, do everything possible to "keep climate close to the Holocene range" -- which means, mobilize the whole world to replace dirty energy with clean as soon as possible.

## OFF

#### Private sector innovation in the commercial space industry is high now.

**Smith 18** [Matthew Smith, 6-11-2018, "Commercialized Space and You," Science in the News, https://sitn.hms.harvard.edu/flash/2018/commercialized-space-and-you/]//DDPT

Step aside, NASA. The 20th century model of space exploration is running out of fuel, and private companies are now leading the race for human expansion across the galaxy. Elon Musk, Richard Branson, and Jeff Bezos are three of the billionaires leading this extraterrestrial adventure with their respective companies, SpaceX, Virgin Galactic, and Blue Origin. Bezos, the founder of Amazon and currently the wealthiest person in the world, has a vision of sending autonomous rovers to the Moon and helping to eventually create a Moon Village. He has explained that collaborations with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and other government agencies are encouraged and appreciated, but are no longer essential to achieve his goal. [Musk](https://www.geekwire.com/2018/jeff-bezos-blue-origin-space-venture-go-moon-settlements/), who co-founded Tesla, has already launched nine rockets within the first five months of 2018, one of which was the most powerful private spacecraft [ever sent into orbit](http://sitn.hms.harvard.edu/flash/2018/spacex-launches-falcon-heavy-rocket-successfully/). Looking forward, SpaceX aims to complete its first manned mission to Mars in 2024, almost a decade earlier than NASA’s projections. Even the current US president is encouraging this shift to private companies driving [innovation in space](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-switch/wp/2018/02/11/the-trump-administration-wants-to-turn-the-international-space-station-into-a-commercially-run-venture/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.d2c1eccab4ca). With almost [$1 billion](https://www.forbes.com/sites/alexknapp/2018/04/10/nearly-1-billion-was-invested-in-space-startups-in-1q2018-new-report-says/#5fdd019b285c) invested in space-focused startups in the first quarter of 2018, the commercialized space industry shows no sign of slowing down.

#### Private space appropriation is uniquely key to ensuring ongoing innovation towards space exploration and colonization.

**Cheng 20** [Dean Cheng, 09-16-2020, "Outer Space and Private Property," Heritage Foundation, https://www.heritage.org/space-policy/commentary/outer-space-and-private-property]//DDPT

Fully 53 years after the Outer Space Treaty, however, this has begun to change. The success of SpaceX, Blue Origin, Virgin Galactic, and other private companies has led to what has been termed Space 2.0.

The Obama administration’s decision to rely on commercial space-launch services to resupply the International Space Station opened the door to expanding private enterprise’s role in space.

The innovation exhibited in the various Falcon launches, including the ability to reuse the booster rockets, has seen a significant drop in the cost of placing payloads into orbit. As a result, a real opportunity exists for companies to begin thinking about how to use space not simply to improve terrestrial operations, but to make money from space and its physical resources.

The uncertainty associated with private property rights, however, has had a constraining effect on the ability to exploit space more extensively. Companies are unlikely to be willing to risk capital and assets if they are not sure that they will be able to profit from their investments.

#### Space exploration solves extinction and endless resource wars.

Collins 10 [Patrick Collins, professor of economics at Azabu University in Japan, and a Collaborating Researcher with the Institute for Space & Astronautical Science, as well as adviser to a number of companies, Adriano V. Autino is President of the Space Renaissance International; Manager, CEO/CTO, Systems Engineering Consultant / Trainer at Andromeda Systems Engineering LLC; and Supplier of methodological tools and consultancy at Intermarine S.p.A, Acta Astronautica, Volume 66, Issues 11–12, June–July 2010, “What the growth of a space tourism industry could contribute to employment, economic growth, environmental protection, education, culture and world peace”, Pages 1553–1562]

7. World peace and preservation of human civilisation

The major source of social friction, including international friction, has surely always been unequal access to resources. People fight to control the valuable resources on and under the land, and in and under the sea. The natural resources of Earth are limited in quantity, and economically accessible resources even more so. As the population grows, and demand grows for a higher material standard of living, industrial activity grows exponentially. The threat of resources becoming scarce has led to the concept of “Resource Wars”. Having begun long ago with wars to control the gold and diamonds of Africa and South America, and oil in the Middle East, the current phase is at centre stage of world events today [37]. A particular danger of “resource wars” is that, if the general public can be persuaded to support them, they may become impossible to stop as resources become increasingly scarce. Many commentators have noted the similarity of the language of US and UK government advocates of “war on terror” to the language of the novel “1984” which describes a dystopian future of endless, fraudulent war in which citizens are reduced to slaves.

7.1. Expansion into near-Earth space is the only alternative to endless “resource wars”

As an alternative to the “resource wars” already devastating many countries today, opening access to the unlimited resources of near-Earth space could clearly facilitate world peace and security. The US National Security Space Office, at the start of its report on the potential of space-based solar power (SSP) published in early 2007, stated: “Expanding human populations and declining natural resources are potential sources of local and strategic conflict in the 21st Century, and many see energy as the foremost threat to national security” [38]. The report ended by encouraging urgent research on the feasibility of SSP: “Considering the timescales that are involved, and the exponential growth of population and resource pressures within that same strategic period, it is imperative that this work for “drilling up” vs. drilling down for energy security begins immediately” [38].

Although the use of extra-terrestrial resources on a substantial scale may still be some decades away, it is important to recognise that simply acknowledging its feasibility using known technology is the surest way of ending the threat of resource wars. That is, if it is assumed that the resources available for human use are limited to those on Earth, then it can be argued that resource wars are inescapable [22] and [37]. If, by contrast, it is assumed that the resources of space are economically accessible, this not only eliminates the need for resource wars, it can also preserve the benefits of civilisation which are being eroded today by “resource war-mongers”, most notably the governments of the “Anglo-Saxon” countries and their “neo-con” advisers. It is also worth noting that the $1 trillion that these have already committed to wars in the Middle-East in the 21st century is orders of magnitude more than the public investment needed to aid companies sufficiently to start the commercial use of space resources.

Industrial and financial groups which profit from monopolistic control of terrestrial supplies of various natural resources, like those which profit from wars, have an economic interest in protecting their profitable situation. However, these groups’ continuing profits are justified neither by capitalism nor by democracy: they could be preserved only by maintaining the pretence that use of space resources is not feasible, and by preventing the development of low-cost space travel. Once the feasibility of low-cost space travel is understood, “resource wars” are clearly foolish as well as tragic. A visiting extra-terrestrial would be pityingly amused at the foolish antics of homo sapiens using long-range rockets to fight each other over dwindling terrestrial resources—rather than using the same rockets to travel in space and have the use of all the resources they need!

7.2. High return in safety from extra-terrestrial settlement

Investment in low-cost orbital access and other space infrastructure will facilitate the establishment of settlements on the Moon, Mars, asteroids and in man[/woman]-made space structures. In the first phase, development of new regulatory infrastructure in various Earth orbits, including property/usufruct rights, real estate, mortgage financing and insurance, traffic management, pilotage, policing and other services will enable the population living in Earth orbits to grow very large. Such activities aimed at making near-Earth space habitable are the logical extension of humans’ historical spread over the surface of the Earth. As trade spreads through near-Earth space, settlements are likely to follow, of which the inhabitants will add to the wealth of different cultures which humans have created in the many different environments in which they live.

Success of such extra-terrestrial settlements will have the additional benefit of reducing the danger of human extinction due to planet-wide or cosmic accidents [27]. These horrors include both man-made disasters such as nuclear war, plagues or growing pollution, and natural disasters such as super-volcanoes or asteroid impact. It is hard to think of any objective that is more important than preserving peace. Weapons developed in recent decades are so destructive, and have such horrific, long-term side-effects that their use should be discouraged as strongly as possible by the international community. Hence, reducing the incentive to use these weapons by rapidly developing the ability to use space-based resources on a large scale is surely equally important [11] and [16]. The achievement of this depends on low space travel costs which, at the present time, appear to be achievable only through the development of a vigorous space tourism industry.

## CASE

### Circumvention

#### Commercial clout means that regs cannot force compliance—BUT, self-interest means the industry will self-police

Hampson 17

Joshua Hampson, Security Studies Fellow at The Niskanen Center, Niskanen Center, January 25, 2017, “The Future of Space Commercialization”, https://niskanencenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/TheFutureofSpaceCommercializationFinal.pdf

NASA and the U.S. military have contracts with some of these companies for launches. In the future, 155 however, the military and government agencies may be more heavily relying on commercial companies for launches, equipment, and services. If the commercial sector becomes a more influential part of the market than the government, as has happened in other areas of technological development, government priorities may take a lower priority to space companies than commercial priorities. In the long-run, this may have two effects: (1) commercial companies could become large enough to push back on policies they disagree with, similar to the Apple vs FBI encryption debate; and (2) as a result of this reliance, the U.S. government may shift from an open, innovation-fostering approach to space to a more controlled and regulated approach.

Complex national security issues could directly hinder commercial development of space. The national security apparatus in the United States, which can wield significant influence over the licensing process, may restrict actions in space to reduce some of these concerns. If conflict breaks out over space satellites and infrastructures, the actions the U.S. military may take could be purely based on military/intelligence strategy. This could directly damage commercial space assets, or indirectly make the space environment unviable for commercial launches or assets. It would be in the best interest of companies seeking to operate in outer space to pay close attention to the increasing tensions in outer space. Industry may be able to encourage de-escalatory action by the United States or avoid undertaking actions that may increase tensions themselves.

### Space Debris

#### There’s no space debris impact

Park 18

Ye Joo Park, citing NASA studies on orbital debris, How Dangerous is Space Debris?, Research Association for Interdisciplinary Studies, RAIS Conference Proceedings, November 19-20, 2018, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.1572516, <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3303541>

Other factors to consider concerning collisions in Space

While it’s true that there are thousands of space objects directly above Earth in an 800-kilometer band, space is so vast that it’s helpful to pause for a moment and reflect... in the area directly above the entire continental U.S., there are typically only three or four items orbiting above 3.1 million square miles. Therefore, the likelihood of collisions between satellites, spacecraft and orbiting objects is very small (NASA 2018).

In fact, in 2013 it was reported that the probability of a collision between an orbiting asset and space debris larger than 1 cm (0.4in.) will be once every 1.5-2 years, according to the Head of the Russian Hall/ History of Space Debris 8 Figure 5 [NASA] Space Agency. This compares with a 2010 estimate giving the likelihood of once every 5 years (Sorokin 2013).

The Feasibility of Practically Reducing Space Debris

Reducing orbital debris is incredibly difficult. Therefore, the most important action that space experts and policy makers currently recommend is to prevent the unnecessary creation of additional orbital debris. This can be done through prudent vehicle design and operations ((UNOOSA 2014).

The International Academy of Astronautics or IAA is a significant, global organization of scientists and space experts from many countries who meet regularly to discuss the importance of space debris as a policy issue. The subject-matter experts of the IAA published their fifth update Situation Report on Space Debris in August 2017 (Bonnal and McKnight 2017). In the executive summary, the IAA reported that if an orbiting satellite impacts with small bits of debris - even as small as 5 mm - the result will be grave, e.g. the collision would likely disrupt or terminate a satellite’s operations (Bonnal and McKnight 2017, 5).

The serious warnings expressed in this conclusion are offset by the positive findings of the IAA that there has been a reduction of the space debris created from the two extraordinary satellite destruction events (2007 and 2009) cited earlier in this paper. According to the IAF report, a large amount of debris from the satellite explosions were frictionally burned when reaching the Earth’s atmosphere after gradually sinking due to the scientific principle of atmospheric drag (in the science of Physics), which is a deterioration in the strength of an orbit because of an object hitting gas molecules in space. Small bits of space junk sink as the orbit gets weaker... then they burn. This is a positive trend “for keeping the short-term collision hazard under control at the lower altitudes (i.e., less than 650 km)” (Bonnal and McKnight 2017, 7).

#### **Military space satelties have already been broken up by space debris – their escalation scenario is absurd**

Wall 21’ Home News Spaceflight Space collision: Chinese satellite got whacked by hunk of Russian rocket in March By Mike Wall published August 17, 2021 We may see more and more of these orbital smashups in the coming years. //RD Debatedrills

Yunhai 1-02's wounds are not self-inflicted. In March, the U.S. Space Force's 18th Space Control Squadron (18SPCS) reported the breakup of Yunhai 1-02, a Chinese military satellite that launched in September 2019. It was unclear at the time whether the spacecraft had suffered some sort of failure — an explosion in its propulsion system, perhaps — or if it had collided with something in orbit. We now know that the latter explanation is correct, thanks to some sleuthing by astrophysicist and satellite tracker Jonathan McDowell, who's based at the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Sponsored Links Cupertino: Startup Is Changing the Way People Retire SmartAsset Related: The worst space debris events of all time Click here for more Space.com videos... CLOSE On Saturday (Aug. 14), McDowell spotted an update in the Space-Track.org catalog, which the 18SPCS makes available to registered users. The update included "a note for object 48078, 1996-051Q: 'Collided with satellite.' This is a new kind of comment entry — haven't seen such a comment for any other satellites before," McDowell tweeted on Saturday. He dove into the tracking data to learn more. McDowell found that Object 48078 is a small piece of space junk — likely a piece of debris between 4 inches and 20 inches wide (10 to 50 centimeters) — from the Zenit-2 rocket that launched Russia's Tselina-2 spy satellite in September 1996. Eight pieces of debris originating from that rocket have been tracked over the years, he said, but Object 48078 has just a single set of orbital data, which was collected in March of this year. "I conclude that they probably only spotted it in the data after it collided with something, and that's why there's only one set of orbital data. So the collision probably happened shortly after the epoch of the orbit. What did it hit?" McDowell wrote in another Saturday tweet. Yunhai 1-02, which broke up on March 18, was "the obvious candidate," he added — and the data showed that it was indeed the victim. Yunhai 1-02 and Object 48078 passed within 0.6 miles (1 kilometer) of each other — within the margin of error of the tracking system — at 3:41 a.m. EDT (0741 GMT) on March 18, "exactly when 18SPCS reports Yunhai broke up," McDowell wrote in another tweet. Thirty-seven debris objects spawned by the smashup have been detected to date, and there are likely others that remain untracked, he added. Despite the damage, Yunhai 1-02 apparently survived the violent encounter, which occurred at an altitude of 485 miles (780 kilometers). Amateur radio trackers have continued to detect signals from the satellite, McDowell said, though it's unclear if Yunhai 1-02 can still do the job it was built to perform (whatever that may be). Space Junk Clean Up: 7 Wild Ways to Destroy Orbital Debris Click here for more Space.com videos... McDowell described the incident as the first major confirmed orbital collision since February 2009, when the defunct Russian military spacecraft Kosmos-2251 slammed into Iridium 33, an operational communications satellite. That smashup generated a whopping 1,800 pieces of trackable debris by the following October. However, we may be entering an era of increasingly frequent space collisions — especially smashups like the Yunhai incident, in which a relatively small piece of debris wounds but doesn't kill a satellite. Humanity keeps launching more and more spacecraft, after all, at an ever-increasing pace. "Collisions are proportional to the square of the number of things in orbit," McDowell told Space.com. "That is to say, if you have 10 times as many satellites, you're going to get 100 times as many collisions. So, as the traffic density goes up, collisions are going to go from being a minor constituent of the space junk problem to being the major constituent. That's just math." We may reach that point in just a few years, he added. The nightmare scenario that satellite operators and exploration advocates want to avoid is the Kessler syndrome — a cascading series of collisions that could clutter Earth orbit with so much debris that our use of, and travel through, the final frontier is significantly hampered. RELATED STORIES — Who's going to fix the space junk problem? — Space junk removal is not going smoothly — The world needs space junk standards, G7 nations agree Our current space junk problem is not that severe, but the Yunhai event could be a warning sign of sorts. It's possible, McDowell said, that Object 48078 was knocked off the Zenit-2 rocket by a collision, so the March smashup may be part of a cascade. "That's all very worrying and is an additional reason why you want to remove these big objects from orbit,"

### Corporate Col

#### Capitalism is key for CCS

Gregory F. Nemet et al. 16, Associate Professor, La Follette School of Public Affairs, University of Wisconsin–Madison, Martina Kraus, German Institute for Economic Research Vera Zipperer, German Institute for Economic Research, November, 2016, The Valley of Death, the Technology Pork Barrel, and Public Support for Large Demonstration Projects, La Follette School Working Paper No. 2016-007

Because the ultimate (but not immediate) goal of supporting demonstrations is to facilitate widespread adoption, demand a6nd thus markets are of course key (Kingsley et al., 1996). In climate change, policies are central to those markets (Taylor et al., 2003; Zhou et al., 2015), thus credibility in those policies is also central (Rai et al., 2010; Finon, 2012). But it is striking how many demonstration programs confronted markets that involved negative shocks around the time that projects came on-line—we see it in synfuels, biofuels, and solar thermal electricity (Figure 9), and CCS (Figure 10). The 1.9 year average lag from project initiation to time on-line is crucial. It would be a mistake to assume a Hotelling price path in which prices of an exhaustible resource (e.g. oil, atmospheric storage of CO2) rise at a constant pure rate of time preference. In this case the relevant price is the level at which avoided CO2 emissions are remunerated. Rather the experience of the past suggests we are more likely to see shocks and boom–bust cycles (Krautkraemer, 1998; Zaklan et al., 2011). We see it in our data in the prices related to each demonstration program (Figure 8). Lupion and Herzog (2013) attribute the failure of the NER300 program to stimulate the construction of any CCS projects to 4 factors: competition with renewables, project complexity, low carbon prices, and a combination of fiscal austerity and weak climate policy around the global financial crisis. Note that three of the four problems involved future demand, not the funding structure itself. Demonstrations need markets that pay off innovation investments not just under a steadily increasing Hotelling-style market, but under a broad range of market conditions. Features of robust demand pull include niche markets (Kemp et al., 1998), hedging across jurisdictions (Nemet, 2010), and flexible production (Sanchez and Kammen, 2016). Government price guarantees have played an important role as we have seen on synfuels, solar thermal electricity, and on a smaller scale, photovoltaics.

#### Try or die for CCS to solve warming

Moniz 9/23/19 - 13th Secretary of Energy (2013 to 2017) and is the founder and CEO of the Energy Futures Initiative

Fredd Krupp is president of the Environmental Defense Fund, Ernest Moniz, “Cutting Climate Pollution Isn’t Enough — We Also Need Carbon Removal,” Text, TheHill, September 23, 2019, <https://thehill.com/opinion/energy-environment/462609-cutting-climate-pollution-isnt-enough-we-also-need-carbon-removal>.

It has been almost four years since the Paris climate agreement was signed. But as leaders gather in New York this week for the United Nations Climate Change Summit, the world remains far off track from meeting the Paris objective of limiting global warming to well below 2 degrees Celsius -- and pursuing efforts at 1.5 degrees.

To meet that target, the world must achieve a 100 percent clean economy — one that produces net zero emissions, or no more climate pollution than can be removed from the atmosphere — soon after mid-century, with the United States and other advanced economies reaching that milestone no later than 2050. It’s a daunting but doable task.

The consequences of falling short are enormous. This year, the U.S. government’s fourth National Climate Assessment documented the huge economic and social impacts of unchecked warming. The Pentagon has repeatedly warned of the impacts on national security and our troops.

Achieving a 100 percent clean economy will require a swift transition to renewables and other zero-carbon energy sources. But we also need to face the reality that meeting the Paris target will require taking carbon out of the atmosphere at massive scale. In part, that’s because eliminating emissions will be very challenging for some sectors, especially the transportation industry and agriculture. Removing carbon from the atmosphere would also bring concentrations down, helping to stabilize the climate at safer levels. So, the push for clean energy must be supplemented by a suite of technologies known as carbon dioxide removal (CDR).

It is not a question of what we’d prefer. It’s a question of insurmountable math.

The crucial role carbon removal must play is becoming more widely recognized. The 2018 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report stressed the importance of carbon removal, and the U.S. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine late last year estimated that ten billion tons of CO2 will need to be pulled from the atmosphere annually by 2050, and double that by 2100. For context, today’s global emissions are less than 40 billion tons per year. If the 10 billion tons of CO2 from CDR were stored underground, that would be roughly double the world’s annual oil production.

The good news is that there are a surprisingly large number of promising pathways for carbon dioxide removal. Nature-based approaches include reforestation and forest management as well as agricultural practices that increase carbon stored in soils. Some of the attendant challenges include competition for land and permanence of the carbon sequestration.

Technological approaches include direct air capture — machines that actually suck carbon from the air — and technologically-enhanced natural processes, such as plants genetically modified with deep roots to fix carbon in the soil; enhanced mineralization, which uses certain reactive rocks to bind with carbon from the air; and accelerated ocean uptake in phytoplankton. These technologies are immature and require considerable research, development and demonstration to ensure viability and affordability at very large scale.

Despite the urgency, there is no dedicated federal effort to develop these crucial technologies; existing programs are piecemeal and largely focused on sequestering emissions from industrial and electricity generating sources.

The National Academies recommended the rapid establishment of a robust, focused, scalable and accelerated federal research program spanning the Departments of Energy and Agriculture, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Science Foundation, among others. Such a program would encompass the full range of technological pathways that can remove CO2 from the environment. ‘’Clearing the Air,’’ an analysis of CDR’s value and a proposed plan to deploy it, has been completed by the Energy Futures Initiative. Over the next decade, the program scale would be about a billion dollars a year.

Carbon dioxide removal is not a magic bullet. We must do everything we can to deploy innovative low- and zero-carbon methods to generate electricity, heat homes, fuel vehicles, and power industry, creating new economic opportunities in the process. Tackling the climate crisis also requires placing a declining limit and a price on carbon pollution, as well as a significant increase in energy technology innovation and deployment across the board.

But CDR is also not a “Plan B.” It is a critical part of any “Plan A” for climate, a necessary complement to emission reduction. It can provide more flexibility and optionality in policy planning, which could ease the transition to a carbon-neutral economy while minimizing transition costs and providing greater assurance that science-based climate goals can be met in a timely manner. It would eventually enable a net negative global economy that could bring the atmospheric carbon concentrations down — and global temperatures with it.

We have delayed meaningful action for far too long. As a result, the scale and urgency of the challenge is such that we cannot simply work on doing better in the future. We need to correct what we did in the past. Carbon removal is the enabler.

**Capitalism is self-correcting and sustainable – war and environmental destruction are not profitable and innovation solves their impacts**

**Kaletsky, ’11** (Anatole, editor-at-large of *The Times* of London, where he writes weekly columns on economics, politics, and international relationsand on the governing board of the New York-based Institute for New Economic

Theory (INET), a nonprofit created after the 2007-2009 crisis to promote and finance academic research in economics, Capitalism 4.0: The Birth of a New Economy in the Aftermath of Crisis, p. 19-21, bgm)

**Democratic capitalism is a system built for survival. It has adapted successfully to shocks of every kind, to upheavals in technology and economics, to political revolutions and world wars. Capitalism has been able to do this because,** unlike communism or socialism or feudalism**, it has an inner dynamic akin to a living thing. It can adapt and refine itself in response to the changing environment. And it will evolve into a new species of the same capitalist genus if that is what it takes to survive. I**n the panic of 2008—09, many politicians, businesses, and pundits forgot about the astonishing adaptability of the capitalist system. Predictions of global collapse were based on static views of the world that extrapolated a few months of admittedly terrifying financial chaos into the indefinite future. **The self-correcting mechanisms that market economies and democratic societies have evolved over several centuries were either forgotten or assumed defunct. The language of biology has been applied to politics and economics, but rarely to the way they interact. Democratic capitalism’s equivalent of the biological survival instinct is a built-in capacity for solving social problems and meeting material needs. This capacity stems from the principle of competition, which drives both democratic politics and capitalist markets. Because market forces generally reward the creation of wealth rather than its destruction, they direct the independent efforts and ambitions of millions of individuals toward satisfying material demands,**

**even if these demands sometimes create unwelcome by-products.** Because voters generally reward politicians for making their lives better and safer, rather than worse and more dangerous, **democratic competition directs political institutions toward solving rather than aggravating society’s problems, even if these solutions sometimes create new problems of their own. Political competition is slower and less decisive than market competition, so its self-stabilizing qualities play out over decades or even generations, not months or years.** But regardless of the difference in timescale, **capitalism and democracy have one crucial feature in common: Both are mechanisms that encourage individuals to channel their creativity, efforts, and competitive spirit into finding solutions for material and social problems. And in the long run, these mechanisms work very well.** If we consider **democratic capitalism as a successful problem-solving machine**, the implications of this view are very relevant to the 2007-09 economic crisis, but diametrically opposed to the conventional wisdom that prevailed in its aftermath. Governments all over the world were ridiculed for trying to resolve a crisis caused by too much borrowing by borrowing even more. Alan Greenspan was accused of trying to delay an inevitable "day of reckoning” by creating ever-bigger financial bubbles. Regulators were attacked for letting half-dead, “zombie” banks stagger on instead of putting them to death. But these charges missed the point of what the democratic capitalist system is designed to achieve. **In a capitalist democracy whose raison d’etre is to devise new solutions to long-standing social and material demands, a problem postponed is effectively a problem solved. To be more exact, a problem whose solution can be deferred long enough is a problem that is likely to be solved in ways that are hardly imaginable today. Once the self-healing nature of the capitalist system is recognized, the charge of “passing on our problems to our grand-children”**—whether made about budget deficits by conservatives or about global warming by liberals—**becomes morally unconvincing. Our grand-children will almost certainly be much richer than we are and will have more powerful technologies at their disposal. It is far from obvious, therefore, why we should make economic sacrifices on their behalf.** Sounder morality, as well as economics, than the Victorians ever imagined is in the wistful refrain of the proverbially optimistic Mr. Micawber: **"Something will turn up."**

## OFF

### 1NC – Core

#### States ought to:

#### --Announce that appropriation of outer space by private actors violates the Outer Space Treaty and that this is a settled matter of customary international law

#### --Announce that this action is taken pursuant to *opinio juris* (the belief that the action is taken pursuant to a legal obligation) and that non-compliant actors are in violation of international law

#### --Fully comply, not appropriating outer space in a manner inconsistent with these proclamations

#### Solves the Aff.

[Fabio](https://kluwerlawonline.com/journalarticle/Air+and+Space+Law/33.3/AILA2008021) **Tronchetti 8**. Dr. Fabio Tronchetti works as a Co-Director of the Institute of Space Law and Strategy and as a Zhuoyue Associate Professor at Beihang University, “The Non–Appropriation Principle as a Structural Norm of International Law: A New Way of Interpreting Article II of the Outer Space Treaty,” Air and Space Law, Volume 33, No 3, 2008, <https://kluwerlawonline.com/journalarticle/Air+and+Space+Law/33.3/AILA2008021>, RJP, **DebateDrills**.

The non–appropriation principle represents the fundamental rule of the space law system. Since the beginning of the space era, it has allowed for the safe and orderly development of space activities. Nowadays, however, the principle is under attack. Some proposals, arguing the need for abolishing it in order to promote commercial use of outer space are undermining its relevance and threatening its role as a guiding principle for present and future space activities. This paper aims at safeguarding the non–appropriative nature of outer space by suggesting a new interpretation of the non–appropriation principle that is based on the view that this principle should be regarded as a customary rule of international law of a special character, namely ‘a structural norm’ of international law.

#### We solve better, since CIL causes follow-on.

Koplow, 9 – Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center.

David A. Koplow, “ASAT-isfaction: Customary International Law and the Regulation of Anti-Satellite Weapons,” Michigan Journal of International Law. Volume 30, Summer 2009. <http://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1452&context=facpub>

Finally, the Article concludes with some policy recommendations, suggesting mechanisms for the world community to press forward with autonomous efforts to promote stability and security in outer space, even in the face of recalcitrance from the leading space powers. I would certainly support the negotiation and implementation of a comprehensive new treaty to prevent an arms race in outer space, and a carefully drafted, widely accepted accord could accomplish much, well beyond what customary law alone could create. But the treaty process, too, has costs and disadvantages, and the world need not pursue just one of these alternatives in isolation.

If the absence of global consensus currently inhibits agreements that countries could already sign, perhaps the world community can nevertheless get some "satisfaction" via the operation of CIL, constructing a similar (although not completely equivalent) edifice of international regulation of ASATs based simply on what countries do.

#### And – their space commons key ev specifically says there needs to be a common understanding but CIL also does that

#### CIL is critical to solve climate change threats. Relying only on treaty commitments fails.

**Clark 18** (Kayla Clark is a lawyer at Morgan Lewis. Education: University of Notre Dame Law School, 2018, J.D. California Polytechnic State University, 2015, B.A. “The Paris Agreement: Its Role in International Law and American Jurisprudence”. 5-10-2018.)

Moreover, the long-term nature of the Paris Agreement has the additional benefit of potentially creating **c**ustomary **i**nternational **l**aw **regarding** international **environmental norms** and development. Customary international law, **recognized to be legally binding** on participating nations,65 **can** be shaped when a custom, such as a commitment to **consistently reduce** greenhouse gas **emissions**, becomes regarded as law. Evidence of customary international law can include: general acceptance by the participants; adherence for a sufficient duration; consistent understanding of the terms and stable enforcement; and a finding of opinio juris––evidence that the terms are seen as law.66 If it can be shown throughout the Paris Agreement’s implementation that the terms, including participants’ commitments and implementation of goals, transitioned from mere statutory obligations to **c**ustomary **i**nternational **l**aw, then the Paris Agreement **stands a credible chance at recognition beyond the limits of** the **treaty**’s **text.** The architecture of the Agreement, with an aspirational goals of temperature reduction and evaluation periods every five years beginning in 2023, leaves ample time for the already binding international treaty to take on another stable and well-recognized form—customary international law.67 In addition to the aspirational goals of the Paris Agreement, the nuanced form of differentiation between nations is a feature that positions the pact for success. The differentiation is meant to be both inclusive and empowering to all participants.68 Beginning with the preamble of the Agreement, “one finds in a condensed manner carefully crafted expressions of the main tensions underpinning the entire text, between developed and developing countries, between more vulnerable countries and the rest, between countries that expect to suffer from measures that ‘respond’ to climate change and the rest . . .”69 The Agreement is facilitated by each state voluntarily committing to reduce its emissions reductions. All states are asked to commit to some amount of emissions reduction, but no states are assigned a mandatory reductions target, as they were in Kyoto. **Under** Paris, “[s]tates thus choose their level of ambition subject to two requirements, namely the regular updating––at least every five years . . . and **a**n obligation of non-regression . . . .”70 The Paris Agreement’s **voluntary contribution scheme** seeks to diffuse the sharply divisive Annex 1 and non-Annex 1 strategy of the Kyoto Protocol, as well as reduce the coercive effect of mandatorily assigned targets. The Annex strategy not only excluded many developing countries, chief of which included high carbon emitters like China and India, but also disheartened developed countries that felt that even a good faith attempt at meeting their target emissions would make only a marginal impact on overall climate change efforts.71 Additionally, the distinction between Annex 1 and non-Annex 1 under the Kyoto Protocol restricted the ability or motivation of developing countries to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions, as they were not required to participate.72 Now, developing **countries like China or India cannot shirk participation merely because of their developing status**.73 The Paris Agreement reflects the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, but implements this international law doctrine more effectively. Though all participating nations must voluntarily assume and be accountable for their emission reduction goals, accommodations for developing countries are also included. To offset the cost on now-included developing countries, the Paris Agreement incorporates adaptation by developing countries as a goal, and urges developed countries to provide developing states with financial and logistical support. Including mechanisms to support adaptation is a new way to address climate change, responsive to the reality that, as Vinuales writes, “[i]t may be that climate change is no longer a matter of precaution but one of prevention – preventing acknowledged risk.”74 Creating infrastructure and advancing technology in developing nations, via funding from developed nations, recognizes the different capacities of different countries, reflects the common but differentiated responsibilities doctrine, and focuses on adaptation. However, the Agreement still expects developing nations to contribute throughout the adaptation process. The third promising feature of the Paris Agreement is the innovative approach to oversight and enforcement. Compared to the Kyoto Protocol’s mandatory and legally-binding emissions reductions, the Paris Agreement takes a less coercive, information-based approach.75 Through the construction of **i**nternational **law**, the Paris Agreement hopes to use both official and unofficial sources of pressure in its information-based enforcement. As Falkner writes, the Paris Agreement **relies on a “two-level game” logic that unites domestic climate politics with strategic international interaction**.76 Though the Paris Agreement does not impute a legal obligation for states to actually reduce their emissions per their commitments, it does require periodic reports to be disclosed to the participants of the Agreement. These reports will occur every five years, beginning in 2023, and will provide the international community with a transparent look into the efforts of other states to combat climate change.77 The information garnered from these periodic reports, and their subsequent review, may facilitate the “naming and shaming” of states that have not succeeded in meeting their goals.78 **The peer pressure function should work effectively** between nations, as they may easily identify **and** call out those that have failed to make a good faith effort to meet their voluntary contributions. The mandatory reporting serves to make the Agreement transparent and legitimate to the international community.79 The naming and shaming also **anticipates pressure on the contributing parties from civil society**, as governments of underperforming countries may experience naming and shaming by environmental groups, the media, and other interested parties.80 Domestically, after nations choose their emission reduction contribution, they will likely face some pressure from groups in their country regarding their performance under the contribution. Internationally, the Agreement is also designed to create peer pressure among states, which could be exerted on states that are failing to meet their commitments. The naming and shaming function between states delivers the brunt of the Agreement’s enforcement mechanism. Though the enforcement tools of the Paris Agreement do not create actual legal liability for states that neglect their commitments, the enforcement strategies should not be seen as toothless.81 By **operating with multiple kinds of enforcement**, and engaging with both domestic and international paradigms over a long period of time, the Paris Agreement consciously **increases the** likelihood of **immediate enforcement** and **of** transitioning from mere statute to **binding customary international law**.82