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#### Space tech advancements and control will produce a qualitative military advantage – REMs, fusion power, AI, lunar base, intelligence, and space weapon platforms. US space privatization maintains a shaky but tenable US lead.
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Advancements in space technology are quickly leading to an inevitable conflict over control in space, which includes control over the Moon through lunar bases and potentially control over the colonization of Mars. The PRC has added the capability to "physically attack satellites using antisatellite [ASAT] interceptors, miniature space mines, and ground-based lasers" into its military space program.1 These capabilities fall under the guise of the Outer Space Treaty’s permission to destroy militarized satellites.2 These technologies could easily be used offensively to create a decision advantage in combat. Some analysts believe that the deliberate collision of PRC satellites with older satellites shows that the PRC has experimented with "parasitic satellites" designed to lie dormant in the vicinity of a target until activated, potentially for hacking purposes.3 The PRC even "reportedly launched a hypersonic 'prototype space fighter' " in 2010. It continues to be locked in an intense space race with the rest of the space-savvy international community—particularly Russia, the United States, and India—with a short-term goal of controlling the Moon with a lunar base and a longer-term goal of populating Mars under the rule of the PRC.4

The development of maneuverable space planes and lunar bases is not unique to the PRC. The National Aeronautical and Space Administration (NASA) developed the X-37 and X-37B space planes, and the Russian Federation is developing a maneuverable space plane using nuclear technology for power.5 All of these nations (as well as several others, including India and Japan) intend to establish lunar bases within the next 20 years.6 Despite the array of international treaties and agreements promoting peaceful global development of space resources in the name of science and humanity, it is unlikely that space will remain weapon free and likely that it will become the next frontier of global combat. Space weapons in development may use robotics, nanotechnology, and directed energy such as microwaves and lasers.7 With the establishment of a lunar base, a nation with advanced laser technology, advanced cyber weaponry, maneuverable space planes, satellite targeting capabilities, nano-science stealth technology, artificial intelligence, and self-guiding nanotechnology bullets would undoubtedly have the capacity to rule the Earth as it sees fit. All of these technologies already exist or are in development phases, and they are the future of intelligence and warfare.8

The US government and NASA, unlike the PRC and the RF, have been encouraging the commercialization of space cargo transportation to meet future American needs for access to the International Space Station (ISS) and to improve the research and development of spaceborne technologies and other developments.9 Private sector involvement has also opened the market for alternative rocket propulsion technologies that can achieve government and commercial goals for space at lower costs and faster than possible under the existing bureaucracy of NASA. Enhanced private sector involvement in space travel utilizes the free-market system to foster radical developments and investment for both government and private sector programs, incentivizing broader participation, which benefits both. Commercializing aspects of standard space operations, such as the recent partnership with SpaceX, will also pave the way for space tourism. This will free up resources for NASA and the newly minted US Space Force to pursue broader goals, such as manned deep space travel, a lunar base, and manned missions to Mars.

Part 2: Lunar Power

Rare earth metals and other minerals are quickly becoming scarce in the United States to the point where the international space race to claim the Moon and Mars has become a top priority, not just for control over them but for the resources available for exploitation. Uranium has even entered the economic radar as a good idea for boosting the American economy instead of remaining too dangerous to mine due to the associated health risks and environmental hazards. This resource is in abundance on the Moon.10 Estimates suggest there may be up to five million tons of Helium-3 (3He) contained within the lunar regolith.11 This has the potential to meet all of [hu]mankind's power needs for thousands of years when used with fusion power.12 On top of the resources potentially available, the Moon provides a unique launching position for future missions to Mars with a faster, more direct, and more efficient path to the Red Planet.13 Control over the Moon is an inherent factor in the future of the human race.

Uranium has long been a part of the nuclear fission enterprise on Earth but comes with high costs, including radioactive waste and extreme health and environmental hazards due to the radiation produced in the fission process. Terrestrial reserves of other energy-producing resources, like oil and natural gas, have also been projected to be exhausted within 50–100 years under current and projected mining and usage rates.14 Alternatively, the element tritium (T), which has a half-life of 12.32 years, naturally decays into 3He,15 which can be used to create a new kind of power—fusion power. Fusion power can be generated by combining deuterium (D) with either more D, T, or 3He, using the following calculations shown in order of their ignition temperatures: D + T = 4He [Helium-4] + n [neutrons] + 17.6 MeV [Million electron Volts] D + D = T + H [Hydrogen] + 4.0 MeV (50%) = 3He + n + 3.3 MeV (50%) D + 3He = 4He + H + 18.4 MeV16 Fusion power can also be created by combining 3He with more 3He, creating Helium-4 (4He).17 The combination of 3He and 3He is the most energy efficient, producing the greatest net energy,18 but also requires the highest ignition temperature to achieve fusion.19 Unfortunately, 3He exists only in minute amounts on Earth.20 The nation that establishes a mining and transportation industry capable of bringing lunar 3He to Earth, and develops a fusion plant network that transforms 3He into power, could control a substantial portion of the planet’s energy industry for decades. Some scientific estimates discount both the estimates of the potential amount of extractable 3He in the lunar regolith and the potential to achieve industrial fusion reactors on Earth capable of processing it. Exemplifying this scientific stance are the calculations of Ian Crawford, who believes both prospects are greatly exaggerated and that there are only approximately 220,507 tons of 3He available in logical extraction areas, such as the titanium-rich lunar basalt flats.21 Despite his dissent, Crawford admits even lunar resources that seem impractical and economically inefficient to transport resources to Earth may provide substantial economic benefits for space-based uses, such as solar power systems and spacecraft fusion engines, for example,22 which would not require transport back to Earth. Earth's finite resources make lunar and space resource exploitation an inevitability. The most pertinent factor governing future human resource exploitation in space is the question of which nation will achieve a successful and effective industrial supply chain first. The most probable three nations to achieve this are the US, the PRC, and the RF, and the three areas that need to be navigated to succeed are facility establishment, production/refinement, and transportation. Establishing lunar facilities is the easiest of these goals, especially when lunar resources that can be used for building are taken into account, which decreases the amount of materials needed to be brought to the Moon and the time needed for construction. In 2008, a NASA experiment found that lunar regolith has potential construction properties. When scientists heated the regolith and used sulfur as a binding agent, they made "waterless concrete," which can be molded and is nearly as strong as concrete when it hardens.23 This process requires minimal effort and relies primarily on direct heat application and the ability to shape the regolith. Consequently, the entire process can be automated by robots with the appropriate tools on the lunar surface, such as the ones NASA began developing specifically for this purpose in 2009.24 The simplicity of the operational requirements means that these three nations already have the technical capability to begin construction using lunar soil after arriving on the Moon. They will also all be capable of bringing any other materials that would be necessary to construct facilities or bases on the lunar surface. Unlike the US, and contrary to existing international law, the PRC's stance on the Moon is that it is territory,25 despite the prohibition on "national appropriation" of celestial bodies outlined in Article II of the Outer Space Treaty.26 The PRC has also proposed mining 3He for future fusion power opportunities.27 The RF, while not openly pursuing a territorial ambition for the Moon, is certainly exploring and advancing prospects of economic development, including 3He extraction and tourism.28 Facility development and resource exploitation areas on the Moon are limited. This will exacerbate the race for prime locations and desirable resources, particularly at the poles, where water ice is believed to exist in large quantities (which can be used to sustain lunar human habitation), and in the titanium- and 3He-rich basalt flats of Mare Tranquillitatis and Oceanus Procellarum.29 Once established, facility operations can begin to extract and refine resources either for use on the lunar surface or for transportation to Earth. Transportation of materials from the Moon to Earth is a substantial financial and logistical undertaking. It will not be easy to show a profit after the considerable expenses associated with it. Nevertheless, extraction and transportation of 3He and other resources to Earth, specifically for fusion power production, have been expressed as long-term goals of the PRC and the RF within decades. Interestingly, the US has not stated this as a goal but has already shifted its space transportation industry sufficiently toward the private sector. The private sector will have the most viable opportunity to build the first industrial space transportation system, specifically because of advantages in the American free-market system.30 By encouraging private sector participation in the space industry and commercializing space transportation, the US has made production of space technologies competitive with proposals in the National Space Policy.31 A competitive industry makes substantial investments in research, development, and production of space transports; engine components for space travel; and tools for use in zero gravity. America cannot afford to fall behind in the race for lunar facility establishment and resource exploitation. This is for reasons of economic and national security and the future security of human expansion into space as the Moon offers the most efficient launching position for missions to Earth's red neighbor, Mars. Part 3: Mars Domination Mars is widely accepted by the scientific community to be the most plausible planet for the first human habitation on a celestial body and, consequently, the most likely location for the first space colony and eventually a second planet for humankind. Thus, Mars is a desirable goal for nations involved in space exploration for many reasons. The territory on Mars, for example, will most likely become marketable for economic value to civilians in the long term. The Outer Space Treaty prevents ownership of territory on celestial bodies but makes no mention of ownership or sale for profit of structures built on, or items brought to, celestial bodies, just as there is no explicit language in the treaty preventing profit-based resource exploitation on celestial bodies by either governments, organizations, or private nationals.32 Additionally, the inevitability of Mars becoming a second planet inhabited by humanity must be considered, along with all of the implications of living spaces and ownership of property that will eventually follow. Denying this inevitability and claiming it as outlawed by international law due to the prohibition on appropriating territory on a celestial body would essentially equate owning property on Earth as also outlawed by international law. After all, Earth is also a celestial body. Language in the treaty encourages expansion into space and essentially says that if persons, governments, or organizations build something on a celestial body, they own that building33 and can do what they want with it, including selling it. They cannot, however, claim to own the planet's ground outside the building—yet. Resources on Mars, while still not mapped out as substantially as lunar resources have been, will likewise create new markets for economic prosperity and national wealth, including more 3He deposits from solar winds like those found in lunar regolith along with substantially high concentrations of iron.34 In addition to buildings constructed on celestial bodies, spacecraft and facilities constructed in space and on celestial bodies are also considered to be the territory of the owning nation, which means that the UN Charter applies to facilities and spacecraft in space and on celestial bodies. UN Charter Article 2(4), in particular, protects space explorers and potential future residents on Mars by prohibiting the "use of force against the territorial integrity" of another nation party to the treaty,35 which all space-faring nations are. Article 51 further dictates that if attacked, "the inherent right of . . . self-defense" shall not be impaired.36 Article V of the Outer Space Treaty prescribes that, in space, all humans are bound to "render all possible assistance to" each other as "envoys of Mankind."37 Essentially, a peaceful international course is possible—even mandated—for human expansion into space. Unfortunately, the PRC and the RF regard space and celestial bodies as territorial goals,38 leading to the assumption that attempts will be made to control and defend such territories as necessary to achieve space superiority, control over space resources, and managerial power over the future colonization of Mars. Control over Mars, in addition to affecting resource exploitation, transportation, and scientific advancements, also has implications for the direction of humanity in space. Establishment of a human colony, or human colonies, on Mars will eventually lead to territorial spaces, development of the land and air (potentially involving terraforming the planet for atmospheric enhancement), and security issues. While an established colony on the Red Planet is still likely decades away, trends within the PRC and RF governments suggest that any established colony on Mars under their jurisdiction would be authoritarian, weaponized, and secret. Given the nature of weather on Mars, fortified structures are easily justified, and the lack of a conventional weapons ban on celestial bodies makes weaponization of such a colony both legal and desirable, mainly because of the third inherently desired factor—secrecy. The inevitability of PRC and RF presence on Mars also suggests that any US developments will also include fortifications and weaponization. While the Outer Space Treaty mandates cooperation between nations on celestial bodies, the extreme distance between Earth and Mars means that a compliance verification system with effective monitoring and enforcement will be complicated, if not impossible, for the foreseeable future. For these reasons, a nation that effectively controls near-Earth space and establishes a security presence on the Moon will effectively be in a position to control Mars. Part 4: Space Control Celestial bodies are not the only potential fields of conflict in space, and in the short term, space itself has become a much more immediately relevant focus for spacefaring nations and the world. This is particularly the case in the vicinity of Earth, including orbital paths for communication technologies, weapon platforms, and sensors. Technological improvements and the proliferation of nation-state and private sector interest and capacity to enter space are causing the acceleration of an inevitability—usable orbital space around Earth is diminishing.39 Satellites and other spaceborne assets orbiting Earth are quickly filling up all of the most useful places to perform their assigned functions within Earth's various orbits, and space debris is complicating matters even further. Increasing numbers of space objects are causing difficulty in establishing safe orbital paths for newly launched spacecraft while increasing the risk to launches destined for deep space.40 Adding to these complications are international developments of ASAT weapons, many of which add to the more than 500,000 pieces of space debris traveling as fast as 17,500 mph41 already orbiting Earth.42 ASATs in use and under development include essentially two broad areas: kinetic energy (KE), such as missiles and rail guns, which impact targets in space; and directed energy (DE), which includes lasers, particle beams, and cyber weapons.43 The Outer Space Treaty, while prohibiting nuclear weapons from being used in any way in space including being stationed in space, "has no specific provision prohibiting the use of conventional weapons, [including lasers], in outer space,"44 which inherently authorizes them. The Outer Space Treaty also contains no prohibition of such weapons being stationed on space-based platforms, including on celestial bodies, or of them being used to target objects on Earth, in space, or on celestial bodies.45 In other words, these weapons are legal in every way, regardless of the potential damage they can cause to international stability and humanity. There are, however, multiple ongoing debates over the nature, definitions, and classifications of several kinds of ASATs currently in operation or in developmental phases. Nearly every KE ASAT results in a large amount of space debris, which causes an abundance of future and immediate problems for space activities, including endangerment of the basic military and commercial functions of satellites for the Global Positioning System (GPS), communications, and recreation. Space debris is therefore a highly undesirable side effect for any nation to risk and potentially dangerous to the integrity of a nation's armed forces. David Koplow addresses this issue in a substantially relevant and logical way in his article “An Inference about Interference: A Surprising Application of Existing International Law to Inhibit Anti-Satellite Weapons.” His stated thesis is as follows: “The [National Technical Means] NTM-protection provisions of arms control treaties already prohibit the testing and use of destructive, debris-creating ASATs, because it is foreseeable that the resulting cloud of space junk will, sooner or later, impermissibly interfere with the operation of another state's NTM satellite, such as by colliding with it or causing it to maneuver away from its preferred orbital parameters into a safer, but less useful, location.”46 By "interfering" with these NTM verifications mandated by multiple treaties, Koplow suggests that intentional actions creating space debris are already outlawed by international law, and that the development of debris creating KE ASATs should cease and be banned immediately.47 Laser weapons, particle beams, and weapons containing depleted uranium are also under debate due to their radioactivity as well as nuclear processes used for some of their operations. Some posit that nuclear activities or materials within a weapon system should constitute classifying them as nuclear weapons, thereby outlawing them in space per the Outer Space Treaty's nuclear weapons ban.48 Advocates for these weapons declare that the weapons are not nuclear. Of the three primary types debated, laser weapons use a nuclear or chemical reaction process to fire a radioactive beam, particle beams rapidly fire atomic charged particles at a target, and hypervelocity rod bundle weapons and railguns use depleted uranium as ammunition.49 Finally, the potential exists for the use of a nuclear explosion in space designed to generate an electromagnetic pulse (EMP) attack on an Earth target, which the RF "has worked on developing" in the form of an “EMP ASAT.”50 With the RF’s recent developments in ASATs and its stated intent “to station weapons in space,”51 the complete weaponization of space by the RF and other nations—including the US and the PRC—is inevitable. The RF and PRC are aggressively pursuing ASAT weapon advancements and preparing for space combat operations, including the RF recently fielding a "ground-based laser weapon" even as it publicly advocated for space not to be weaponized.52 Part 5: The Future of Space Space exploration converges on two of Sun Tzu's concepts of the strategic battlespace: “open ground” and the “ground of intersecting highways.” The former consists of areas where all sides have "liberty of movement" and the latter of areas where "contiguous states" converge.53 On open ground, Sun Tzu advises not "to block the enemy’s way," and on intersecting grounds he suggests to "join hands with your allies.54 Space is essentially a combination of these types of ground, where all nations are contiguously connected, and yet it consists of a legally recognized area of free movement for all persons and nations. Interestingly, Sun Tzu’s The Art of War, written over 2,000 years ago, advocates indirectly for peaceful human expansion into space, where allied nations proceed forth together while intentionally avoiding negative engagements with potential adversaries. This ancient concept of human cooperation and peaceful coexistence is also consistent with the Department of Defense's (DOD) and intelligence community's (IC) National Security Space Policy55 and the National Space Policy of the United States of America.56 Executive Order (EO) 13914, signed on 6 April 2020, clarifies the position of the US government that while international cooperation in space exploration is essentially mandatory, America "does not view [space] as a global commons,"57 reiterating that the Outer Space Treaty does in fact protect the individual interests of nations in space, including the right to self-defense. The policy further clarifies the intent of the United States to harvest materials from celestial bodies and strengthens the implied relationships with both the international community and the private sector concerning space exploration and related developments.58 By combining these principles, this renewed position on space developments further complements Sun Tzu’s ideas of the strategic battlespace in relation to the space domain moving into the future, regarding space as an area that can be used and exploited by everyone, but acknowledging that claims, defense, and security are also going to be essential factors in the way mankind moves forward in the space domain. In addressing the impact of space exploration, and the subsequent superiority gained by the PRC, the RF, or the US in the process, it is important to recognize the three principle issues of the strategic space environment outlined in these national policies: congestion, contestation, and competitiveness. The US IC is mandated by section 1.1 of EO 12333 to "provide . . . the necessary information on which to base decisions concerning the development and conduct of foreign, defense, and economic policies, and the protection of United States national interests from foreign security threats,"59 which now include threats from space and threats toward US space assets. Congestion, contestation, and competitiveness in space now directly impact the IC's ability to effectively pursue its mandate under EO 12333 and must be addressed collectively to ensure the future national security of the United States on Earth and in space. Enhancing the space industrial base’s ability to innovate and participate in the expansion of humankind into space fosters a unique opportunity to share with, and benefit from, research and development initiatives related to activities in space. Combining private sector and government resources together has the potential to greatly accelerate advancements across a wide range of space assets—including spacecraft developments, zero gravity research, energy production, and weapon applications—all of which will help minimize the risks of congestion, contestation, and competitiveness. Congestion in space refers to objects, including active devices and dangerous debris, filling up the usable orbital paths used for government and commercial purposes, primarily satellites. It also applies to finite amounts of bandwidth and frequencies used for transmissions that are currently being exhausted by demand threatening to exceed supply.60 Congestion will also inherently refer to space traffic once an industry exists that requires transportation between the Earth and the Moon, as well as to physical locations for lunar and Martian resource exploitation facilities and extraction points and places to build and operate on celestial bodies, including the Moon and Mars. This will eventually include a significant focus on the colonization of Mars since large portions of the planet are unsuitable for human habitation due to terrain, radiation, meteoroids, and weather. Short-term intelligence and counterintelligence impacts from the congestion of near-Earth space consist of primarily radio interference, protecting satellites from becoming compromised, effective deployment and concealment of collection platforms, and ensuring the integrity of protected information in transit.

Sharing space in accordance with Sun Tzu’s ancient wisdom does not mean ceding it, and while space debris is the primary factor in congestion, contestation is becoming an issue due to potential adversarial ASATs. Contestation is an anticipated inevitability and one that will grow exponentially as more nations enter space and with further developments and potential use of ASATs, either in war, by accident, or for other reasons. Murphy’s Law applies, even in space. Currently, competitiveness is driving both the potential for contestation as well as the congestion in near-Earth space. Commercial and multi-governmental competition is increasing for space-related research and development, deployment of assets, and physical space for occupation by those assets. Intelligence agencies in many nations, including allies and adversaries of the US, are now advancing the deployment, use, and decision advantages of spaceborne intelligence assets, including space-based surveillance and weapons platforms. Reasserting US superiority over the space environment is vital to the continuation of American leadership on Earth and the effectiveness of IC assurance of national security through space superiority. American leadership in space exploration is the only way to ensure that humanity's expansion into the stars is undertaken with the ideologies of liberty and free-market economics leading the way.

America’s leadership in ingenuity and technological developments, combined with free-market capitalism, has transformed the face of the world for more than two centuries. Its leadership has created the environment necessary to explore game-changing space technologies. These technologies will revolutionize the entire space industry. For example, the Variable Specific Impulse Magnetoplasma Rocket (VASIMR) is an experimental electromagnetic thruster for spacecraft propulsion that will dramatically reduce travel time to Mars and other destinations.61 Commercial spacecraft like the Dream Chaser Cargo System will result in a private sector space travel industry, incentivizing space tourism and, potentially, a space cargo transportation industry. 62 In February 2020, the US Department of Energy announced a $50 million investment in fusion research and development projects across the country.63 One of these is the Plasma Science and Fusion Center at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology with the goal of keeping the United States at the forefront of fusion energy development.64 Another is the Fusion Technology Institute at the University of Wisconsin, which is focusing on advancing research in the field of helium-based fusion power production technologies on Earth.65 This technology will address finite terrestrial energy resources and production of 3He-based electricity from lunar regolith.

These are just a few examples of the future of space technology research and development, and such technologies were all made possible because of the structure of the American free-market system. The biggest challenge for the IC will be to balance President Dwight Eisenhower’s vision with Sun Tzu’s battlefield strategies. Eisenhower understood in 1958 that “through [space] exploration, man hopes to broaden his horizons, add to his knowledge, [and] improve his way of living on earth.”66 Sun Tzu knew that “all warfare is based on deception,” “the highest form of generalship is to balk the enemy's plans,” and the greatest fighters “put themselves beyond the possibility of defeat” to achieve victory.67 American leaders participating in seizing and maintaining US space superiority shoulder this responsibility and must forge a new path forward that enhances human life on Earth, denies the possibility of victory to US adversaries, and ensures the integrity and security of American assets in the space domain as the world moves forward together into the future.

#### Private property rights are key to economic investment in space

Jose A. Martin del **Campo 21**, Research Assistant @ School of Law, Doctor of Law, “Finders Keepers: Who Has Say Over Private Property in Space”, Texas A&M Journal of Property Law (2021) Available at: <https://doi.org/10.37419/JPL.V7.I2.3> //AAli

Current space law is unclear as to whether private entities may claim possession of resources extracted from their endeavors in outer space. The lack of certainty prevents private entities from entirely investing in infrastructure and capabilities to access new deposits of resources due to the depletion of minerals and resources on Earth. The establishment of a new space regime devoid of non-appropriation principles found in international law is necessary to motivate private entities to invest the capital in extracting and transporting space resources back to Earth. This Comment seeks to understand how the current framework of space law impacts the property rights of private entities and their claim to resources in space. The 1967 Outer Space Treaty prohibited the claiming of property by sovereign nations. However, the concept of private entities now having the capability to extract resources from outer space has reignited the issue of property rights in outer space. With resources becoming scarcer or priced out of the market, the solution of mining these resources from celestial bodies has caused a new space race. Past multilateral agreements have dealt with similar discoveries such as the polymetallic nodules on the ocean floor; however, these agreements led to disputes as to ownership and the rights to extract said resources. With little to no support from the industrialized nations, the structure of any new regime must ensure access for the benefit of humankind. The benefit of allowing these private entities the right to claim mined resources must be weighed against potential drawbacks in order to create a framework that balances the interest of the free market with that of the common heritage principle. In determining that a suitable framework fails to guide a new space regime, this Comment proposes that a new governing body comprising a rotation of space-faring and nonspacefaring nations act as a regulatory body for the interest of all of humankind.

I. INTRODUCTION On October 4, 1957, the Space Age officially began when the Soviet Union launched Sputnik into orbit, the first successful, human made satellite.1 A little more than a decade later, on July 20, 1969, American astronauts Neil Armstrong and Edwin “Buzz” Aldrin became the first humans to land and step foot on the moon.2 Neil Armstrong marked the completion of John F. Kenney’s national goal of landing an astronaut on the moon when he radioed back to Earth “[t]hat’s one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.”3 The launch of Sputnik, the moon landing, and other endeavors achieved by the scientific community, kick-started a chain of events leading to the current ambition of exploring outer space and mining resources throughout the solar system. The push for unlocking low-cost space travel and space industrialization by entrepreneurs, like Elon Musk and Jeff Bezos, propels the search for extraterrestrial materials such as water and minerals.4 According to NASA, minerals found in the asteroid belt between Mars and Jupiter contain an estimated value of approximately $100 billion for every person on Earth.5 However, uncertainty lingers because private entities are unsure that they will possess property rights to their payload or the mined celestial body.6 Celestial bodies refer to naturally occurring objects in space. The United States Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee (“COMSTAC”), an advisory body to the Federal Aviation Administration’s (“FAA”) Office of Commercial Space Transportation (“FAA-AST”), has undertaken review regarding the granting of private property licenses.7 COMSTAC expressed a desire to confirm that private entity resource extractions may be owned and utilized as it deems appropriate.8

The current framework of space law is a combination of agreements with the foundation of space law consisting of the 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (“Outer Space Treaty”).9 At the time of signing, the Outer Space Treaty hoped to foster cooperative and peaceful exploration of outer space without discrimination of any kind.10 However, Article II of the Outer Space Treaty contains the bane of private property rights in outer space, which forbids the national appropriation of the moon and other celestial bodies.11 While the Outer Space Treaty explicitly mentions the prohibition of public entities claiming celestial bodies, private enterprises risk failing to have their interest in property rights recognized by the global community. Private entities and investors grapple with the issues pertaining to their rights to mine and extract resources from outer space legally. Without further international recognition of their property rights, private entities may shy away from exploring the concept of celestial mining. The issue of not knowing what laws are applicable, or to whom private companies are accountable, impedes the progress private entities make in achieving their goal of harvesting extraterrestrial resources. Private entities fear that the non-appropriation clause of Article II of the Outer Space Treaty, the epicenter of the issue, will strip them of the right to transport their mined resources back to Earth. A new legal regime will likely need to be formed that facilitates the continuation of innovation and promotes the exploration of outer space. Whether or not past private and public international doctrines, i.e., the law of the sea, may provide guidance in creating a new doctrine of space law is yet to be determined.

The advancement in modern technology, along with the depletion of natural resources, creates a unique opportunity for private entities to resolve this issue through the exploitation of outer space. Space law is once again relevant due to its inadequacies in protecting the property rights of said entities in space. Part II will explore the different treaties and principles that gave rise to space law, and Part III will analyze whether the application of such principles should continue, or if the establishment of a new regime offers a more beneficial long-term solution. Part IV will then explore the structure of a new outer space regime and the enforcement of property rights. II. LEGAL PRINCIPLES INFLUENCING THE DEVELOPMENT OF SPACE LAW As the world continues to transform and evolve, lawmakers across the globe must adapt past laws or develop and ratify new laws to address current events and situations. The venture into outer space is similar to that of famous past explorations in which customary laws guided journeys, providing a framework of starting points for the crafting of the present-age space law. Space law must adapt and evolve as engineers and the science community make discoveries that past generations could only dream about. The United Nations General Assembly (“General Assembly”) maintains the view that “International Law” is not spatially restricted, and that its charter is relevant even in the outer reaches of outer space and to celestial bodies.12 When analogizing to present international treaties, the most applicable set of principles is that of the high seas.13 Based on the principle of res communis, issues arise because there is a lack of precise rules.14 Since the beginning of the space race in 1957, the United Nations facilitated general agreements on how space exploration should be conducted. However, an understanding of past and current laws is necessary to determine how to proceed in recognizing property rights in space for private entities.

A. History of the Current Space Law Framework Space law is the body of law applicable to and involved in governing space-related activities.15 Space law is “associated with the rules, principles, and standards of international law appearing in the five international treaties and five sets of principles governing outer space,” originating under the supervision of the United Nations Organization.16 The foundation of space law, similar to general international law, is composed of matters such as international agreements, treaties, conventions, rules and regulations of international organizations, General Assembly resolutions, national laws, executive and administrative orders, and judicial decisions.17 Following the launch of Sputnik in 1957, the General Assembly created an ad hoc committee concerned with identifying legal issues involving outer space activities.18 The Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (“COPUOS”) was established in 1958 and was made permanent on December 12, 1959.19 COPUOS is intended to endorse peaceful international collaboration and establish the common interest of humankind in outer space.20 It is the preeminent body regarding the formation of international space law, drafting five international treaties and five sets of principles regarding space-related activities.21 Topics covered by the treaties include nonappropriation of outer space by any one country, arms control within space, and the freedom of exploration.22 The primary focus of the treaties being any and all activities performed in outer space be done so to enhance the well-being of humankind and the promotion of international cooperation.23 In 1966, COPUOS proposed the Outer Space Treaty, which was ratified soon after in 1967.24 The Outer Space Treaty forms the bedrock for international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of space and the development of new law.25 The Outer Space Treaty’s principles focus on exploration carried out for the benefit and in the interest of all countries (Art. I), preclusion of sovereign states from appropriating celestial bodies in outer space (Art. II), the performance of activities in outer space in accordance with international law (Art. III), and the prohibition of launching any kinds of objects or armaments into orbit that possess nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction (Art. IV).26 Of importance to this Comment is the language of Article II. Article II does not explicitly mention the property rights of private entities; the failure to do so led to a split regarding whether such rights breach the Outer Space Treaty.27 COPUOS concluded four more treaties following the ratification of the Outer Space Treaty.28 The second treaty was the Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, the Return of Astronauts, and the Return of Objects Launched into Outer Space (“Rescue Agreement”), which entered into force in 1968.29 The Rescue Agreement elaborates on Articles V and VII of the Outer Space Treaty.30 It provides that nations rescue and assist distressed astronauts, which also includes returning them to their launching state.31 Also, states, upon request, are to provide assistance in recovering space objects that re-enter Earth outside of the territory of its proper owner.32 The Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects (“Liability Convention”), the third of the five COPUOS treaties, was under the scrutiny of the Legal Subcommittee of COPUOS for approximately nine years.33 The General Assembly ultimately reached an agreement in 1971, and the Liability Convention entered into force in 1972.34 The Liability Convention expounds on Article VII of the Outer Space Treaty providing “that a launching [s]tate shall be absolutely liable to pay compensation for damage caused by its space objects on the surface of the Earth or to aircraft, and liable for damage due to its faults in space.”35 The Liability Convention possesses the procedures regarding claim settlement for damages.36 The COPUOS Legal Subcommittee drafted the Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space (“Registration Convention”), the fourth treaty, from 1962 until the General Assembly adopted the treaty in 1974.37 The convention entered into force in September 1976.38 This treaty builds upon desires in prior treaties to provide a mechanism to assist identifying space objects.39 The Registration Convention made a request for the Secretary-General to maintain the registration and provide open admittance to the information.40 The fifth and final treaty by COPUOS was the Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (“Moon Agreement”).41 The General Assembly adopted the agreement in 1979; however, the Moon Agreement lacked widespread ratification, with only five countries signing by July 1984.42 The overall purpose of the Moon Agreement was to reinforce the principles highlighted in the provisions of the Outer Space Treaty and their application to the Moon and other celestial bodies.43 The Moon Agreement seeks to encourage peaceful exploration, avoid disruption of celestial environments, and alert the United Nations of the location and purpose of any construction of a station on a celestial body.44 In addition, the Moon and its natural resources are identified as belonging to the common heritage of humankind and, should exploitation of these resources become feasible, an international regime should be created to oversee such progress.45 Since its inception, the Moon Agreement, containing the resource limitation found within the common heritage principle, garnered little support internationally, particularly within the United States.46 With only fourteen signatories, none being spacefaring nations, the Moon Agreement lacks international recognition as law.47 However, the provisions of the Moon Agreement may block the full economic potential and development of space.48 A comprehension of international law aids in understanding the principle of the common heritage of humankind emphasized in the Moon Agreement

#### Primacy solves arms races and great power war – unipolarity is sustainable, and prevents power vacuums and global escalation

Brands 18 [(Hal, Henry Kissinger Distinguished Professor at Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies and a senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments) "American Grand Strategy in the Age of Trump," Page 129-133]

Since World War II, the United States has had a military second to none. Since the Cold War, America has committed to having overwhelming military primacy. The idea, as George W. Bush declared in 2002, that America must possess “strengths beyond challenge” has featured in every major U.S. strategy document for a quarter century; it has also been reflected in concrete terms.6

From the early 1990s, for example, the United States consistently accounted for around 35 to 45 percent of world defense spending and maintained peerless global power-projection capabilities.7 Perhaps more important, U.S. primacy was also unrivaled in key overseas strategic regions—Europe, East Asia, the Middle East. From thrashing Saddam Hussein’s million-man Iraqi military during Operation Desert Storm, to deploying—with impunity—two carrier strike groups off Taiwan during the China-Taiwan crisis of 1995– 96, Washington has been able to project military power superior to anything a regional rival could employ even on its own geopolitical doorstep.

This military dominance has constituted the hard-power backbone of an ambitious global strategy. After the Cold War, U.S. policymakers committed to averting a return to the unstable multipolarity of earlier eras, and to perpetuating the more favorable unipolar order. They committed to building on the successes of the postwar era by further advancing liberal political values and an open international economy, and to suppressing international scourges such as rogue states, nuclear proliferation, and catastrophic terrorism. And because they recognized that military force remained the ultima ratio regum, they understood the centrality of military preponderance.

Washington would need the military power necessary to underwrite worldwide alliance commitments. It would have to preserve substantial overmatch versus any potential great-power rival. It must be able to answer the sharpest challenges to the international system, such as Saddam’s invasion of Kuwait in 1990 or jihadist extremism after 9/11. Finally, because prevailing global norms generally reflect hard-power realities, America would need the superiority to assure that its own values remained ascendant. It was impolitic to say that U.S. strategy and the international order required “strengths beyond challenge,” but it was not at all inaccurate.

American primacy, moreover, was eminently affordable. At the height of the Cold War, the United States spent over 12 percent of GDP on defense. Since the mid-1990s, the number has usually been between 3 and 4 percent.8 In a historically favorable international environment, Washington could enjoy primacy—and its geopolitical fruits—on the cheap.

Yet U.S. strategy also heeded, at least until recently, the fact that there was a limit to how cheaply that primacy could be had. The American military did shrink significantly during the 1990s, but U.S. officials understood that if Washington cut back too far, its primacy would erode to a point where it ceased to deliver its geopolitical benefits. Alliances would lose credibility; the stability of key regions would be eroded; rivals would be emboldened; international crises would go unaddressed. American primacy was thus like a reasonably priced insurance policy. It required nontrivial expenditures, but protected against far costlier outcomes.9 Washington paid its insurance premiums for two decades after the Cold War. But more recently American primacy and strategic solvency have been imperiled.

THE DARKENING HORIZON For most of the post–Cold War era, the international system was— by historical standards—remarkably benign. Dangers existed, and as the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, demonstrated, they could manifest with horrific effect. But for two decades after the Soviet collapse, the world was characterized by remarkably low levels of great-power competition, high levels of security in key theaters such as Europe and East Asia, and the comparative weakness of those “rogue” actors—Iran, Iraq, North Korea, al-Qaeda—who most aggressively challenged American power. During the 1990s, some observers even spoke of a “strategic pause,” the idea being that the end of the Cold War had afforded the United States a respite from normal levels of geopolitical danger and competition. Now, however, the strategic horizon is darkening, due to four factors.

First, great-power military competition is back. The world’s two leading authoritarian powers—China and Russia—are seeking regional hegemony, contesting global norms such as nonaggression and freedom of navigation, and developing the military punch to underwrite these ambitions. Notwithstanding severe economic and demographic problems, Russia has conducted a major military modernization emphasizing nuclear weapons, high-end conventional capabilities, and rapid-deployment and special operations forces— and utilized many of these capabilities in conflicts in Ukraine and Syria.10 China, meanwhile, has carried out a buildup of historic proportions, with constant-dollar defense outlays rising from US$26 billion in 1995 to US$226 billion in 2016.11 Ominously, these expenditures have funded development of power-projection and antiaccess/area denial (A2/AD) tools necessary to threaten China’s neighbors and complicate U.S. intervention on their behalf. Washington has grown accustomed to having a generational military lead; Russian and Chinese modernization efforts are now creating a far more competitive environment.

### Case

#### Extinction comes first – it’s the worst of all evils

Baum and Barrett 18 - Seth D. Baum & Anthony M. Barrett, Global Catastrophic Risk Institute. 2018. “Global Catastrophes: The Most Extreme Risks.” Risk in Extreme Environments: Preparing, Avoiding, Mitigating, and Managing, edited by Vicki Bier, Routledge, pp. 174–184.

What Is GCR And Why Is It Important? Taken literally, a global catastrophe can be any event that is in some way catastrophic across the globe. This suggests a rather low threshold for what counts as a global catastrophe. An event causing just one death on each continent (say, from a jet-setting assassin) could rate as a global catastrophe, because surely these deaths would be catastrophic for the deceased and their loved ones. However, in common usage, a global catastrophe would be catastrophic for a significant portion of the globe. Minimum thresholds have variously been set around ten thousand to ten million deaths or $10 billion to $10 trillion in damages (Bostrom and Ćirković 2008), or death of one quarter of the human population (Atkinson 1999; Hempsell 2004). Others have emphasized catastrophes that cause long-term declines in the trajectory of human civilization (Beckstead 2013), that human civilization does not recover from (Maher and Baum 2013), that drastically reduce humanity’s potential for future achievements (Bostrom 2002, using the term “existential risk”), or that result in human extinction (Matheny 2007; Posner 2004). A common theme across all these treatments of GCR is that some catastrophes are vastly more important than others. Carl Sagan was perhaps the first to recognize this, in his commentary on nuclear winter (Sagan 1983). Without nuclear winter, a global nuclear war might kill several hundred million people. This is obviously a major catastrophe, but humanity would presumably carry on. However, with nuclear winter, per Sagan, humanity could go extinct. The loss would be not just an additional four billion or so deaths, but the loss of all future generations. To paraphrase Sagan, the loss would be billions and billions of lives, or even more. Sagan estimated 500 trillion lives, assuming humanity would continue for ten million more years, which he cited as typical for a successful species. Sagan’s 500 trillion number may even be an underestimate. The analysis here takes an adventurous turn, hinging on the evolution of the human species and the long-term fate of the universe. On these long time scales, the descendants of contemporary humans may no longer be recognizably “human”. The issue then is whether the descendants are still worth caring about, whatever they are. If they are, then it begs the question of how many of them there will be. Barring major global catastrophe, Earth will remain habitable for about one billion more years 2 until the Sun gets too warm and large. The rest of the Solar System, Milky Way galaxy, universe, and (if it exists) the multiverse will remain habitable for a lot longer than that (Adams and Laughlin 1997), should our descendants gain the capacity to migrate there. An open question in astronomy is whether it is possible for the descendants of humanity to continue living for an infinite length of time or instead merely an astronomically large but finite length of time (see e.g. Ćirković 2002; Kaku 2005). Either way, the stakes with global catastrophes could be much larger than the loss of 500 trillion lives. Debates about the infinite vs. the merely astronomical are of theoretical interest (Ng 1991; Bossert et al. 2007), but they have limited practical significance. This can be seen when evaluating GCRs from a standard risk-equals-probability-times-magnitude framework. Using Sagan’s 500 trillion lives estimate, it follows that reducing the probability of global catastrophe by a mere one-in-500-trillion chance is of the same significance as saving one human life. Phrased differently, society should try 500 trillion times harder to prevent a global catastrophe than it should to save a person’s life. Or, preventing one million deaths is equivalent to a one-in500-million reduction in the probability of global catastrophe. This suggests society should make extremely large investment in GCR reduction, at the expense of virtually all other objectives. Judge and legal scholar Richard Posner made a similar point in monetary terms (Posner 2004). Posner used $50,000 as the value of a statistical human life (VSL) and 12 billion humans as the total loss of life (double the 2004 world population); he describes both figures as significant underestimates. Multiplying them gives $600 trillion as an underestimate of the value of preventing global catastrophe. For comparison, the United States government typically uses a VSL of around one to ten million dollars (Robinson 2007). Multiplying a $10 million VSL with 500 trillion lives gives $5x1021 as the value of preventing global catastrophe. But even using “just" $600 trillion, society should be willing to spend at least that much to prevent a global catastrophe, which converts to being willing to spend at least $1 million for a one-in-500-million reduction in the probability of global catastrophe. Thus while reasonable disagreement exists on how large of a VSL to use and how much to count future generations, even low-end positions suggest vast resource allocations should be redirected to reducing GCR. This conclusion is only strengthened when considering the astronomical size of the stakes, but the same point holds either way. The bottom line is that, as long as something along the lines of the standard riskequals-probability-times-magnitude framework is being used, then even tiny GCR reductions merit significant effort. This point holds especially strongly for risks of catastrophes that would cause permanent harm to global human civilization. The discussion thus far has assumed that all human lives are valued equally. This assumption is not universally held. People often value some people more than others, favoring themselves, their family and friends, their compatriots, their generation, or others whom they identify with. Great debates rage on across moral philosophy, economics, and other fields about how much people should value others who are distant in space, time, or social relation, as well as the unborn members of future generations. This debate is crucial for all valuations of risk, including GCR. Indeed, if each of us only cares about our immediate selves, then global catastrophes may not be especially important, and we probably have better things to do with our time than worry about them. While everyone has the right to their own views and feelings, we find that the strongest arguments are for the widely held position that all human lives should be valued equally.

#### Low risk of collisions – it’s overhyped

Albrecht 16 [Mark Albrecht, chairman of the board of USSpace LLC, head of the White House National Space Council from 1989 to 1992, and Paul Graziani, CEO and founder of Analytical Graphics, a company that develops software and provides mission assurance through the Commercial Space Operations Center (ComSpOC), Congested space is a serious problem solved by hard work, not hysteria, 2016, https://spacenews.com/op-ed-congested-space-is-a-serious-problem-solved-by-hard-work-not-hysteria/]

Popular culture has embraced the risks of collisions in space in films like Gravity. Some participants have dramatized the issue by producing graphics of Earth and its satellites, which make our planet look like a fuzzy marble, almost obscured by a dense cloud of white pellets meant to conceptualize space congestion.

Unfortunately, for the sake of a good visual, satellites are depicted as if they were hundreds of miles wide, like the state of Pennsylvania (for the record, there are no space objects the size of Pennsylvania in orbit). Unfortunately, this is the rule, not the exception, and almost all of these articles, movies, graphics, and simulations are exaggerated and misleading. Space debris and collision risk is real, but it certainly is not a crisis.

So what are the facts?

On the positive side, space is empty and it is vast. At the altitude of the International Space Station, one half a degree of Earth longitude is almost 40 miles long. That same one half a degree at geostationary orbit, some 22,000 miles up is over 230 miles long. Generally, we don’t intentionally put satellites closer together than one-half degree. That means at geostationary orbit, they are no closer than 11 times as far as the eye can see on flat ground or on the sea: That’s the horizon over the horizon 10 times over. In addition, other than minute forces like solar winds and sparse bits of atmosphere that still exist 500 miles up, nothing gets in the way of orbiting objects and they behave quite predictably. The location of the smallest spacecraft can be predicated within a 1,000 feet, 24 hours in advance.

#### Asteroid mining fails- it’s too costly

Fickling 20 [(David, Bloomberg opinion columnist, previously at Guardian and Financial Times, MA in Eng Lit from Cambridge) “We’re Never Going to Mine the Asteroid Belt,” Bloomberg Opinion, December 21, 2020, <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2020-12-21/space-mining-on-asteroids-is-never-going-to-happen>] TDI

It’s wonderful that people are shooting for the stars — but those who declined to fund the expansive plans of the nascent space mining industry were right about the fundamentals. Space mining won’t get off the ground in any foreseeable future — and you only have to look at the history of civilization to see why. One factor rules out most space mining at the outset: gravity. On one hand, it guarantees that most of the solar system’s best mineral resources are to be found under our feet. Earth is the largest rocky planet orbiting the sun. As a result, the cornucopia of minerals the globe attracted as it coalesced is as rich as will be found this side of Alpha Centauri. Gravity poses a more technical problem, too. Escaping Earth’s gravitational field makes transporting the volumes of material needed in a mining operation hugely expensive. On Falcon Heavy, the large rocket being developed by Elon Musk’s SpaceX, transporting a payload to the orbit of Mars comes to as little as [$5,357 per kilogram](https://www.spacex.com/media/Capabilities&Services.pdf) — a drastic reduction in normal launch costs. Still, at those prices just lofting a single half-ton drilling rig to the asteroid belt would use up the annual exploration budget of a small mining company. Power is another issue. The international space station, with 35,000 square feet of solar arrays, generates up to 120 kilowatts of electricity. That drill would need a [similar-sized power plant](https://www.rocktechnology.sandvik/en/products/exploration-drill-rigs-and-tools/compact-core-drill-rigs/) — and most mining companies operate multiple rigs at a time. Power demands rise drastically once you move from exploration drilling to mining and processing. Bringing material back to Earth would raise the costs even more. Japan’s Hayabusa2 satellite spent six years and 16.4 billion yen ($157 million) recovering a single gram of material from the asteroid Ryugu and returning it to Earth earlier this month.

#### Public Sector thumps-

Voosen 21 [(Paul Voosen, 5-5-2021), "NASA's new fleet of satellites will offer insights into the wild cards of climate change," Science, <https://www.science.org/content/article/nasas-new-fleet-satellites-will-offer-insights-wild-cards-climate-change>] ZS

NASA is about to announce its next generation of Earth-observing satellites. As soon as this month, it will lay out preliminary plans for a multibillion-dollar set of missions that will launch later this decade. This "Earth system observatory," as NASA calls it, will offer insights into two long-standing wild cards of climate change—clouds and aerosols—while providing new details about the temperatures and chemistry of the planet's changing surface. The satellite fleets also mark a revival for NASA's earth science, which has languished over the past decade compared with exploration of Mars and other planets. Although officials have been planning the missions for several years, the Biden administration is accelerating them as part of its focus on addressing climate change. "Earth system science is poised to make an enormous difference in our ability to mitigate, adapt to, and plan for changes we're seeing," says Karen St. Germain, director of NASA's earth science division. "The pace we're going to have to do that is much higher in the decade in front of us than the decade behind us." Agency spokespeople declined to provide details about the missions because they have not yet been formally approved. But at a workshop last month, Charles Webb, an associate director for flight programs at NASA, said four missions would go ahead, launching as soon as 2028—an acceleration of plans under the Trump administration, when only two missions were scheduled to begin development. "It became pretty clear the greatest science return is having all of these in operation close to each other," Webb said. The missions lack official names, but go by the shorthand of ACCP (Aerosol, Cloud, Convection, and Precipitation), which covers two missions; Surface Biology and Geology (SBG), and Mass Change , which would measure tiny variations in gravity indicating changes in ice and water. The administration's proposed 15% bump for NASA's earth science budget for next year, to $2.3 billion, would help fund the accelerated program. The increase would also be welcome news for NASA's earth science researchers after 2 decades operating under administrations leery of climate. Jeremy Werdell of NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center recalls multiple attempts by the Trump administration to kill Pace, a $900 million ocean-monitoring satellite for which he is principal investigator. "You'd see the chart with all the upcoming missions, and you'd see yours isn't there." (The mission survived and is due to launch in 2023.) However, even President Joe Biden's proposed investment would leave NASA's inflation-adjusted spending on earth science below the levels 20 years ago, says Waleed Abdalati, director of the Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences at the University of Colorado, Boulder, and former NASA chief scientist. "We're well behind where we were."

#### Squo debris thumps- Their own card says that the kessler effect would happen regardless of the aff because they aren’t removing any debris.

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

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

#### Alliances check miscalc – too costly

MacDonald 13 [(Bruce, teaches at the United States Institute of Peace on strategic posture and space/cyber security issues, leads a study on China and Crisis Stability in Space, and is adjunct professor at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies) “Deterrence and Crisis Stability in Space and Cyberspace,” in Anti-satellite Weapons, Deterrence and Sino-American Space Relations, September 2013, <https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a587431.pdf>] TDI

The US alliance structure can promote deterrence and crisis stability in space, as with nuclear deterrence. China has no such alliance system. If China were to engage in large-scale offensive counter-space operations, it would face not only the United States, but also NATO, Japan, South Korea and other highly aggrieved parties. Given Beijing’s major export dependence on these markets, and its dependence upon them for key raw material and high technology imports, China would be as devastated economically if it initiated strategic attacks in space. In contrast to America’s nuclear umbrella and extended deterrence, US allies make a tangible and concrete contribution to extended space deterrence through their multilateral participation in and dependence upon space assets. Attacks on these space assets would directly damage allied interests as well as those of the United States, further strengthening deterrent effects.

#### Space colonization impossible- deadly conditions, mental health issues, and costs- Spencer ’17 literally only talks about mars, this card takes out their entire 2nd advantage because they have no link

Teller 15 {(Danielle Teller, 2015) "It’s completely ridiculous to think that humans could live on Mars," Quartz, <https://qz.com/536483/why-its-compeltely-ridiculous-to-think-that-humans-could-live-on-mars/>} ZS

Mars has almost no surface water; a toxic atmosphere that is too thin for humans to survive without pressure suits; deadly solar radiation; temperatures lower than Antarctica; and few to none of the natural resources that have been critical to human success on Earth. Smart people have proposed solutions for those pesky environmental issues, some of which are seriously sci-fi, like melting the polar ice caps with nuclear bombs. But those aren’t even the real problems. The real problems have to do with human nature and economics. First, we live on a planet that is perfect for us, and we seem to be unable to prevent ourselves from making it less and less habitable. We’re like a bunch of teenagers destroying our parents’ mansion in one long, crazy party, figuring that our backup plan is to run into the forest and build our own house. We’ll worry about how to get food and a good sound system later. Proponents of Mars colonization talk about “terraforming” Mars to make it more like Earth, but in the meantime, we’re “marsforming” Earth by making our atmosphere poisonous and annihilating our natural resources. We are also well on our way to making Earth one big desert, just like Mars. Maybe a silver lining is that we have already proven ourselves capable of one aspect of terraforming Mars—heating up the planet. We have been warming Earth at a good clip by dumping enormous amounts of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. On the other hand, the atmosphere of Mars is already 95% carbon dioxide, and despite centuries of vigorous efforts to deforest our planet and burn all of the fossil fuel we can lay our hands on, humans have raised carbon dioxide levels by a paltry 0.01% on Earth. It may be enough to cook us all to death, but staging a second industrial revolution on Mars—or exploding a few nuclear bombs (we’ve tried that here)—probably won’t raise those chilly temperatures much. A second problem presented by human nature is that we don’t enjoy prolonged periods of extreme duress, and we don’t function particularly well under those conditions. It seems romantic to grow potatoes in a “hab” on Mars, but when you look at harsh environments on Earth, a different picture emerges. Antarctica has the closest temperatures to the red planet, an average of -56°F (-49°C) compared to an average of -67°F (-55°C) on Mars. Despite having a completely breathable atmosphere and plenty of fresh water, Antarctica has no permanent residents. Nobody wants to live there. Scientists who work at Antarctic bases suffer from a mental health disorder called Winter-Over syndrome, characterized by symptoms such as depression, irritability, aggressive behavior, insomnia, memory deficits, and the occurrence of mild fugue states known as the “antarctic stare.” Since it must be a bit like living with a colony of zombies, it’s no wonder that they want to stay drunk all winter (pdf). Living on Mars would be way, way more miserable than living in Antarctica. Imagine how much more expensive it would be to stay drunk for your entire life on Mars. This brings us to the economic problem with colonizing Mars. It is extraordinarily expensive to ship goods to Mars, and at least right now, Mars has nothing to offer in return. There are no cod, no beavers to make hats from, no gold, no forests, none of the treasures that drew Europeans to colonize new continents. The wealth required to fund the colonies would need to come exclusively from here. We haven’t even colonized the Sahara desert, the bottom of the oceans or the moon, because it makes no economic sense. It would be far, far easier and cheaper to “terraform” the deserts on our own planet than to terraform Mars. Yet we can’t afford it. What makes us think that we could afford to colonize a barren rock 250 million miles (402 million km) away after we have used up all of our local resources? Astro spends his days evaluating audacious ideas at X, Alphabet’s (formerly Google’s) “moonshot factory.” About six months ago, an ex-DARPA (Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency) program manager pitched a moonshot proposal: he wanted to set up a permanent manned colony on Mars. Astro suggested that for the amount of money and creativity necessary to set up a colony on Mars, we could help thousands of times as many people here on Earth. Sadly, this scientist wasn’t interested in projects on Earth. He said that he was a “space cadet,” and that nothing that didn’t have to do with space exploration interested him. There is nothing wrong with being excited about exploring space. There’s nothing wrong with dreaming about setting up colonies in space either. But a colony on Mars would need to be a nearly perfectly self-contained, resource neutral system that harvests energy from the sun and is rarely or never re-supplied. That is currently beyond the reach of science and human ingenuity. Yet we are hurtling through a vast emptiness right now on a giant space station, and we won’t survive unless we learn to live in a resource neutral way. Our space station is way less boring than Mars—it is teeming with fascinating life forms and covered with mind-blowing geographic features. It even comes equipped with snacks that aren’t freeze-dried. The problems our space station faces aren’t boring either. To quote Mark Watney from The Martian, to avoid catastrophe, we’re going to have to science the shit out of this. Maybe if we got excited enough to treat Earth as though it were Mars, some of the energy currently pointed towards the stars could be repurposed to doing something even more audacious—ensure that the space station we already have can take us into the next millennium.

#### Statistical evidence shows the capitalism ends poverty- means that neoliberalism is good.

Jesse Hathaway 18, 10/28/2018, "Want to end poverty? Promote capitalism, not socialism," <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/op-eds/want-to-end-poverty-promote-capitalism-not-socialism>, MarshTop of Form

In 1981, 44 percent of the world's population was classified as living in “extreme poverty,” which means earning $1.90 per day or less in wages, according to the World Bank. As of 2013, that number had declined to just 10.7 percent. This was the direct result of the transition by many large countries — including China, India, and Russia — to largely free-market economies and away from socialism.

Unfortunately, many countries, including the United States, cling to suboptimal big-government policies and to policies that subject market forces to political considerations. This is known as "crony capitalism." But although flawed, this is still far better than a full-fledged socialist system, which would cause poverty to skyrocket.

If people truly want to end poverty — and they should — they should choose the only proven way to do that, instead of endorsing pie-in-the-sky fantasies and long-discredited ideologies. Big government wealth redistribution policies are a main cause of poverty. People who create and innovate, including the bright minds behind drawing readers and advertisers to Teen Vogue, should be celebrated for providing goods and services that people want.

To end poverty, government needs to get out of the way of the people, and let the magic of the free market work, as it has every single time it’s been allowed to do so.