### 1NC—CP

#### CP: States ought to adopt a binding international agreement that bans the appropriation of outer space by private entities by establishing outer space as a global commons subject to regulatory delimiting and global liability except for the appropriation of lunar heritage sites in the Sea of Tranquility by helium-3 mining.

#### Uncertainty kills investment in He-3 mining.

Bilder 09 “A Legal Regime for the Mining of Helium-3 on the Moon: U.S. Policy Options” Richard B. Bilder [Foley & Lardner-Bascom Emeritus Professor of Law, University of Wisconsin Law School.] 10/8/2009 <https://media.law.wisc.edu/m/wndnj/bilder1489273mining_helium-3ftns.pdf> SM

B. Should the U.S. Attempt to Establish an International Lunar Resource Regime Outside of the Framework of the Present Moon Agreement? While I have suggested that there are now good arguments for the U.S. – preferably, collectively with other space powers – to ratify and accede to the Moon Agreement under arrangements which would ensure that the legal regime established pursuant to Article 11 fully met U.S. requirements, the fact remains that such ratification by the U.S. may not currently be politically attainable. As was the case when the Agreement was first presented to the Senate subcommittee in 1980, influential and respected individuals and groups in the U.S. continue to strongly oppose U.S. ratification, remaining convinced that the Agreement’s fundamental cast – especially, its provisions characterizing lunar resources as the “common heritage of mankind” and mandating the establishment of an “international regime” – will in practice inhibit the productive development and exploitation of He-3 and other lunar resources, and, in particular, create such uncertainty for private enterprise as to effectively discourage, if not prevent, private investment and industry from playing any meaningful role in the exploitation of such resources – a role they believe essential to the successful commercial development of such resources.61 It may be argued that, given the risks and uncertainty necessarily involved in the development of lunar He-3-based fusion energy, the enormous investment certainly required, and the likely very long time horizon before any financial return can hope to be achieved, the prospect of private enterprises choosing to play a leading role in He-3 or other lunar resource development – at least without substantial government assistance – is open to question.62 However, the 1980 Senate Hearings and subsequent lack of administration interest in the Agreement suggest that, if such opposition persists, the prospect for Senate ratification of the Agreement at any time soon may remain uncertain.

#### Mining on heritage sites lets us skip in the research project with human-obtained samples – that’s preferable to generic sites.

Glass 92 “Lunar Site Characterization and Mining” Charles E. Glass [registered professional geological engineer in the State of Arizona, this is from a NASA edited paper] 1992 <https://space.nss.org/settlement/nasa/spaceresvol3/lscam1.htm> SM

Before resources are committed to lunar mining, a significant amount of information will be needed. I hope that our workshop group will illuminate some of the more obscure areas, such as the specific requirements of an ore processing facility. Other important information can be acquired only through onsite exploration and testing.

Potential lunar mining sites can be divided into two general groups- generic sites and Apollo sites. Geologic data for both types of site are sparse and of poor spatial resolution

Generic sites have not been visited. They are potential mine sites only because they are in lunar regions with mineralogic properties that are generally understood by comparison of remotely sensed data with data from analysis of Apollo site samples; e.g., mare sites, highland sites, or transition sites. See figure 15. Generic sites will require exploration at a variety of scales.

Initial exploration using a satellite in lunar orbit will allow regional exploration of many generic sites. Polar sites, if suitable ones can be identified, have several advantages for a mining operation. First, the continuous solar radiation at the poles would enable continuous mining o perations under stable temperature and lighting conditions. (See figure 16.) Such an environment would eliminate the stress on mining equipment and personnel caused by the alternation of 2-week lunar nights and days at other sites. Second, the high thermal gradients encountered at the poles due to low Sun angles could help provide cryogenic storage for processing gases and product gases. Third, the potential occurrence of water frozen in the perpetually shadowed areas of the poles is an incentive for exploring polar sites.

Exploration of generic sites at intermediate scales is required to bridge the gap between the low- resolution remote sensing data and the more intensive measurements made by human beings. This intermediate-scale exploration could be done by automated rovers, which should be able to cover relatively large areas rather rapidly.

The automated nature of lunar exploration will demand advances in high-resolution sensing and in computer processing and integration of data acquired by different instruments on the same roving vehicle. Knowledge gained from terrestrial mineral exploration can be used for preliminary training of automated interpretation systems, but the unique conditions of the lunar environment will likely require an intelligent computer- vision system capable of "learning" and adjusting as new data become available.

[Images omitted]

Completion of these exploration programs should bring our knowledge of generic sites up to that of the Apollo sites, the second general category. Regional exploration is not deemed necessary for the Apollo sites because of the relatively extensive body of knowledge already assembled. However, detailed site investigations to obtain specific parameters for mine design will be required for the first mining attempt.

In outlining these exploration requirements, our workshop group made several assumptions. First, we assumed that the prototype lunar mining venture should be an unqualified success. Second, we assumed that the startup product would be liquid oxygen, with the subsequent addition of such byproducts as metals for structural use, ceramics, and bulk materials for shielding. Third, we assumed that the mining operation wou[a excavate lunar regolith and deliver a well-graded feedstock to the processing facility. (No crushing is required, with oversized material being removed mechanically.)

Specific Parameters for Mine Design

The final stage of the exploration program-to acquire specific parameters for mine design-will begin only after a chosen site has been as thoroughly explored as an Apollo site. Even for the Apollo sites, information is insufficient to assure the success of our first lunar mine. Factors that affect mining include mineralogy, grain size distribution, abrasiveness, depth of loosely compacted regolith, and surface topography. How these factors vary from place to place is not well understood. The Apollo missions were never intended to be resource appraisals. Nevertheless, a restudy of Apollo samples and survey data with an eye toward resource appraisal would be a promising first step toward obtaining the needed site detail.

#### Tranquility mining is key – it has the highest known density of He-3.

O’Reilly 16 LUNAR EXPLORATION FOR HE-3 Bryan O’Reilly The Ohio State University 2016 <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/159567253.pdf> SM

* Mare Tranquillitatis = science word for Sea of Tranquility

Schmitt (2006) summarized initial research on the exploration for lunar He-3 that identified potential areas of high He-3 concentration. Mare Tranquillitatis, for example, is considered a particularly attractive site for a manned lunar base and the mining of lunar He-3. This site also holds Fe, Ti, and other minerals important for cost-effective, on-site production of construction materials and O2 from mineralized oxygen. In siting a manned lunar base, water may be extracted atomically bound OH- and lunar ice, and other issues that need to be addressed in choosing a manned lunar base.

The present research study further tests the recommended locations (e.g. Mare Tranquillitatis) of high He-3 concentrations. In particular, the utility of satellite-based Gamma Ray Spectrometers (GRS) is investigated to indirectly map He-3 abundances in terms of the surficial abundances of gamma-radiating elements like titanium, oxygen and iron that reflect distributions of lunar ilmenite (e.g., Hasebe et al., 2008). In addition, satellite microwave measurements may be used to estimate regolith thickness, maturity, and dielectric constants to help map out He-3 concentrations and other lunar mineral deposits (Wang, 2010).

Satellite remote sensing data from past lunar missions are used to estimate TiO2 and hydrogen concentrations, and the solar wind flux over the crust to identify lunar He-3 prospects. These results may help constrain the fiscal and technological viability of mining lunar He-3.

Current uses of helium-3 far outpace its supply and production on Earth. This shortage is detrimental to areas ranging from national security to important physics and medical research. The growing decrease of He-3 stores also drastically limits efforts to make He-3-D fusion a realistic energy source. However, the growing demand may well be satisfied with the He-3 concentrations hosted within the regolith of our closest celestial neighbor, the Moon. Indeed, the mining of He-3 on the Moon is an imminent, if not the next, giant leap for space exploration (Schmitt, 2006).

Elements of this research were presented at the fall’15 Undergraduate Student Poster Forum and the spring’16 Denman Undergraduate Research Forum of The Ohio State University. Further aspects of this research were presented at the annual conferences of the Geologic Society of America (O’Reilly and von Frese, 2015) and NASA’s Lunar and Planetary Institute (O’Reilly and von Frese, 2016).

METHODS

National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) data collection

The elemental abundance data for this research were collected from NASA’s publicly available Planetary Data System (PDS) Geoscience Node. Specifically, the data were observed by the Lunar Prospector (LP) mission’s gamma ray and neutron spectrometer tools and processed by the LP Spectrometer Team as part of a NASA Lunar Data Analysis Program. Elemental abundances of Ti were derived from LP gamma ray spectrometer (Feldman et al., 1999) observations acquired during the high-altitude portion of the LP mission. For the Ti distribution, the data are given in units of elemental weight percent (Prettyman et al., 2002). The half-degree hydrogen abundances came from the LP neutron spectrometer epithermal neutron data that had been corrected by the thermal neutron data (Feldman et al., 2001). Equations 3 and 4 of Feldman et al. (2001) show how the corrected epithermal data were converted into hydrogen abundances as parts per million (ppm). Note, however, that these abundances can be unreliable in regions of high thorium and rare-Earth element abundances (Maurice et al., 2004).

In general, using the above method yields an average ±1.7 wt% uncertainty in the TiO2 estimates (Elphic et al., 2002). Estimates from areas with higher levels of TiO2 are considered to be more reliable than those from lower TiO2 areas. Uncertainties in H estimates are typically less than 1% over latitudes ±70° and increase significantly towards the poles (Feldman et al., 2001). Estimates of H taken from large lunar craters in the South Pole showed uncertainties averaging around 50% (Feldman et al., 2001).

Modeling

The raw elemental abundance data were converted from the original ASCII files to Microsoft Excel through the “paste special” tool for import into MATLAB. Once imported, the data were processed by the scripts in Appendix A to produce various lunar abundance maps. The script in Figure A1 produces contour maps of the elemental data on the lunar near and far sides using the M\_Map MATLAB mapping package (Pawlowicz 2014). This script uses the sinusoidal map projection to produce equal-area representations of the abundance data.

The script in Figure A2 produces stereographic projections of abundances in the lunar polar regions. Equation 1 (Fa and Ya-Qiu, 2007) was used to estimate crustal exposure to solar wind flux as a percentage in terms of lunar longitude (θ) and latitude (Φ) in degrees, and the constant flux (F0) at a subsolar point. Here, f represents the amount of time the lunar surface is fully shielded from solar winds by Earth’s magnetotail in the span of 28 days (one orbital period). To produce the normalized solar wind flux, the model assumed F0 = 0.5, and f = 0.25 based on the amount of time the moon is in the magnetotail. Equation 1 was implemented by the MATLAB script in Figure A3 to produce a contour map (Figure 2) of the lunar near and far side exposures in percent of the maximum solar wind flux over a single lunar orbital period. These maps in the sinusoidal map projection were obtained using the previously cited M\_map mapping package.
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RESULTS

Solar Flux

Figure 2 shows that the Moon’s orbit around Earth largely affects the intensity of solar exposure on its surface, with the near side receiving significantly lower exposure than the far side. This is due to Earth’s magnetosphere which, during a full Moon when the near side is facing the Sun, rests within Earth’s magnetotail shielded from solar radiation.

[Figure omitted] Figure 2. Solar flux as a percent of solar wind flux exposure per lunar cycle for the near (top) and far (bottom) sides of the lunar surface between 65°S - 65°N.

Titanium Distribution

The distribution of Ti correlates with large impact events (Schmitt, 2006), and thus the highest Ti concentrations are within the maria of the lunar near side (Figure 3). Mare Tranquillitatis, in particular, appears to have the highest overall concentration. On the moon, Ti occurs as the mineral ilmenite (FeTiO3) with the crystal structure that locks in the small He-3 atoms. The blank strip surrounding 180°E in Figure 3 reflects a no-data area due to lack of orbital coverage by the satellite (Feldman et al., 1999).

Diurnal Heating

Areas within ±60 ̊ latitudes experience large average daily temperature shifts. The Apollo 15 site (26.13224 N, 3.63400 E), for example, underwent a shift from 374 ̊K to 92 ̊K (Heiken et al., 1991). The areas around the poles typically stay within 10 ̊ of 115 ̊K with even smaller variations in permanently shadowed craters (Vasavada et al., 1999). Volatiles are essentially baked out of the regolith when subjected to these extreme temperature changes (Cocks, 2010).

Polar Migration

After volatiles are released from the lunar regolith, they are either redeposited on the lunar surface or released into space (Cocks 2010). Figure 4 shows the increase of hydrogen around the poles compared to lower longitudes. This measurable increase is attributed to permanently shadowed craters, which prevent massive temperature fluctuations and provide shielding from micrometeoroids. The blank strips surrounding 180°E in Figure 4 reflect areas with no data due to lack of orbital coverage by the satellite (Feldman et al., 1999).
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[Figure omitted] Figure 3. Weight percent Ti distribution for the near (top) and far (bottom) sides of the lunar surface from 65°S - 65°N. Mare Tranquillitatis is highlighted (8.5°N, 31.4°E) as an area of high Ti. Map statistics include the amplitude range (AR) of (max, min) values, amplitude standard deviation (ASD), amplitude mean (AM), and contour interval (CI) in weight %.
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[Figure omitted] Figure 4. Volatile hydrogen concentrations in ppm for the lunar north pole (top left) from 90°N - 65°N, south pole (top right) from 90°S - 65°S, and the far side (bottom) from 90°W - 90°E and from 65°S - 65°N of the lunar surface. Map statistics include amplitude range (AR) of (max, min) values, amplitude standard deviation (ASD), amplitude mean (AM), and contour interval (CI) in ppm.

DISCUSSION

The data above contain implications for the search for large concentrations of He-3. The only method for deposition of He-3 is through exposure of the regolith to solar radiation carrying the isotope. Figure 5 shows the geometry of the Moon’s exposure to solar radiation over a single orbital period (28 days). Accordingly, most of this exposure occurs on the far side of the Moon when it is between the Sun and Earth outside the magnetosphere.

In general, the areas of high solar exposure are also subject to extreme diurnal

[Figure omitted] Figure 5. A 2-D geometric rendering of the relationship between the Sun (orange), Earth (large circle), and the moon (small circle) throughout a lunar orbital period. The moon is positioned outside the magnetosphere (green dashed line) during a new moon exposing the far side (light blue). The moon is positioned inside the protective magnetotail (red dashed line) during a full moon preventing exposure of the near side (dark blue).

temperature fluctuations. During the lunar orbital period, these drastic temperature changes will occur due to the prolonged exposure or protection from solar radiation causing the deposited volatiles to leave the regolith and possibly be re-ionized and –deposited onto the lunar surface (Cocks, 2010). This implies that many of the volatiles initially deposited by solar wind exposure do not remain stably in place. The distribution of hydrogen measured in Figure 4 suggests that the volatiles in general may be concentrated around the poles.

Much like hydrogen, He-3 is also deposited in the regolith through solar wind. However, exposing these elements to extreme temperature shifts causes them to vaporize and leave the lunar surface. Some of these volatiles are re-ionized due to subsequent solar wind exposure and possibly deposited again near the poles where they are better protected from temperature changes (Cocks, 2010). This mechanism could help explain the larger polar accumulations of volatiles.

The lunar polar regions offer protection from extreme temperature variations, which also may be provided by the presence of permanently shadowed craters. These craters not only protect volatiles from vaporizing out of the regolith, but they also shield the regolith from micrometeorite impacts that disturb the surface encouraging the further release of volatiles. These polar regions are estimated by the Lunar Prospector team (Schmitt, 2000) to contain roughly 5 to 15 times more hydrogen. Figure 6 shows an example of the permanently shadowed Shackleton crater.

[Figure omitted] Figure 6. The Shackleton crater located near the South Pole, where the colors indicate the percentage of time illuminated during a single lunar orbital period. The rim of the crater contains zero (white) and near zero illumination values which identify it as a permanently shadowed crater (Zuber et al., 2012).

Another important aspect to consider is the relationship between titanium (Ti) and He-3. The majority of Ti on the Moon appears in the form of ilmenite (FeTiO3). Tests done on lunar ilmenite, olivine, pyroxene, and plagioclase show that for grains in the same size range from the same soil, ilmenite (FeTiO3) contains 10 to 100 more times as much He-3 (Fa and Ya-Qiu, 2007). The structure of ilmenite, seen in Figure 7, is better able to hold onto the small He-3 ions when subjected to extreme conditions. This suggests that He-3 is more protected from the effects of massive temperature shifts than other volatiles when high concentrations of Ti are present. Figure 3 shows that most of the Ti on the Moon appears in the large impact craters of the nearside.

[Figure omitted] Figure 7. The crystal structure of Ilmenite. The alternating layers of Fe and Ti along with the rhombohedral shape shown above allow for tighter confinement of loose He-3 ions (Ribeiro and Lazaro, 2014).

With all of these factors considered, two areas of particular interest are suggested for holding large concentrations of He-3. They include Mare Tranquillitatis (8.5 ̊N 31.4 ̊E) that has the highest concentration of Ti on the lunar surface, and thus also possible large He-3 stores. The second area of interest is the South Pole Aitken basin with large permanently shadowed craters that enhance its ability to hold volatiles like He-3 through diurnal heating shifts over the lunar orbital period. These permanently shadowed craters would protect the volatiles from temperature shifts and the regolith from being disturbed by micrometeorite impacts.

CONCLUSIONS

Lunar resource development is an extensive and expensive effort, however, this study seeks to introduce the need to explore for these resources. This study examined the shortage of available He-3 and the affected industries. Hopes in the distant future for clean fusion energy also rest on access to this valuable resource. As U.S. stockpiles diminish and demand continues, the economic incentive for the acquisition of He-3 deposits on the moon becomes an increasingly attractive option.

The objective of this study was to use available satellite data to estimate possible locations of large lunar He-3 deposits. From the analysis of NASA’s satellite gamma ray data, two areas were targeted for possibly holding large concentrations of He-3. Specifically, Mare Tranquillitatis was identified as holding enhanced ilmenite concentrations and other elements that would be essential in any mining mission. The South Pole Aitken basin was also targeted due to its large permanently shadowed areas that enhance its ability to hold volatiles and prevent their migration due to diurnal heating. In general, these results are also consistent with previous lunar site recommendations for locating large He-3 concentrations (e.g. Schmitt, 2006).

#### Only mining at Tranquility sites is economically feasible and profitable – it’s the only location with enough data to be categorized as a measured resource.

Schmidt 06 “Return to the Moon exploration, enterprise, and energy in the human settlement of space” Harrison Schmidt [an American geologist, retired NASA astronaut, university professor, former U.S. senator from New Mexico, and the most recent person living, and only civilian to have walked on the Moon. Schmitt is the last surviving crew member of Apollo 17] <https://www.amazon.com/Return-Moon-Exploration-Enterprise-Settlement/dp/0387242856> SM

Economic geologists — who study the value, quantity, and origin of mineral deposits — use the terms "measured," "indicated," and "inferred" to distinguish resources that are at decreasing levels of certainty in terms of available tonnage at a specified value (see Figure 6.4).87 Exploration, drilling, and sample analysis, or other direct means, have delineated "measured reserves" to the extent that further investments of capital for actual production are warranted. Of course, such investments only will be made if the value and tonnage, or volume, make economic sense in the time frame that the resource can be sold in a forecasted market. "Indicated resources" have enough geological definition to be included in long-term mine planning but will require additional investment in quantitative exploration before they can become defined as measured resources ready for production. "Inferred resources" are based on geological inference but are too speculative to be included in planning until further exploration takes place.

The current economic and geological position of lunar helium-3 in the titanium-rich portions of Mare Tranquillitatis is shown in Figure 6.4. Relative to the figure, upward, positive economic change in lunar helium-3 will be determined by increases in the cost of alternative sources of terrestrial energy, particularly coal. Downward, negative economic change would be caused by higher than anticipated lunar development costs. Increases in geological certainty could arise from direct sensing of helium-3 from orbital spacecraft; however, it definitely will come from detailed mapping and the fusion of all pertinent geochemical and geotechnical data prior to mining.

The first consideration an economic geologist makes relative to a potential resource must involve its estimated value, against which the costs of production can be weighed. What is the likely price per unit that can be realized in the marketplace at the point in the future when the production operations begin? The value of lunar helium-3 for fusion electrical power plants on Earth will be a function of the demand and supply of competitive energy sources. As already discussed in the previous chapter (Section 5.3), helium-3 will be in direct future competition with steam coal for power generation. Forecasting coal prices in the 2010-2015 time frame will be important to evaluating the competitive value of lunar helium-3. Prices for thermal or steam coal in Asia (4% of world demand, rising at 10% annually) have begun to rise rapidly, up 70-80% in 2004.88 In fact, some analysts expect steam coal to reach and hold over $2.50/million BTU in 2005.89 Spot prices have approached $2.00 in the United States for the eastern stoker coal in 2004.9° Therefore, forecasting coal prices of at least $2.50/million BTU, appears to be a reasonable planning assumption for 2010-2015.9' This gives a conservative estimate that the energy equivalent value of 100 kg of helium-3 in 2010-2015 would be about $140 million.

6.3.2 Mining analysis With this value of $140 million 100 kg in mind, how much helium-3 is reasonably available in the richest (highest grade or concentration) known portions of the lunar regolith? Working with the Wisconsin Fusion Technology Institute team in the 1980s, the late Professor Eugene Cameron,92 one of the world's foremost economic geologists, made the

[Figure omitted] FIGURE 6.4 Current position of lunar helium-3 in titanium-rich portions of Mare Tranquillitatis relative to demonstrated economic potential. (Graphic background courtesy of P. J. Brown, University of Wisconsin—Madison)

first estimates of the quantities of helium-3 expected to be present in titanium-rich regolith on the Moon. Cameron, using available spectro-scopic data on titanium concentration as discussed in Section 6.2.3, determined that the highest grade area for helium-3 totaled about 84,000 km2 and another 195,000 km2 of medium grade concentrations all within Mare Tranquillitatis. By geological inference, using photogeological mapping and remotely-sensed titanium concentrations, this is the region to which Apollo 11 samples apply, as well as those provided by Apollo 17. Cameron also studied the distribution of craters and estimated that about 50% of the 84,000 km2 would be minable by the Wisconsin Mark II miner (see Section 7.2.2). If mined to a depth of 3 meters with a helium-3 concentration of 20 wppb (Section 5.2), this highest grade area would yield about 2500 tonnes of helium-3. In 2010-2015, with coal at $2.50/ million BTU, this amount of helium-3 will probably have an energy equivalent value of about $3.5 trillion! Even at 2003's contract coal prices, the value would be about $1.75 trillion. This economic potential, and the policy and environmental advantages of helium-3 fusion, have been exciting enough to keep the interest of the Wisconsin group and the author since the late 1980s.

Since Cameron's initial work, as discussed above, the helium-3 resources in Mare Tranquillitatis have moved close enough to being "measured resources" to warrant investment in the integrated analysis of all available sample and remote-sensing data. Cameron based his analysis on Apollo 11 sample data, the available spectroscopic definition of titanium distribution, and 1960s Lunar Orbiter photography.93 Apollos 15, 16, and 17 metric and panametric cameras, operating from orbit, gathered additional high-resolution and stereophotography of the area of interest in Mare Tranquillitatis. Subsequently, two additional data sets obtained by the Department of Defense and NASA promise to further refine our knowledge of the distribution of titanium in that region's regolith. Respectively, these data came from optical spectrometers aboard the Clementine mission in 199494 and from the neutron and gamma-ray spectrometers of the Lunar Prospector mission in 1998-1999.95 Further, improved optical specrometric data from Earth have been collected.96 As discussed above, nanophase native iron accumulates in the regolith as a function of exposure to micrometeor impact, so remotely-sensed concentrations of such iron measure the length of exposure to solar wind and, in turn, indirectly measure relative helium-3 concentrations. This accounts for the strong correlation between both titanium oxide concentration and regolith maturity.97

It may be possible, as well as desirable to potential investors, to directly map helium-3 distribution in the regolith. This could be done on a global scale by developing an advanced gamma-ray spectrometer for a special-purpose, low-cost lunar orbiter, mapping the 20.6 (and higher) MeV gamma-rays released when a helium-3 nucleus captures a solar cosmic-ray-induced neutron.98 (Significant in-situ understanding of neutron flux at the lunar surface was gained by the lunar neutron probe experiment deployed on Apollo 17.99) Telerobotic rovers could accomplish more specific and higher resolution mapping of a targeted mining site, albeit at significantly higher cost than an orbital sensor. The cost, however, of either an orbiter or surface rovers should not be incurred until the existing data sets are fully exploited and the need for one or the other becomes clear.

Although a major project that fuses all the available data sets is clearly necessary, there can be little doubt that very interesting concentrations (grades) of helium-3 are present in the upper 3 to 6 meters of Mare Tranquillitatis regolith. Based on analyses of Apollo samples to date, the average, undisturbed concentration of helium-3 in major portions of Mare Tranquillitatis appears to be at least 20 wppb, and conceivably higher. Analysis of drill cores from Apollo 15, 16, and 17, even though they have been depleted in volatiles by agitation and are highly variable from one buried ejecta blanket to another, indicates that this average grade will continue to a depth of at least 3 meters and probably to the base of the regolith.10°

#### Helium-3 fusion possible now—Solves warming and energy infrastructure reliability

**Whittington 21** (Mark, contributor to the Hill. “Solving the climate and energy crises: Mine the Moon's helium-3?”<https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/540856-solving-the-climate-and-energy-crises-mine-the-moons-helium-3> February 28, 2021)DR 22

Solar System Resources has agreed to provide 500 kilograms of helium-3 mined from the Moon to U.S. Nuclear Corp. in the 2028-2032 timeframe.

According to [a paper](https://mdcampbell.com/Helium-3version2.pdf) published by Jeff Bonde and Anthony Tortorello, helium-3 is an isotope that has been deposited in lunar soil over billions of years by solar wind. Roughly 1.1 million metric tons of the isotope exists on the Moon down to a depth of several meters. Twenty-five metric tons of helium-3, about a quarter of the cargo capacity of a SpaceX Starship, would suffice to fuel all the power needs of the United States for a year.

The announcement does not reveal how Solar System Resource proposes to mine the helium-3. The company’s website is very heavy on breathtakingly inspirational verbiage and light on how it intends to raise the money and develop the technology to mine the solar system’s resources. However, the paper suggests that a rover could scoop up lunar regolith, separate helium-3 along with oxygen and hydrogen, store them and eject the processed lunar soil. The gasses would be taken back to a lunar base where the oxygen and hydrogen would be put to good use and the helium-3 stored for later export to Earth.

The announcement also does not reveal what U.S. Nuclear Corp. intends to do with the helium-3 once it takes delivery. The company, which builds radiation detection devices, has a subsidiary, [Magneto-Inertial Fusion Technology, Inc.,](https://www.usnuclearcorp.com/magneto-inertial-fusion-technologies/) that is researching a fusion technology called [staged Z-pinch.](https://arpa-e.energy.gov/sites/default/files/04_WESSEL.pdf) This would create a fusion reaction long enough and sustained enough to become a power source. Presumably, an abundant store of helium-3 could be an asset for those experiments.

Fusion using helium-3 has advantages and disadvantages over using deuterium, an isotope of hydrogen and tritium, another isotope of hydrogen.

Deuterium and tritium fusion releases radioactive neutrons that will damage and weaken the containment vessel. Periodically, a fusion reactor using this method would have to be taken offline for decontamination. Tritium is also radioactive, making its handling difficult and dangerous. A deuterium and helium-3 fusion creates helium and charged protons as byproducts and few or no radioactive particles.

The main disadvantage of fusion using helium-3 is that it would take a far greater amount of energy to achieve it than the conventional deuterium and tritium variety. According to [Open Mind,](https://www.bbvaopenmind.com/en/science/physics/helium-3-lunar-gold-fever/#:~:text=In%201986%2C%20scientists%20at%20the,produce%20energy%20by%20nuclear%20fusion.) Frank Close, a physicist at the University of Oxford, regards fusion using helium-3 as “moonshine.” Close suggests that a deuterium and helium-3 fusion will still produce some radioactive neutrons.

Gerald Kulcinski, director of the [Fusion Technology Institute](https://fti.neep.wisc.edu/fti.neep.wisc.edu/index.html) at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, disagrees. Close’s objection is based on using conventional fusion technology. The Fusion Technology Institute has achieved some progress in minimizing radioactive neutron production using different technology.

Helium-3 fusion is an even more promising technology, albeit a more difficult and complicated one to develop. The consensus seems to be that such reactors will not be achieved for some decades, say mid-century.

No one can guarantee that enough helium-3 will be mined from the Moon to jump-start serious development of technology using the isotope as a fusion fuel in the foreseeable future. There is no guarantee that such a development will see practical results anytime soon. However, the effort would be well worth pursuing, with substantial money and effort deployed behind it. If not the two aforementioned companies, someone should undertake the effort. Fusion using helium-3 as fuel would change the world in profoundly beneficial ways.

The great problem civilization faces is access to clean, affordable and reliable energy. Recent [events](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/weather/knocked-out-texas-millions-face-record-lows-without-power-new-n1257964) in Texas prove that not having energy, even for a few days, can be catastrophic. At the same time, humankind needs sources of energy that do not harm the environment, especially by emitting greenhouse gasses.

It appears that humankind is returning to the Moon, at long last. [President Trump](https://thehill.com/people/donald-trump) [started](https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/482265-trump-goes-all-in-for-nasas-artemis-return-to-the-moon-program) the Artemis Project. [President Biden](https://thehill.com/people/joe-biden) has thrown his support behind the effort. There are many reasons to return to the Moon, from science, to commerce, to soft political power. Solving the decades-long energy crisis could be the singular benefit for expanding human activity to Earth’s nearest neighbor.

#### Extinction from energy collapse

Greene 19 [Sherrell R. Greene Mr. Greene received his B.S. and M.S. degrees in Nuclear Engineering from the University of Tennessee. He is a recognized subject matter expert in nuclear reactor safety, nuclear fuel cycle technologies, and advanced reactor concept development. Mr. Greene is widely acclaimed for his systems analysis, team building, innovation, knowledge organization, presentation, and technical communication skills. Mr. Greene worked at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) for over three decades. During his career at ORNL, he served as Director of Research Reactor Development Programs and Director of Nuclear Technology Programs. . "Enhancing Electric Grid, Critical Infrastructure, and Societal Resilience with Resilient Nuclear Power Plants (rNPPs)." <https://ans.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00295450.2018.1505357?needAccess=true> edited for ableist language in brackets[]]

Societies and nations are examples of large-scale, complex social-physical systems. Thus, societal resilience can be defined as the ability of a nation, population, or society to anticipate and prepare for major stressors or calamities and then to absorb, adapt to, recover from, and restore normal functions in the wake of such events when they occur. A nation’s dependence on its Critical Infrastructure systems, and the resilience of those systems, are therefore major components of national and societal resilience.

There are a variety of events that could deal ~~crippling~~ [Incapacitating] blows to a nation’s Grid, Critical Infrastructure, and social fabric. The types of catastrophes under consideration here are “very bad day” scenarios that might result from severe GMDs induced by solar CMEs, HEMP attacks, cyber attacks, etc.5

As briefly discussed in Sec. III.C, the probability of a GMD of the magnitude of the 1859 Carrington Event is now believed to be on the order of 1%/year. The Earth narrowly missed (by only several days) intercepting a CME stream in July 2012 that would have created a GMD equal to or larger than the Carrington Event.41 Lloyd’s, in its 2013 report, “Solar Storm Risk to the North American Electric Grid,” 42 stated the following: “A Carrington-level, extreme geomagnetic storm is almost inevitable in the future…The total U.S. population at risk of extended power outage from a Carrington-level storm is between 20-40 million, with durations of 16 days to 1-2 years…The total economic cost for such a scenario is estimated at $0.6-2.6 trillion USD.” Analyses conducted subsequent to the Lloyd’s assessment indicated the geographical area impacted by the CME would be larger than that estimated in Lloyd’s analysis (extending farther northward along the New England coast of the United States and in the state of Minnesota),43 and that the actual consequences of such an event could actually be greater than estimated by Lloyd’s.

Based on “Report of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack: Critical National Infrastructures” to Congress in 2008 (Ref. 39), a HEMP attack over the Central U.S. could impact virtually the entire North American continent. The consequences of such an event are difficult to quantify with confidence. Experts affiliated with the aforementioned Commission and others familiar with the details of the Commission’s work have stated in Congressional testimony that such an event could “kill up to 90 percent of the national population through starvation, disease, and societal collapse.” 44,45 Most of these consequences are either direct or indirect impacts of the predicted collapse of virtually the entire U.S. Critical Infrastructure system in the wake of the attack.

Last, recent analyses by both the U.S. Department of Energy46 and the U.S. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine47 have concluded that cyber threats to the U.S. Grid from both state-level and substatelevel entities are likely to grow in number and sophistication in the coming years, posing a growing threat to the U.S. Grid.

These three “very bad day” scenarios are not creations of overzealous science fiction writers. A variety of mitigating actions to reduce both the vulnerability and the consequences of these events has been identified, and some are being implemented. However, the fact remains that events such as those described here have the potential to change life as we know it in the United States and other developed nations in the 21st century, whether the events occur individually, or simultaneously, and with or without coordinated physical attacks on Critical Infrastructure assets.

#### Extinction from warming—feedback loops bypass defense

Ng ’19 [Yew-Kwang; May 2019; Professor of Economics at Nanyang Technology University, Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences in Australia and Member of the Advisory Board at the Global Priorities Institute at Oxford University, Ph.D. in Economics from Sydney University; Global Policy, “Keynote: Global Extinction and Animal Welfare: Two Priorities for Effective Altruism,” vol. 10, no. 2, p. 258-266]

Catastrophic climate change

Though by no means certain, CCC causing global extinction is possible due to interrelated factors of non‐linearity, cascading effects, positive feedbacks, multiplicative factors, critical thresholds and tipping points (e.g. Barnosky and Hadly, [2016](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0005); Belaia et al., [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0008); Buldyrev et al., [2010](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0016); Grainger, [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0027); Hansen and Sato, [2012](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0029); IPCC [2014](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0031); Kareiva and Carranza, [2018](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0033); Osmond and Klausmeier, [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0056); Rothman, [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0066); Schuur et al., [2015](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0069); Sims and Finnoff, [2016](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0072); Van Aalst, [2006](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0079)).[7](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-note-1009_67)

A possibly imminent tipping point could be in the form of ‘an abrupt ice sheet collapse [that] could cause a rapid sea level rise’ (Baum et al., [2011](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0006), p. 399). There are many avenues for positive feedback in global warming, including:

* the replacement of an ice sea by a liquid ocean surface from melting reduces the reflection and increases the absorption of sunlight, leading to faster warming;
* the drying of forests from warming increases forest fires and the release of more carbon; and
* higher ocean temperatures may lead to the release of methane trapped under the ocean floor, producing runaway global warming.

Though there are also avenues for negative feedback, the scientific consensus is for an overall net positive feedback (Roe and Baker, [2007](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0065)). Thus, the Global Challenges Foundation ([2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0026), p. 25) concludes, ‘The world is currently completely unprepared to envisage, and even less deal with, the consequences of CCC’.

The threat of sea‐level rising from global warming is well known, but there are also other likely and more imminent threats to the survivability of mankind and other living things. For example, Sherwood and Huber ([2010](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0071)) emphasize the adaptability limit to climate change due to heat stress from high environmental wet‐bulb temperature. They show that ‘even modest global warming could … expose large fractions of the [world] population to unprecedented heat stress’ p. 9552 and that with substantial global warming, ‘the area of land rendered uninhabitable by heat stress would dwarf that affected by rising sea level’ p. 9555, making extinction much more likely and the relatively moderate damages estimated by most integrated assessment models unreliably low.

While imminent extinction is very unlikely and may not come for a long time even under business as usual, the main point is that we cannot rule it out. Annan and Hargreaves ([2011](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0004), pp. 434–435) may be right that there is ‘an upper 95 per cent probability limit for S [temperature increase] … to lie close to 4°C, and certainly well below 6°C’. However, probabilities of 5 per cent, 0.5 per cent, 0.05 per cent or even 0.005 per cent of excessive warming and the resulting extinction probabilities cannot be ruled out and are unacceptable. Even if there is only a 1 per cent probability that there is a time bomb in the airplane, you probably want to change your flight. Extinction of the whole world is more important to avoid by literally a trillion times.

### 1NC—CP

#### Text – States ought to adopt a binding international agreement that bans the appropriation of outer space by private entities except for space elevators by establishing outer space as a global commons subject to regulatory delimiting and global liability.

#### Space Elevators constitute Appropriation – they impede orbits.

Matignon 19 Louis de Gouyon Matignon 3-3-2019 "LEGAL ASPECTS OF THE SPACE ELEVATOR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM" <https://www.spacelegalissues.com/space-law-legal-aspects-of-the-space-elevator-transportation-system/> [PhD in space law (co-supervised by both Philippe Delebecque, from Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne, France, and Christopher D. Johnson, from Georgetown University || regularly write articles on the website Space Legal Issues so as to popularise space law and public international law]//Elmer

An Earth-based space elevator would consist of a cable with one end attached to the surface near the equator and the other end in space beyond geostationary orbit. An orbit is the curved path through which objects in space move around a planet or a star. The 1967 Treaty’s regime and customary law enshrine the principle of non-appropriation and freedom of access to orbital positions. Space Law and International Telecommunication Laws combined to protect this use against any interference. The majority of space-launched objects are satellites that are launched in Earth’s orbit (a very small part of space objects – scientific objects for space exploration – are launched into outer space beyond terrestrial orbits). It is important to precise that an orbit does not exist: satellites describe orbits by obeying the general laws of universal attraction. Depending on the launching techniques and parameters, the orbital trajectory of a satellite may vary. Sun-synchronous satellites fly over a given location constantly at the same time in local civil time: they are used for remote sensing, meteorology or the study of the atmosphere. Geostationary satellites are placed in a very high orbit; they give an impression of immobility because they remain permanently at the same vertical point of a terrestrial point (they are mainly used for telecommunications and television broadcasting). A geocentric orbit or Earth orbit involves any object orbiting Planet Earth, such as the Moon or artificial satellites. Geocentric (having the Earth as its centre) orbits are organised as follow: 1) Low Earth orbit (LEO): geocentric orbits with altitudes (the height of an object above the average surface of the Earth’s oceans) from 100 to 2 000 kilometres. Satellites in LEO have a small momentary field of view, only able to observe and communicate with a fraction of the Earth at a time, meaning a network or constellation of satellites is required in order to provide continuous coverage. Satellites in lower regions of LEO also suffer from fast orbital decay (in orbital mechanics, decay is a gradual decrease of the distance between two orbiting bodies at their closest approach, the periapsis, over many orbital periods), requiring either periodic reboosting to maintain a stable orbit, or launching replacement satellites when old ones re-enter. 2) Medium Earth orbit (MEO), also known as an intermediate circular orbit: geocentric orbits ranging in altitude from 2 000 kilometres to just below geosynchronous orbit at 35 786 kilometres. The most common use for satellites in this region is for navigation, communication, and geodetic/space environment science. The most common altitude is approximately 20 000 kilometres which yields an orbital period of twelve hours. 3) Geosynchronous orbit (GSO) and geostationary orbit (GEO) are orbits around Earth at an altitude of 35 786 kilometres matching Earth’s sidereal rotation period. All geosynchronous and geostationary orbits have a semi-major axis of 42 164 kilometres. A geostationary orbit stays exactly above the equator, whereas a geosynchronous orbit may swing north and south to cover more of the Earth’s surface. Communications satellites and weather satellites are often placed in geostationary orbits, so that the satellite antennae (located on Earth) that communicate with them do not have to rotate to track them, but can be pointed permanently at the position in the sky where the satellites are located. 4) High Earth orbit: geocentric orbits above the altitude of 35 786 kilometres. The competing forces of gravity, which is stronger at the lower end, and the outward/upward centrifugal force, which is stronger at the upper end, would result in the cable being held up, under tension, and stationary over a single position on Earth. With the tether deployed, climbers could repeatedly climb the tether to space by mechanical means, releasing their cargo to orbit. Climbers could also descend the tether to return cargo to the surface from orbit.

#### Private Companies are pursuing Space Elevators.

Alfano 15 Andrea Alfano 8-18-2015 “All Of These Companies Are Working On A Space Elevator” <https://www.techtimes.com/articles/77612/20150818/companies-working-space-elevator.htm> (Writer at the Tech Times)//Elmer

Space elevators are solid proof that any mundane object sounds way cooler if you stick the word "space" in front of it. But there's much more than coolness at stake when building a space elevator – this technology has the potential to revolutionize space transportation, and the Canadian private space company Thoth Technology that was recently awarded a patent for its space elevator design isn't the only company in the game. One of the other major players is a U.S.-based company called LiftPort Group, founded by space entrepreneur Michael Laine in 2003. Its plan for a space elevator is vastly different from the one for which Thoth received a patent, however. Whereas Thoth's plans entail tethering a 12-mile-high inflatable space elevator to the Earth, LiftPort is shooting for the moon. Originally, LiftPort had planned to build an Earth elevator, too, but it abandoned the idea in 2007 in favor of building a lunar elevator. The basic design for a lunar elevator is an anchor in the moon that is attached to a cable that extends to a space station situated at a very special point. Known as a Lagrange Point, this is the gravitational tipping point between the Earth and the moon, where their gravitational pulls essentially cancel one another out. A robot could then travel up and down the tether, ferrying cargo between the moon and the station. Out farther in space, a counterweight would balance out the system. Both types of space elevator are intended to increase space access, but in very different ways. Thoth's Earth elevator aims to make launches easier by starting off 12 miles above the Earth's surface. LiftPort's space elevator aims to increase access to the moon in particular, because it is much easier to launch a rocket to the Lagrange Point and dock it at a space station than it is to get to the moon directly. There's a third major company based in Japan called Obayashi Corp. whose plans look like a hybrid of Thoth's and LiftPort's. Obayashi is not a space company, however – it's actually a construction company. Like Thoth, Obayashi plans to build an Earth elevator. But its Earth elevator would consist of a cable tethered to the blue planet, a robotic cargo-carrier, a space station, and a counterweight. It essentially looks like LiftPort's plans, but stuck to the Earth instead of to the moon.

#### Yes Space Elevators – NASA confirms.

Snowden 18 Scott Snowden 10-2-2018 "A colossal elevator to space could be going up sooner than you ever imagined" <https://www.nbcnews.com/mach/science/colossal-elevator-space-could-be-going-sooner-you-ever-imagined-ncna915421> (Scott has written about science and technology for 20 years for publications around the world. He covers environmental technology for Forbes.)//Elmer

For more than half a century, rockets have been the only way to go to space. But in the not-too-distant future, we may have another option for sending up people and payloads: a colossal elevator extending from Earth’s surface up to an altitude of 22,000 miles, where geosynchronous satellites orbit. NASA says the basic concept of a space elevator is sound, and researchers around the world are optimistic that one can be built. The Obayashi Corp., a global construction firm based in Tokyo, has said it will build one by 2050, and China wants to build one as soon as 2045. Now an experiment to be conducted soon aboard the International Space Station will help determine the real-world feasibility of a space elevator. “The space elevator is the Holy Grail of space exploration,” says Michio Kaku, a professor of physics at City College of New York and a noted futurist. “Imagine pushing the ‘up’ button of an elevator and taking a ride into the heavens. It could open up space to the average person.”

#### Regardless of completion, Elevators spur investment in Nanotechnology

Liam O’Brien 16. University of Wollongong. 07/2016. “Nanotechnology in Space.” Young Scientists Journal; Canterbury, no. 19, p. 22.

Nanotechnology is at the forefront of scientific development, continuing to astound and innovate. Likewise, the space industry is rapidly increasing in sophistication and competition, with companies such as SpaceX, Blue Origin and Virgin Galactic becoming increasingly prevalent in what could become a new commercial space race. The various space programs over the past 60 years have led to a multitude of beneficial impacts for everyday society. Nanotechnology, through research and development in space has the potential to do the same. Potential applications of nanotechnology in space are numerous, many of them have the potential to capture and inspire generations to come. One of these applications is the space elevator. By using carbon nanotubes, a super light yet strong material, this concept would be an actual physical structure from the surface of the Earth to an altitude of approximately 36 000 km. The tallest building in the world would fit into this elevator over 42 000 times. The counterweight, used to keep the elevator taught, is proposed to be an asteroid. This would need to be at a distance of 100 000 km, a quarter of the distance to the moon. The benefits of such a structure would be enormous. 95% of a space shuttle's weight at take-off is fuel, costing US$ 20 000 per kilogram to send something into space. However, with a space elevator the cost per kilogram can be reduced to as little as US$ 200. Exploration to other planets can begin at the tower, and travel to and from the moon could become as simple as a morning commute to work. Solar sails provide the means to travel large distances and incredible speeds. Much like sails on a boat use wind, the solar sail uses light as a source of propulsion. Ideally these sails would be kilometres in length and only a few micrometres in thickness. This provides us with the ability to travel at speeds previously unheard of. Using carbon nanotubes once again, a solar sail has the capability to travel at 39 756 km/s which is 13% of the speed of light! This sail could reach Pluto in an astonishing 1.7 days, and Alpha Centauri in just 32 years. Space travel to other planets, other stars, could be possible with solar sails. The Planetary Society is funding for a space sail of itself, and has successfully launched one into orbit. NASA has also sent a sail into orbit, allowing it to burn up in the atmosphere after 240 days. Investing time and resources into nanotechnology for space exploration has benefits for society today. Materials such as graphene are being used in modern manufacturing at an increasing rate as the applications become utilised. Carbon nanotubes will change the way we think about materials and their strength. These nanotubes have a tensile strength one hundred times that of steel, yet are only a sixth of the weight. Imagine light weight vehicles using less petrol and energy as well as being just as strong as regular vehicles. With potentials to revolutionize the way we think about space travel, nanotechnology has a bright future. As a new field of science, it has the capability to push the human race to the outer reaches of our galaxy and hopefully one day to other stars. It will inspire generations of explorers and dreamers to challenge themselves and advance the human race into the next era. As Richard Feynman said in his 1959 talk 'There's Plenty of Room at the Bottom' "A field in which little has been done, but in which an enormous amount can be done. There is still plenty more to achieve.

#### Nano tech solves warming

Bhavya Khullar. September 4, 2017. Nanomaterials Could Combat Climate Change and Reduce Pollution. https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/nanomaterials-could-combat-climate-change-and-reduce-pollution/

The list of environmental problems that the world faces may be huge, but some strategies for solving them are remarkably small. First explored for applications in microscopy and computing, nanomaterials—materials made up of units that are each thousands of times smaller than the thickness of a human hair—are emerging as useful for tackling threats to our planet’s well-being. Scientists across the globe are developing nanomaterials that can efficiently use carbon dioxide from the air, capture toxic pollutants from water and degrade solid waste into useful products. “Nanomaterials could help us mitigate pollution. They are efficient catalysts and mostly recyclable. Now, they have to become economical for commercialization and better to replace present-day technologies completely,” says [Arun Chattopadhyay](http://www.iitg.ac.in/arun/), a member of the chemistry faculty at the Center for Nanotechnology, Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati. To help slow the climate-changing rise in atmospheric CO2levels, researchers have developed nanoCO2 harvesters that can suck atmospheric carbon dioxide and deploy it for industrial purposes. “Nanomaterials can convert carbon dioxide into useful products like alcohol. The materials could be simple chemical catalysts or photochemical in nature that work in the presence of sunlight,” says Chattopadhyay, who has been working with nanomaterials to tackle environmental pollutants for more than a decade. Many research groups are working to address a problem that, if solved, could be a holy grail in combating climate change: how to pull CO2 out of the atmosphere and convert it into useful products. Chattopadhyay isn’t alone. Many research groups are working to address a problem that, if solved, could be a holy grail in combating climate change: how to pull CO2 out of the atmosphere and convert it into useful products. Nanoparticles offer a promising approach to this because they have a large surface-area-to-volume ratio for interacting with CO2 and properties that allow them to facilitate the conversion of CO2into other things. The challenge is to make them economically viable. Researchers have tried everything from metallic to carbon-based nanoparticles to reduce the cost, but so far they haven’t become efficient enough for industrial-scale application. One of the most recent points of progress in this area is work by scientists at the CSIR-Indian Institute of Petroleum and the Lille University of Science and Technology in France. The researchers developed a nanoCO2 harvester that uses water and sunlight to convert atmospheric CO2 into methanol, which can be employed as an engine fuel, a solvent, an antifreeze agent and a diluent of ethanol. Made by wrapping a layer of modified graphene oxide around spheres of copper zinc oxide and magnetite, the material looks like a miniature golf ball, captures CO2 more efficiently than conventional catalysts and can be readily reused, according to Suman Jain, senior scientist of the Indian Institute of Petroleum, Dehradun in India, who developed the nanoCO2harvester. Jain says that the nanoCO2 harvester has a large molecular surface area and captures more CO2 than a conventional catalyst with similar surface area would, which makes the conversion more efficient. But due to their small size, the nanoparticles have a tendency to clump up, making them inactive with prolonged use. Jain adds that synthesizing useful nanoparticle-based materials is also challenging because it’s hard to make the particles a consistent size. Chattopadhyay says the efficiency of such materials can be improved further, providing hope for useful application in the future. CLEANSING WATER Most toxic dyes used in textile and leather industries can be captured with nanoparticles. “Water pollutants such as dyes from human-created waste like those from tanneries could get to natural sources of water like deep tube wells or groundwater if wastewater from these industries is left untreated,” says Chattopadhyay. “This problem is rather difficult to solve.” An international group of researchers led by professor Elzbieta Megiel of the University of Warsaw in Poland reports that nanomaterials have been widely studied for removing heavy metals and dyes from wastewater. According to the research team, adsorption processes using materials containing magnetic nanoparticles are highly effective and can be easily performed because such nanoparticles have a large number of sites on their surface that can capture pollutants and don’t readily degrade in water. Chattopadhyay adds that appropriately designed magnetic nanomaterials can be used to separate pollutants such as arsenic, lead, chromium and mercury from water. However, the nanotech-based approach has to be more efficient than conventional water purification technology to make it worthwhile. In addition to removing dyes and metals, nanomaterials can also be used to clean up oil spills. Researchers led by Pulickel Ajayan at Rice University in Houston, Texas, have developed a reusable nanosponge that can remove oil from contaminated seawater.

### CASE

#### Squo debris thumps –

Orwig 16 [(Jessica, MS in science and tech journalism from Texas A&M, BS in astronomy and physics from Ohio State) “Russia says a growing problem in space could be enough to spark a war,” Insider,’ January 26, 2016, <https://www.businessinsider.com/russia-says-space-junk-could-spark-war-2016-1>] TDI

NASA has already [warned that](https://www.businessinsider.com/space-junk-at-critical-density-2015-9) the large amount of space junk around our planet is growing beyond our control, but now a team of Russian scientists has cited another potentially unforeseen consequence of that debris: War.

Scientists estimate that anywhere from 500,000 to 600,000 pieces of human-made space debris between 0.4 and 4 inches in size are currently orbiting the Earth and traveling at speeds over [17,000 miles per hour](https://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/station/news/orbital_debris.html).

If one of those pieces smashed into a military satellite it "may provoke political or even armed conflict between space-faring nations," Vitaly Adushkin, a researcher for the Institute of Geosphere Dynamics at the Russian Academy of Sciences, reported in a paper set to be published in the peer-reviewed journal [Acta Astronautica](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0094576515303416), which is sponsored by the International Academy of Astronautics.

#### It takes centuries and adaptation solves

Ted Muelhaupt 19, Associate Principal Director of the Systems Analysis and Simulation Subdivision (SASS) and Manager of the Center for Orbital and Reentry Debris Studies at The Aerospace Corporation, M.S., B.S. Aerospace and Aeronautical Engineering & Mechanics, University of Minnesota - Twin Cities, Senior Member of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, “How Quickly Would It Take For the Kessler Syndrome To Destroy All The Satellites In LEO? And Could You See This Happening From Earth?”, Quora, 2/28/2019, https://www.quora.com/How-quickly-would-it-take-for-the-Kessler-Syndrome-to-destroy-all-the-satellites-in-LEO-And-could-you-see-this-happening-from-Earth

The dynamics of the Kessler Syndrome are real, and most people studying it agree on the concept: if there is sufficient density of objects and mass, a chain reaction of debris breaking up objects and creating more debris can occur. But the timescale of this process takes decades and centuries. There are many assumptions that go into these models. Though there is still argument about this, many people in the field think that the process is already underway in low earth orbit. But others, including myself, think we can stop it if we take action. This is a slow motion disaster that we can prevent.

But in spite of hype to the contrary, we will never “lose access to space”. Certain missions may become impractical or too expensive, and we may decide that some orbits are too risky for humans. Even that depends on the tolerance for the risk. But robots don’t have mothers, and if we feel it is worthwhile we will take the risk and fly the satellites where we need to.

To the specifics of the question, it will take many decades. It will not destroy all satellites in LEO. You won’t be able to see it from the ground unless you were extraordinarily lucky, and you happened to see a flash from a collision in the instant you were looking, with just the right lighting.

#### Squo tracking, shielding, and removal plans solve

Dr. Brian Koberlein 16, Professor of Physics at the Rochester Institute of Technology and PhD in Astrophysics from the University of Connecticut, “Cascade Effect”, 5-4, https://archive.briankoberlein.com/2016/05/04/cascade-effect/index.html

In the movie Gravity the driving force of the plot is a catastrophic cascade of space debris. An exploding satellite sends high speed debris into the path of other satellites, and the resulting collisions create more space debris until everything from a space shuttle to the International Space Station faces an eminent threat of destruction. Not unexpectedly, the movie portrayal of such a situation is not particularly accurate, but the risk of a debris cascade is very real.

It’s known as the Kessler syndrome, after Donald Kessler, who first imagined the scenario in the 1970s. The problem comes down to the fact that small objects in Earth orbit can stay in orbit for a very long time. If an astronaut drops a bolt, it can stay in orbit for decades or centuries. Because the relative speed of two objects in orbit can be quite large, it doesn’t take a big object to pose a real threat to your spacecraft. On the highway a small pebble can chip your car windshield. In space it can be done by a chip of paint traveling at thousands of kilometers per hour. In the history of the space shuttle missions, there were more than 1,600 debris strikes. Because of such strikes, more than 90 space shuttle windows had to be replaced over the lifetime of shuttle missions.

While that might sound alarming, it’s actually quite manageable. Upgrades and maintenance were quite common on the shuttle missions, and we tend to err on the side of caution when it comes to replacing parts. Modern spacecraft also have ways to mitigate the risk of small impacts, such as Whipple shields made of thin layers of material spaced apart so that objects disintegrate when hitting the shield rather than the spacecraft itself. We also have a tracking system that currently tracks more than 300,000 objects bigger than 1 cm, so we can make sure that most spacecraft avoid these objects.

But the risk of big collisions isn’t negligible. In 2009 the Iridium 33 and Kosmos-2251 satellites collided at high speed, destroying both spacecraft and creating more dangerous debris. It wouldn’t take many collisions like this for the debris numbers to rise dramatically, and more debris means a greater risk of collisions. In Gravity the cascade happens very quickly, triggered by a single event. The reality is not quite so grave. Instead of happening overnight, Kessler syndrome would occur gradually, raising collision risks to the point where certain orbits become logistically impractical. It could occur so gradually that we might not notice it early on, and there are some that argue it’s already underway.

The good news is that we’re aware of the threat. And, as the old saying goes, knowing is half the battle. Already we take steps to limit the amount of debris created. New spacecraft include end of life plans to remove them from orbit, either by sending them into Earths atmosphere to burn up, or sending them to a “graveyard orbit” that poses little risk to other spacecraft. There are also plans on the drawing board to clear orbits of debris, particularly in low-Earth orbit where the risk is greatest. The cascade effect is a real risk, but it’s also one we can likely manage with a bit of ingenuity.

#### Collision risk is infinitesimally small

Fange 17 Daniel Von Fange 17, Web Application Engineer, Founder and Owner of LeanCoder, Full Stack, Polyglot Web Developer, “Kessler Syndrome is Over Hyped”, 5/21/2017, http://braino.org/essays/kessler\_syndrome\_is\_over\_hyped/

The orbital area around earth can be broken down into four regions. Low LEO - Up to about 400km. Things that orbit here burn up in the earth’s atmosphere quickly - between a few months to two years. The space station operates at the high end of this range. It loses about a kilometer of altitude a month and if not pushed higher every few months, would soon burn up. For all practical purposes, Low LEO doesn’t matter for Kessler Syndrome. If Low LEO was ever full of space junk, we’d just wait a year and a half, and the problem would be over. High LEO - 400km to 2000km. This where most heavy satellites and most space junk orbits. The air is thin enough here that satellites only go down slowly, and they have a much farther distance to fall. It can take 50 years for stuff here to get down. This is where Kessler Syndrome could be an issue. Mid Orbit - GPS satellites and other navigation satellites travel here in lonely, long lives. The volume of space is so huge, and the number of satellites so few, that we don’t need to worry about Kessler here. GEO - If you put a satellite far enough out from earth, the speed that the satellite travels around the earth will match the speed of the surface of the earth rotating under it. From the ground, the satellite will appear to hang motionless. Usually the geostationary orbit is used by big weather satellites and big TV broadcasting satellites. (This apparent motionlessness is why satellite TV dishes can be mounted pointing in a fixed direction. You can find approximate south just by looking around at the dishes in your northern hemisphere neighborhood.) For Kessler purposes, GEO orbit is roughly a ring 384,400 km around. However, all the satellites here are moving the same direction at the same speed - debris doesn’t get free velocity from the speed of the satellites. Also, it’s quite expensive to get a satellite here, and so there aren’t many, only about one satellite per 1000km of the ring. Kessler is not a problem here. How bad could Kessler Syndrome in High LEO be? Let’s imagine a worst case scenario. An evil alien intelligence chops up everything in High LEO, turning it into 1cm cubes of death orbiting at 1000km, spread as evenly across the surface of this sphere as orbital mechanics would allow. Is humanity cut off from space? I’m guessing the world has launched about 10,000 tons of satellites total. For guessing purposes, I’ll assume 2,500 tons of satellites and junk currently in High LEO. If satellites are made of aluminum, with a density of 2.70 g/cm3, then that’s 839,985,870 1cm cubes. A sphere for an orbit of 1,000km has a surface area of 682,752,000 square KM. So there would be one cube of junk per .81 square KM. If a rocket traveled through that, its odds of hitting that cube are tiny - less than 1 in 10,000.

#### Uncertainty from debris collisions creates restraint not instability.

MacDonald 16, B., et al. "Crisis stability in space: China and other challenges." Foreign Policy Institute. Washington, DC (2016). (senior director of the Nonproliferation and Arms Control Project with the Center for Conflict Analysis and Prevention)//Elmer

In any crisis that threatens to escalate into major power conflict, political and military leaders will face uncertainty about the effectiveness of their plans and decisions. This uncertainty will be compounded when potential conflict extends to the space and cyber domains, where weapon effectiveness is largely untested and uncertain, infrastructure interdependencies are unclear, and damaging an adversary could also harm oneself or one’s allies. Unless the stakes become very high, no country will likely want to gamble its well-being in a “single cosmic throw of the dice,” in Harold Brown’s memorable phrase. 96 The novelty of space and cyber warfare, coupled with risk aversion and worst-case assessments, could lead space adversaries into a situation of what can be called “hysteresis,” where each adversary is restrained by its own uncertainty of success. This is conceptually shown in Figures 1 and 2 for offensive counter-space capabilities, though it applies more generally. 97 These graphs portray the hypothetical differences between perceived and actual performance capabilities of offensive counter-space weapons, on a scale from zero to one hundred percent effectiveness. Where uncertainty and risk aversion are absent for two adversaries, no difference would exist between the likely performance of their offensive counter-space assets and their confidence in the performance of those weapons: a simple, straight-line correlation would exist, as in Figure 1. The more interesting, and more realistic, case is notionally presented in Figure 2, which assumes for simplicity that the offensive capabilities of each adversary are comparable. In stark contrast to the case of Figure 1, uncertainty and risk aversion are present and become important factors. Given the high stakes involved in a possible large-scale attack against adversary space assets, a cautious adversary is more likely to be conservative in estimating the effectiveness of its offensive capabilities, while more generously assessing the capabilities of its adversary. Thus, if both side’s weapons were 50% effective and each side had a similar level of risk aversion, each may conservatively assess its own capabilities to be 30% effective and its adversary’s weapons to be 70% effective. Likewise, if each side’s weapons were 25% effective in reality, each would estimate its own capabilities to be less than 25% effective and its adversary’s to be more than 25% effective, and so on. In Figure 2, this difference appears, in oversimplified fashion, as a gap that represents the realistic worry that a country’s own weapons will under-perform while its adversary’s weapons will over-perform in terms of effectiveness. If both countries face comparable uncertainty and exhibit comparable risk aversion, each may be deterred from initiating an attack by its unwillingness to accept the necessary risks. This gap could represent an “island of stability,” as shown in Figure 2. In essence, given the enormous stakes involved in a major strike against the adversary’s space assets, a potential attacker will likely demonstrate some risk aversion, possessing less confidence in an attack’s effectiveness. It is uncertain how robust this hysteresis may prove to be, but the phenomenon may provide at least some stabilizing influence in a crisis. In the nuclear domain, the immediate, direct consequences of military use, including blast, fire, and direct radiation effects, were appreciated at the outset. Nonetheless, significant uncertainty and under-appreciation persisted with regard to the collateral, indirect, and climatological effects of using such weapons on a large scale. In contrast, the immediate, direct effects of major space conflict are not well understood, and potential indirect and interdependent effects are even less understood. Indirect effects of large-scale space and cyber warfare would be virtually impossible to confidently calculate, as the infrastructures such warfare would affect are constantly changing in design and technology. Added to this is a likely anxiety that if an attack were less successful than planned, a highly aggrieved and powerful adversary could retaliate in unanticipated ways, possibly with highly destructive consequences. As a result, two adversaries facing potential conflict may lack confidence both in the potential effectiveness of their own attacks and in the ineffectiveness of any subsequent retaliation. Such mutual uncertainty would ultimately be stabilizing, though probably not particularly robust. This is reflected in Figure 2, where each side shows more caution than the technical effectiveness of its systems may suggest. Each curve notionally represents one state’s confidence in its offensive counter-space effectiveness relative to their actual effectiveness. Until true space asset resilience becomes a trusted feature of space architectures, deterrence by risk aversion, and cross-domain deterrence, may be the only means for deterrence to function in space.

#### No Escalation over Satellites:

#### Planning Priorities

Bowen 18 Bleddyn Bowen 2-20-2018 “The Art of Space Deterrence” <https://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/commentary/the-art-of-space-deterrence/> (Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Leicester)//Elmer

Space is often an afterthought or a miscellaneous ancillary in the grand strategic views of top-level decision-makers. A president may not care that one satellite may be lost or go dark; it may cause panic and Twitter-based hysteria for the space community, of course. But the terrestrial context and consequences, as well as the political stakes and symbolism of any exchange of hostilities in space matters more. The political and media dimension can magnify or minimise the perceived consequences of losing specific satellites out of all proportion to their actual strategic effect.

#### Military Precedent

Zarybnisky 18, Eric J. Celestial Deterrence: Deterring Aggression in the Global Commons of Space. Naval War College Newport United States, 2018. (Senior Materiel Leader at United States Air Force)//Elmer

PREVENTING AGGRESSION IN SPACE While deterrence and the Cold War are strongly linked in the public’s mind through the nuclear standoff between the United States and the Soviet Union, the fundamentals of deterrence date back millennia and deterrence remains relevant. Thucydides alludes to the concept of deterrence in his telling of the Peloponnesian War when he describes rivals seeking advantages, such as recruiting allies, to dissuade an adversary from starting or expanding a conflict.6F 6 Aggression in space was successfully avoided during the Cold War because both sides viewed an attack on military satellites as highly escalatory, and such an action would likely result in general nuclear war.7F 7 In today’s more nuanced world, attacking satellites, including military satellites, does not necessarily result in nuclear war. For instance, foreign countries have used highpowered lasers against American intelligence-gathering satellites8F 8 and the United States has been reluctant to respond, let alone retaliate with nuclear weapons. This shift in policy is a result of the broader use of gray zone operations, to which countries struggle to respond while limiting escalation. Beginning with the fundamentals of deterrence illuminates how it applies to prevention of aggression in space.

#### No space war – it’s hype and systems are redundant

Johnson-Freese and Hitchens 16 [Dr. Joan Johnson-Freese is a member of the Breaking Defense Board of Contributors, a Professor of National Security Affairs at the Naval War College and author of Space Warfare in the 21st Century: Arming the Heavens. Views expressed are those of the author alone. Theresa Hitchens is a Senior Research Scholar at the Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland (CISSM), and the former Director of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) in Geneva, Switzerland. Stop The Fearmongering Over War In Space: The Sky’s Not Falling, Part 1. December 27, 2016. https://breakingdefense.com/2016/12/stop-the-fearmongering-over-war-in-space-the-skys-not-falling-part-1/]

In the last two years, we’ve seen rising hysteria over a future war in space. Fanning the flames are not only dire assessments from the US military, but also breathless coverage from a cooperative and credulous press. This reporting doesn’t only muddy public debate over whether we really need expensive systems. It could also become a self-fulfilling prophecy. The irony is that nothing makes the currently slim possibility of war in space more likely than fearmongering over the threat of war in space.

Two television programs in the past two years show how egregious this fearmongering can get. In April 2015, the CBS show 60 Minutes ran a segment called “The Battle Above.” In an interview with General John Hyten, the then-chief of U.S. Air Force Space Command, it came across loud and clear that the United States was being forced to prepare for a battle in space — specifically against China — that it really didn’t want.

It was explained by Hyten and other guests that China is building a considerable amount of hardware and accumulating significant know-how regarding space, all threatening to space assets Americans depend on every day. If viewers weren’t frightened after watching the segment, it wasn’t for lack of trying on the part of CBS.

Using terms like “offensive counterspace” as a 1984 NewSpeak euphemism for “weapons,” it was made clear that the United States had no choice but to spend billions of dollars on offensive counterspace technology to not just thwart the Chinese threat, but control and dominate space. While it didn’t actually distort facts — just omit facts about current U.S. space capabilities — the segment was basically a cost-free commercial for the military-industrial complex.

In retrospect though, “The Battle Above” was pretty good compared to CNN’s recent special, War in Space: The Next Battlefield. The latter might as well have been called Sharknado in Space – because the only far-out weapons technology our potential adversaries don’t have, according to the broadcast, seems to be “sharks with frickin’ laser beams attached to their heads!”

First, CNN needs to hire some fact checkers. Saying “unlike its adversaries, the U.S. has not yet weaponized space” is deeply misleading, like saying “unlike his political opponents, President-Elect Donald Trump has not sprouted wings and flown away”: A few (admittedly alarming) weapons tests aside, no country in the world has yet weaponized space. Contrary to CNN, stock market transactions are not timed nor synchronized through GPS, but a closed system. Cruise missiles can find their targets even without GPS, because they have both GPS and precision inertial measurement units onboard, and IMUs don’t rely on satellite data. Oh, and the British rock group Pink Floyd holds the only claim to the Dark Side of the Moon: There is a “far side” of the Moon — the side always turned away from the Earth — but not a “dark side” — which would be a side always turned away from the Sun.

More nefariously, the segment sensationalized nuggets of truth within a barrage of half-truths, backed by a heavy bass, dramatic soundtrack (and gravelly-voiced reporter Jim Sciutto) and accompanied by sexy and scary visuals.

Make no mistake there are dangers in space, and the United States has the most to lose if space assets are lost. The question is how best to protect them. Here are a few facts CNN omitted.

The Reality

The U.S. has all of the technologies described on the CNN segment and deemed potentially offensive: maneuverable satellites, nano-satellites, lasers, jamming capabilities, robotic arms, ballistic missiles that can be used as anti-satellite weapons, etc. In fact, the United States is more technologically advanced than other countries in both military and commercial space.

That technological superiority scares other countries; just as the U.S. military space community is scared of other countries obtaining those technologies in the future. The U.S. military space budget is more than 10 times greater than that of all the countries in the world combined. That also causes other countries concern.

More unsettling still, the United States has long been leery of treaty-based efforts to constrain a potential arms race in outer space, as supported by nearly every other country in the world for decades. Indeed, under the administration of George W. Bush, the U.S. talking points centered on the mantra “there is no arms race in outer space,” so there is no need for diplomat instruments to constrain one. Now, a decade later, the U.S. military – backed by the Intelligence Community which operates the nation’s spy satellites – seems to be shouting to the rooftops that the United States is in danger of losing the space arms race already begun by its potential adversaries. The underlying assumption — a convenient one for advocates of more military spending — is that now there is nothing that diplomacy can do.

However, it must be remembered that most space-related technologies – with the exception of ballistic missiles and dedicated jammers – have both military and civil/commercial uses; both benign — indeed, helpful — and nefarious uses. For example, giving satellites the ability to maneuver on orbit can allow useful inspections of ailing satellites and possibly even repairs.

Further, the United States is not unable to protect its satellites, as repeated during the CNN broadcast by various interviewees and the host. Many U.S. government-owned satellites, including precious spy satellites, have capabilities to maneuver. Many are hardened against electro-magnetic pulse, sport “shutters” to protect optical “eyes” from solar flares and lasers, and use radio frequency hopping to resist jamming.

Offensive weapons, deployed on the ground to attack satellites, or in space, are not a silver bullet. To the contrary, U.S. deployment of such weapons may actually be detrimental to U.S. and international security in space (as we argued in a recent Atlantic Council publication, Towards a New National Security Space Strategy). Further, there are benefits to efforts started by the Obama Administration to find diplomatic tools to restrain and constrain dangerous military activities in space.

These diplomatic efforts, however, would be undercut by a full-out U.S. pursuit of “space dominance.” This includes dialogue with China, the lack of which Gen. William Shelton, retired commander of Air Force Space Command, lamented in the CNN report.

Given CNN’s “cast,” the spin was not surprising. Starting with Ghost Fleet author Peter Singer set the sensationalist tone, which never altered. The apocalyptic opening, inspired by Ghost Fleet, posited a scenario where all U.S. satellites are taken off-line in nearly one fell swoop. Unless we are talking about an alien invasion, that scenario is nigh on impossible. No potential adversary has such capabilities, nor will they ever likely do so. There is just too much redundancy in the system.

#### MAD checks space escalation – nuclear response and debris

Bowen 18 [Bleddyn Bowen, Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Leicester. The Art of Space Deterrence. February 20, 2018. https://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/commentary/the-art-of-space-deterrence/]

Fourth, the ubiquity of space infrastructure and the fragility of the space environment may create a degree of existential deterrence. As space is so useful to modern economies and military forces, a large-scale disruption of space infrastructure may be so intuitively escalatory to decision-makers that there may be a natural caution against a wholesale assault on a state’s entire space capabilities because the consequences of doing so approach the mentalities of total war, or nuclear responses if a society begins tearing itself apart because of the collapse of optimised energy grids and just-in-time supply chains. In addition, the problem of space debris and the political-legal hurdles to conducting debris clean-up operations mean that even a handful of explosive events in space can render a region of Earth orbit unusable for everyone. This could caution a country like China from excessive kinetic intercept missions because its own military and economy is increasingly reliant on outer space, but perhaps not a country like North Korea which does not rely on space. The usefulness, sensitivity, and fragility of space may have some existential deterrent effect. China’s catastrophic anti-satellite weapons test in 2007 is a valuable lesson for all on the potentially devastating effect of kinetic warfare in orbit.

#### Colonization’s coming within the century

Reedy 17 [Christiana Reedy, Futurism editor. When Will the First Human Space Colony Be Established? August 17, 2017. https://futurism.com/when-will-the-first-human-space-colony-be-established]

Will humanity be ready to colonize space before doomsday? We asked Futurism readers when they thought humans will colonize off-planet, and the results revealed quite a consensus. More than 70 percent of people who took the poll thought a colony will be established during the first half of the 21st century, and the decade with the most votes — a whopping 36 percent of participants — was the 2030s. Satish Varma, a software engineer, explained why he voted for this decade. Varma wrote in his response that our technological advances in spacecraft design, artificial intelligence (AI), and bionics will be the driving forces that finally propel us into space long term. “Currently there are some promising advances in space exploration and artificial intelligence by companies like SpaceX, Google, and Tesla in a short time frame,” Varma wrote. Varma’s observations are right on — both SpaceX and Blue Origin have recently reached significant milestones in developing reusable rockets, which will be key in making space travel economically viable. Google has recently developed an AI that can learn almost as fast as we can, making the technology much more promising for real-world applications, like flying spaceships. What The Experts Have To Say The technologies have enticed governments and companies around the world to take the idea of space colonization seriously. The two most popular targets for human occupation are currently Mars and the Moon. The Moon gets a little less attention these days, but scientists have estimated that we could build a colony there over the pan of six years and for as little as $10 billion. The Chinese and European space agencies are carefully examining the possibility of a Moon base, as such a resource would greatly reduce the cost of traveling to other planets — including Mars. On the Mars front, the United Arab Emirates (UAE) has announced its intention to establish a settlement on the Red Planet by 2117. Other nations are likely to beat the UAE in reaching this goal, however, as the U.S. government has tasked NASA with getting humans on Mars by 2033, and China has set an even more ambitions goal: by the end of the decade. These government efforts align with readers’ predictions. But SpaceX CEO Elon Musk hopes to prove just how much more efficient private companies are than government bureaucracies. His plan, too, is to send humans to Mars by 2020, but that isn’t his only goal. He wants to make travel to the Red Planet affordable, setting the price cap at $200,000 in his new plan that focuses on establishing a self-sustaining space civilization rather than a simple exploratory expedition. Such an establishment will be paramount to the future of the human species, Musk said. “History suggests there will be some doomsday event, and I would hope you would agree that becoming a multi-planetary species would be the right way to go,” Musk said at a press conference last year. “I want to make Mars seem possible… like something that we can do in our lifetimes.” With all these efforts to get humans off world over the course of the next few decades, it seems like a good bet a Martian colony is not only something this generation could see, but something it will.

#### The Private Industry is the only avenue for Space Colonization – Governments have no incentive and are bound by I-Law.

Eure 16 (, J., 2016. Space… the final frontier. [online] Campbell Law Observer. Available at: <http://campbelllawobserver.com/space-the-final-frontier/> [Accessed 28 December 2021] Jonathan Eure is a 2017 graduate of Campbell Law School, winner of the 2017 J. Bryan Boyd Award for Excellence in Legal Journalism, and served as a senior staff writer for the Campbell Law Observer. He lived in Morganton, in the foothills of North Carolina, before moving to Raleigh for law school. He earned BA’s in Political Science and History from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, graduating in 2014. The summer after his first year of law school, Jonathan worked as a legislative research intern with Representative Rob Bryan in the North Carolina General Assembly. Jonathan now interns with the Honorable Paul Newby at the North Carolina Supreme Court. Jonathan is the Secretary for the Campbell Public Interest Law Student Association (CPILSA).)-rahulpenu

Space… the final frontier With the recent discovery of a new earth-like planet, many countries are beginning serious talks about inhabiting and colonizing a planet in outer space. We very soon might turn on the news and hear stories of interstellar exploration and colonization. We might even hear about voyages of a starship named Enterprise. This probably sounds like wild speculation, or the contents of a cheesy science fiction novel. However, after a European research team announced the discovery of an earth-like planet circling the inhabitable zone of Proxima Centauri in August, 2016, we may soon see more discussions of the logistics and technology required to reach out into the stars. The part of that discussion we ultimately must address is the legal ramifications of colonization, essentially what are the laws to which nations and private individuals must adhere, when claiming portions of a new planet, moon, or asteroid. Proxima Centauri is the closest star to our own, lying a mere 4.54 light years from the Sun. In interstellar terms, that is a stone’s throw away, though clearly still an impossible journey for a civilization who has yet to visit another planet in our own Solar System. Still, Proxima Centauri’s vicinity to Earth has garnered a fair amount of interest from parties who hope to discover an inhabitable, one day reachable, planet. Guillem Anglada-Escudé led a research team of 31 scientists from eight different countries for months studying Proxima Centauri through the European Southern Observatory’s HARPS spectrograph and 3.6 meter telescope in La Silla, Chile. While investigating a tiny wobble Proxima Centauri experiences, the team discovered that the cause of the wobble is an Earthlike planet, promptly named “Proxima b.” “…overall, Proxima b is the best opportunity we have ever had for an inhabitable planet that may be reachable in the foreseeable future.” To be classified as “Earthlike,” Proxima b was studied based on likely mass, position, and orbit around Proxima Centauri, and the effects of Proxima Centauri on Proxima b. The researchers believe Proxima b has a similar mass to Earth, possibly indicating a similar, rocky makeup. Though Proxima Centauri, as a red dwarf star, releases less energy than our Sun, Proxima b is located in the so-called “goldilocks zone” of Proxima Centauri; in other words, not too hot, not too cold. Therefore, the researchers believe the basic elements for human life, heat, oxygen, and water could exist on Proxima b. There is some concern that the amount of solar radiation expelled by Proxima Centauri could make Proxima b uninhabitable, but overall, Proxima b is the best opportunity we have ever had for an inhabitable planet that may be reachable in the foreseeable future. “A ratified treaty is then given the full force of domestic law in the U.S., and the U.S. government would generally be bound to uphold the tenets of that treaty. Being bound to a treaty in this case means the U.S. could not claim any portion of Proxima b as U.S. property.” Obviously we have to get there first, and at this very moment, some of the most brilliant minds on Earth are attempting to develop interstellar travel. Ideas such as asteroid mining and economic incentives of resources available in space are already pushing us toward the day when we might visit another planet. Once we do, our current legal framework may make colonization difficult, at least on a national level. The best starting place for understanding space law is the “Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies,” better known as the “Outer Space Treaty.” Signed in 1967 by the member nations of the UN, including space race powerhouses the U.S. and U.S.S.R., the Outer Space Treaty created a series of broad principles controlling the manner in which nations would explore space. These principles include provisions that exploration is permitted in all states, that no celestial bodies may be appropriated by individual states, that nations take responsibility for the environments of space and celestial bodies, and that non-governmental space activities must be authorized and continually supervised by the states which have jurisdiction over such activities. In order to have ratified such a treaty in the U.S., the President would have sent the treaty to Congress for their “advice and consent,” and the treaty would have to be approved by a two-thirds majority. The treaty would then be sent back to the President to be ratified, as described in Article II, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution. A ratified treaty is then given the full force of domestic law in the U.S., and the U.S. government would generally be bound to uphold the tenets of that treaty. Being bound to a treaty in this case means the U.S. could not claim any portion of Proxima b as U.S. property. Fortunately, this is also true for Russia and China, the U.S.’s primary competitors in space, and none of these nations can violate the treaty without risking adverse reactions from the others. The Outer Space Treaty is the only one of the U.N.’s treaties on outer space to which the U.S. or any other major space-faring nation belongs, and is therefore the only treaty that really matters, though the U.N. has passed other resolutions on the issue. “**Private** **exploration** of space **becomes** **more** of a **reality** each day, with private corporations such as SpaceX, Blue Origin, and Virgin Galactic testing **new** **platforms** for space travel.” As a policy matter, though the **O**uter **S**pace **T**reaty uses lofty ideals to **bind** **nations** into mutual respect and perhaps even unity of purpose, focusing solely on those ideals discounts a key ingredient of the original space race. Promulgation of national ideology was the original motivator of the space race between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. Without national ideology, prestige, or power as a motivating factor, there is really **no** **incentive** **for** the **governments** of major spacefaring nations **to** **spend** massive amounts of money over long periods of time **on** such risky endeavors as space **colonization**. For this reason, the **colonization** of Proxima b would more likely **fall** **to** private **corporations** with much to gain from the resources other worlds might offer. Private exploration of space becomes more of a reality each day, with private corporations such as SpaceX, Blue Origin, and Virgin Galactic testing new platforms for space travel. A **movement** has **grown** **up** **alongside** these private spacefaring **companies** **claiming** planets such as Proxima b might become a **new** **frontier**,

where private citizens can stake their own personal claims. This movement has even **proposed** **legislation** in Congress. The “Space Settlement Prize Act,” which would **ultimately** **guarantee** that **any** **settlement** built privately on other planets, moons, asteroids, etc., would be **owned** **by** the private citizens or **corporations** **who** **claim** **them**. This act would likely function similarly to the Homestead Acts, which allowed settlers who worked unclaimed land, to buy that land at very little cost. Furthermore, these groups claim that they are **not** **subject** **to** the **O**uter **S**pace **T**reaty, as the treaty’s provisions only govern nations. “The language of the Outer Space Treaty does not forbid private claims on and settlement of celestial bodies, only national appropriations. Furthermore, nations themselves are answerable in case of any environmental damages.” It is an interesting theory, and these 21st century frontiersmen and women might be correct. The Outer Space Treaty does not only govern nations themselves, but national oversight of non-governmental organizations as well. As all private attempts at space colonization on Proxima b and any other celestial body would be through corporate entities. These corporate entities would certainly fall under the national mandate to authorize and continually supervise the operation of such groups. But just because governments must have some form of oversight in place to manage private space exploration corporations, does not mean there is a mandate to control the legal operation of such corporations. The language of the Outer Space Treaty does not forbid private claims on and settlement of celestial bodies, only national appropriations. Furthermore, nations themselves are answerable in case of any environmental damages. Nations can certainly pass laws regulating the actions of private corporations consistent with the Outer Space Treaty’s mandate, and in fact the U.S. is already considering and attempting to create policies governing private space craft and travel. The problem is that none of this law has become official yet. The reality behind this entire discussion is that it will not become truly important until either nations or private corporations prove they can travel to another planet. Until then, the laws of space colonization are nothing more than an academic exercise. However, they have been proven important in one sense: protection of our moon. Prohibitions on national appropriation, military use, or exploitation have certainly been effective in keeping the moon unmolested (though technological and financial constraints also played a major role). So perhaps there is a reasonable groundwork for the future laws of space colonization. Proxima b may not be the first place they are exercised, but the discovery of a relatively nearby Earthlike planet is sure to hasten the need for such laws to be in place before we land. The law now needs to boldly go where no law has gone before.

#### Space colonization is key to ensure human survival – pursuing it as soon as possible is crucial

Kovic 18 (Marko Kovic, co-founder and president of the thinktank [ZIPAR](https://kovic.ch/zipar/), the Zurich Institute of Public Affairs Research. He is also co-founder and CEO of the consulting firm [ars cognitionis](https://kovic.ch/consulting-ars-cognitionis/),. He has a PhD in political communication, University of Zurich.)(“Why space colonization is so important”, Nov 10, 2018, https://medium.com/@marko\_kovic/space-colonization-why-nothing-else-matters-a877723f77d4)//ASMITH

Should humankind exist in the future? Should the future existence of humankind be as good as possible in as many ways as possible? If your answer to these two questions is Yes, then there is a topic that you should care about a lot: Space colonization. Why, you might wonder, does space colonization matter, possibly more than anything else, as the title of this article claims? Because the future of humankind directly and completely dependent on whether and how we manage to colonize space. Space colonization is a double-edged sword. On one hand, the creation of permanent and self-sustainable human habitats beyond Earth is unavoidable if humankind is to exist in the long-term future. On the other hand, however, space colonization could bring about a catastrophically bad future if we colonize space in a bad way. That future that might be worse than one in which humankind does not exist. Space or bust: Why we must reach for the stars Why should we pursue space colonization in the first place? Don’t we have more pressing problems today, on Earth? Yes, we do have many problems on Earth today, and we should try to solve them. But space colonization is just that: A strategy for dealing with certain problems. An the problems that space colonization would be dealing with are, arguably, among the greatest problems of them all: Existential risks; risks that might lead to the extinction of humankind [1]. Currently, all of our proverbial existential eggs are in the same basket. If a natural existential risk strikes (for example, a large asteroid colliding with Earth) or if a man-made existential risk results in a catastrophic outcome (for example, runaway global warming [2, 3]), all of humankind is at risk because humankind is currently limited to planet Earth. If, however, there are self-sustainable human habitats beyond Earth, then the probability of an irreversibly catastrophic outcome for all of humankind is drastically reduced. Investing in space colonization today could therefore have immense future benefits. Using resources today in order to make space colonization possible in the medium-term future is not a waste, but a very profitable investment. If humankind stays limited to Earth and if we go extinct as a consequence of doing so, then we will all the billions of life years and billions of humans who might have come to exist — and who would have experienced happiness and contributed to humankind’s continued epistemic and moral progress. Taking space colonization more seriously today does not, of course, mean that we should only pursue space colonization and ignore everything else that is bad in the world. We should continue dealing with current global problems and, at the same time, invest greater resources into space colonization. At this point in our history and our technological development, even modest amounts of resources directed at space colonization would go a long way, such as public funding of basic research. Additionally, it is very likely that technological advances in the domain of space colonization would improve our lives in other ways as well thanks to technology transfer [4] — investing in space colonization today would probably be a win-win situation. So the situation seems clear: We must pursue space colonization and try to spread beyond Earth as fast as possible. Unfortunately, there is a catch: Yes, we must colonize space if humankind is to survive, but space colonization itself is very risky. So much so that bad outcomes of space colonization might be even worse for humankind than “merely” going extinct.