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### 1

#### 1] Interp – the Affirmative must only defend that appropriation of outer space is unjust.

#### a] Private entities are non-governmental.

Dunk 11 Von Der Dunk, Frans G. "1. The Origins Of Authorisation: Article VI Of The Outer Space Treaty And International Space Law." National Space Legislation in Europe. Brill Nijhoff, 2011. 3-28. (University of Nebraska)//Elmer

4. Interpreting Article VI of the Outer Space Treaty One main novel feature of Article VI stood out with reference to the role of private enterprise in this context. Contrary to the version o fthe concept applicable under general international law, where 'direct state responsibility' only pertained to acts somehow directly attributable to a state and states could only be addressed for acts by private actors under 'indirect', 'due care' / 'due diligence' responsibility18, Article VI made no difference as to whether the activities at issue were the state's own ("whether such activities are carried on by governmental agencies" ...) or those of private actors (... "or by non-governmental entities"). The interests of the Soviet Union in ensuring that, whomever would actually conduct a certain space activity, some state or other could be held responsible for its compliance with applicable rules of space law to that extent had prevailed. However, the general acceptance of Article VI as cornerstone of the Outer Space Treaty unfortunately was far from the end of the story. Partly, this was the consequence of key principles being left undefined.

#### b] Unjust refers to a negative action – it means contrary.

Black Laws No Date "What is Unjust?" <https://thelawdictionary.org/unjust/> //Elmer

Contrary to right and justice, or to the enjoyment of his rights by another, or to the standards of conduct furnished by the laws.

#### 2] Violation – the Affirmative defends a new, multi-lateral agreement between states which is beyond the scope of the resolution.

#### 3] Standards – Effects and Extra-T which are voters for predictable limits and ground – allowing the Aff to defend implementation through any number of agreements/mechanisms explodes predictable limits – it shifts the topic to not appropriation good/bad but how we should end it which skews pre-tournament prep. Allowing them to be Effects-T gives them unlimited advantage ground like multilateral governance good or PTD perception spill-over which skews our ground since they could say our particular mechanism side-steps your links.

#### 4] TVA – just defend space mining being bad without the multilateral governance part of the plan.

#### 5] Paradigm Issues –

#### a] Topicality is Drop the Debater – it’s a fundamental baseline for debate-ability.

#### b] Use Competing Interps – 1] Topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical and 2] Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### c] No RVI’s - 1] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, 2] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and 3] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive.

### 2

#### Commercial mining solves extinction from scarcity, climate, terror, war, and disease.

Pelton 17—(Director Emeritus of the Space and Advanced Communications Research Institute at George Washington University, PHD in IR from Georgetown).. Pelton, Joseph N. 2017. The New Gold Rush: The Riches of Space Beckon! Springer. Accessed 8/30/19.

Are We Humans Doomed to Extinction? What will we do when Earth’s resources are used up by humanity? The world is now hugely over populated, with billions and billions crammed into our overcrowded cities. By 2050, we may be 9 billion strong, and by 2100 well over 11 billion people on Planet Earth. Some at the United Nations say we might even be an amazing 12 billion crawling around this small globe. And over 80 % of us will be living in congested cities. These cities will be ever more vulnerable to terrorist attack, natural disaster, and other plights that come with overcrowding and a dearth of jobs that will be fueled by rapid automation and the rise of artifi cial intelligence across the global economy. We are already rapidly running out of water and minerals. Climate change is threatening our very existence. Political leaders and even the Pope have cautioned us against inaction. Perhaps the naysayers are right. All humanity is at tremendous risk. Is there no hope for the future? This book is about hope. We think that there is literally heavenly hope for humanity. But we are not talking here about divine intervention. We are envisioning a new space economy that recognizes that there is more water in the skies that all our oceans. Th ere is a new wealth of natural resources and clean energy in the reaches of outer space—more than most of us could ever dream possible. There are those that say why waste money on outer space when we have severe problems here at home? Going into space is not a waste of money. It is our future. It is our hope for new jobs and resources. The great challenge of our times is to reverse public thinking to see space not as a resource drain but as the doorway to opportunity. The new space frontier can literally open up a “gold rush in the skies.” In brief, we think there is new hope for humanity. We see a new a pathway to the future via new ventures in space. For too long, space programs have been seen as a money pit. In the process, we have overlooked the great abundance available to us in the skies above. It is important to recognize there is already the beginning of a new gold rush in space—a pathway to astral abundance. “New Space” is a term increasingly used to describe radical new commercial space initiatives—many of which have come from Silicon Valley and often with backing from the group of entrepreneurs known popularly as the “space billionaires.” New space is revolutionizing the space industry with lower cost space transportation and space systems that represent significant cost savings and new technological breakthroughs. “New Commercial Space” and the “New Space Economy” represent more than a new way of looking at outer space. These new pathways to the stars could prove vital to human survival. If one does not believe in spending money to probe the mysteries of the universe then perhaps we can try what might be called “calibrated greed” on for size. One only needs to go to a cubesat workshop, or to Silicon Valley or one of many conferences like the “Disrupt Space” event in Bremen, Germany, held in April 2016 to recognize that entrepreneurial New Space initiatives are changing everything [ 1 ]. In fact, the very nature and dimensions of what outer space activities are today have changed forever. It is no longer your grandfather’s concept of outer space that was once dominated by the big national space agencies. The entrepreneurs are taking over. The hopeful statements in this book and the hard economic and technical data that backs them up are more than a minority opinion. It is a topic of growing interest at the World Economic Forum, where business and political heavyweights meet in Davos, Switzerland, to discuss how to stimulate new patterns of global economic growth. It is even the growing view of a group that call themselves “space ethicists.” Here is how Christopher J. Newman, at the University of Sunderland in the United Kingdom has put it: Space ethicists have offered the view that space exploration is not only desirable; it is a duty that we, as a species, must undertake in order to secure the survival of humanity over the longer term. Expanding both the resource base and, eventually, the habitats available for humanity means that any expenditure on space exploration, far from being viewed as frivolous, can legitimately be rationalized as an ethical investment choice. (Newman) On the other hand there are space ethicists and space exobiologists who argue that humans have created ecological ruin on the planet—and now space debris is starting to pollute space. Th ese countervailing thoughts by the “no growth” camp of space ethicists say we have no right to colonize other planets or to mine the Moon and asteroids—or at least no right to do so until we can prove we can sustain life here on Earth for the longer term. However, for most who are planning for the new space economy the opinion of space philosophers doesn’t really fl oat their boat. Legislators, bankers, and aspiring space entrepreneurs are far more interested in the views of the super-rich capitalists called the space billionaires. A number of these billionaires and space executives have already put some very serious money into enterprises intent on creating a new pathway to the stars. No less than five billionaires with established space ventures—Elon Musk, Paul Allen, Jeff Bezos, Sir Richard Branson, and Robert Bigelow—have invested millions if not billions of dollars into commercializing space. They are developing new technologies and establishing space enterprises that can bring the wealth of outer space down to Earth. This is not a pipe dream, but will increasingly be the economic reality of the 2020s. These wealthy space entrepreneurs see major new economic opportunities. To them space represents the last great frontier for enterprising pioneers. Th us they see an ever-expanding space frontier that offers opportunities in low-cost space transportation, satellite solar power satellites to produce clean energy 24h a day, space mining, space manufacturing and production, and eventually space habitats and colonies as a trajectory to a better human future. Some even more visionary thinkers envision the possibility of terraforming Mars, or creating new structures in space to protect our planet from cosmic hazards and even raising Earth’s orbit to escape the rising heat levels of the Sun in millennia to come. Some, of course, will say this is sci-fi hogwash. It can’t be done. We say that this is what people would have said in 1900 about airplanes, rocket ships, cell phones and nuclear devices. The skeptics laughed at Columbus and his plan to sail across the oceans to discover new worlds. When Thomas Jefferson bought the Louisiana Purchase from France or Seward bought Alaska, there were plenty of naysayers that said such investment in the unknown was an extravagant waste of money. A healthy skepticism is useful and can play a role in economic and business success. Before one dismisses the idea of an impending major new space economy and a new gold rush, it might useful to see what has already transpired in space development in just the past five decades. The world’s first geosynchronous communications satellite had a throughput capability of about 500 kb / s. In contrast, today’s state of the art Viasat 2 —a half century later— has an impressive throughput of some 140 Gb/s. Th is means that the relative throughput is nearly 300,000 greater, while its lifetime is some ten times longer (Figs. 1.1 and 1.2 ). Each new generation of communications satellite has had more power, better antenna systems, improved pointing and stabilization, and an extended lifetime. And the capabilities represented by remote sensing satellites , meteorological satellites , and navigation and timing satellites have also expanded their capabilities and performance in an impressive manner. When satellite applications first started, the market was measured in millions of dollars. Today commercial satellite services exceed a quarter of a billion dollars. Vital services such as the Internet, aircraft traffi c control and management, international banking, search and rescue and much, much more depend on application satellites. Th ose that would doubt the importance of satellites to the global economy might wish to view on You Tube the video “If Th ere Were a Day Without Satellites?” [ 2 ]. Let’s check in on what some of those very rich and smart guys think about the new space economy and its potential. (We are sorry to say that so far there are no female space billionaires, but surely this, too, will come someday soon.) Of course this twenty-fi rst century breakthrough that we call the New Space economy will not come just from new space commerce. It will also come from the amazing new technologies here on Earth. Vital new terrestrial technologies will accompany this cosmic journey into tomorrow. Information technology, robotics, artificial intelligence and commercial space travel systems have now set us on a course to allow us humans to harvest the amazing riches in the skies—new natural resources, new energy, and even totally new ways of looking at the purpose of human existence. If we pursue this course steadfastly, it can be the beginning of a New Space renaissance. But if we don’t seek to realize our ultimate destiny in space, Homo sapiens can end up in the dustbin of history—just like literally millions of already failed species. In each and every one of the five mass extinction events that have occurred over the last 1.5 billion years on Earth, some 50–80 % of all species have gone the way of the T. Rex, the woolly mammoth, and the Dodo bird along with extinct ferns, grasses and cacti. On the other hand, the best days of the human race could be just beginning. If we are smart about how we go about discovering and using these riches in the skies and applying the best of our new technologies, it could be the start of a new beginning for humanity. Konstantin Tsiokovsky, the Russian astronautics pioneer, who fi rst conceived of practical designs for spaceships, famously said: “A planet is the cradle of mankind, but one cannot live in a cradle forever.” Well before Tsiokovsky another genius, Leonardo da Vinci, said, quite poetically: “Once you have tasted flight, you will forever walk the earth with your eyes turned skyward, for there you have been, and there you will always long to return.” The founder of the X-Prize and of Planetary Resources, Inc., Dr. Peter Diamandis, has much more brashly said much the same thing in quite diff erent words when he said: “The meek shall inherit the Earth. The rest of us will go to Mars.” The New Space Billionaires Peter Diamandis is not alone in his thinking. From the list of “visionaries” quoted earlier, Elon Musk, the founder of SpaceX; Sir Richard Branson, the founder of Virgin Galactic; and Paul Allen, the co-founder of Microsoft and the man who financed SpaceShipOne, the world’s first successful spaceplane have all said the future will include a vibrant new space economy. Th ey, and others, have said that we can, we should and we soon shall go into space and realize the bounty that it can offer to us. Th e New Space enterprise is today indeed being led by those so-called space billionaires , who have an exciting vision of the future. They and others in the commercial space economy believe that the exploitation of outer space may open up a new golden age of astral abundance. They see outer space as a new frontier that can be a great source of new materials, energy and various forms of new wealth that might even save us from excesses of the past. Th is gold rush in the skies represents a new beginning. We are not talking about expensive new space ventures funded by NASA or other space agencies in Europe, Japan, China or India. No, these eff orts which we and others call New Space are today being forged by imaginative and resourceful commercial entrepreneurs. Th ese twenty-fi rst century visionaries have the fortitude and zeal to look to the abundance above. New breakthroughs in technology and New Space enterprises may be able to create an “astral life raft” for humanity. Just as Columbus and the Vikings had the imaginative drive that led them to discover the riches of a new world, we now have a cadre of space billionaires that are now leading us into this New Space era of tomorrow. These bold leaders, such as Paul Allen and Sir Richard Branson, plus other space entrepreneurs including Jeff Bezos of Amazon and Blue Origin, and Robert Bigelow, Chairman of Budget Suites and Bigelow Aerospace, not only dream of their future in the space industry but also have billions of dollars in assets. These are the bright stars of an entirely new industry that are leading us into the age of New Space commerce. These space billionaires, each in their own way, are proponents of a new age of astral abundance. Each of them is launching new commercial space industries. They are literally transforming our vision of tomorrow. These new types of entrepreneurial aerospace companies—the New Space enterprises—give new hope and new promise of transforming our world as we know it today. The New Space Frontier What happens in space in the next few decades, plus corresponding new information technologies and advanced robotics, will change our world forever. These changes will redefi ne wealth, change our views of work and employment and upend almost everything we think we know about economics, wealth, jobs, and politics. Th ese changes are about truly disruptive technologies of the most fundamental kinds. If you thought the Internet, smart phones, and spandex were disruptive technologies, just hang on. You have not seen anything yet. In short, if you want to understand a transition more fundamental than the changes brought to the twentieth century world by computers, communications and the Internet, then read this book. There are truly riches in the skies. Near-Earth asteroids largely composed of platinum and rare earth metals have an incredible value. Helium-3 isotopes accessible in outer space could provide clean and abundant energy. There is far more water in outer space than is in our oceans. In the pages that follow we will explain the potential for a cosmic shift in our global economy, our ecology, and our commercial and legal systems. These can take place by the end of this century. And if these changes do not take place we will be in trouble. Our conventional petro-chemical energy systems will fail us economically and eventually blanket us with a hydrocarbon haze of smog that will threaten our health and our very survival. Our rare precious metals that we need for modern electronic appliances will skyrocket in price, and the struggle between “haves” and “have nots” will grow increasingly ugly. A lack of affordable and readily available water, natural resources, food, health care and medical supplies, plus systematic threats to urban security and systemic warfare are the alternatives to astral abundance. The choices between astral abundance and a downward spiral in global standards of living are stark. Within the next few decades these problems will be increasingly real. By then the world may almost be begging for new, out of- the-box thinking. International peace and security will be an indispensable prerequisite for exploitation of astral abundance, as will good government for all. No one nation can be rich and secure when everyone else is poor and insecure. In short, global space security and strategic space defense, mediated by global space agreements, are part of this new pathway to the future.

#### Resource scarcity coming now and causes extinction—asteroid mining is the only way to solve

Crombrugghe 18 – Guerric, Business Development Manager Brussels, Brussels Capital Region, “Asteroid mining as a necessary answer to mineral scarcity”, LinkedIn, 1/11/2018, <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/asteroid-mining-necessary-answer-mineral-scarcity-de-crombrugghe>

We need minerals, and we always will. Yet, our reserves are finite and a 100% end-of-life recycling rate is impossible to achieve. Eventually, new entrants will therefore be required to sustain our system. While the business case for asteroid mining can obviously not be closed with current technologies, it will someday become a necessity. We may as well start preparing ourselves. Scarcity of resources, the challenge of the 21st century According to the World Bank, in 2016 humanity's growth rate was of 1.18% in terms of population, and 2.50% in terms of GDP. Both of these, in turn, drive our staggering resource consumption: there are more of us, and each of us needs more. On the other, the Earth is a closed system, and resources are only available in a finite amount. We all know by now that there is only this much oil & gas, but the same can actually be said for water, arable land, minerals, etc. These two simple observations have sparkled the debate around the scarcity of resources. Even with the best intentions, mathematics teaches us that it is impossible to indefinitely extract resources from a given finite supply [1]. The problem arising in the short-term is the exhaustion of the existing supply. That limit is actually coming in fast. In a paper published in 2007, Stephen Kessler demonstrates that the global mineral reserves are only sufficient for the next 50 years. The figure on the right shows the ratio of known global reserve to global annual consumption, given a rough indication of adequacy in years. It dates from an earlier paper, published in 1994. Since then, the development of environmental-friendly technologies (e.g. batteries, electric engines, etc.) has drastically increased the consumption rate of high-tech metals such as cobalt, platinum, rare earths, or titanium. On the other hand, exploration programs have allowed to discover new deposits, notably of gold and diamond. We will certainly be able to continue to increase - or at least sustain - our reserves, but only temporarily. Recycling and other temporary fixes An obvious solution is recycling, i.e. rejuvenating our stocks. A popular concept to illustrate this idea is that of urban mining: retrieving the ores present in smartphones and other electronic devices. It may prove to be not only more environmental-friendly, be also safer and more cost-effective. Nevertheless, every solution based on recycling is, again, nothing more than a temporary fix, buying us a finite amount of time. The United Nations Environment Programme studied in a report the current recycling rate of 60 metals. More than half of them have an end-of-life recycling rate below 1%, and less than one-third are above 50%. Nickel, for example, is relatively easy to retrieve, with and end-of-life recycling rate of up to 63% under the best conditions. At that rate, less than 1% of the initial stock is available after only 10 cycle. Even with a staggering 99% efficiency, the same 1% limit is achieved in less than 460 cycles. Not bad, of course, but still not enough. Should our hunger for resources continue, and even with the most optimised recycling techniques, a second problem will arise in the longer term: the amount of resources needed at a given time will simply exceed the total available stock. Unless we manage to find growth vectors that do not require raw materials, that tipping point is an impassable limit. Its proximity obviously depends on our consumption rate. Asteroid mining? No matter which way we look at it, we will thus be short on resources, either through sheer exhaustion (i.e. transformation in an unrecoverable form) or because the demand will exceed the total reserves. We can - and should - talk about recycling, dematerialisation, and other more ethically questionable solutions such as bio-engineering. Nonetheless, no matter how good they are, these are only temporary fixes. If we don't radically change our lifestyle, we will sooner or later have to address the elephant in the room: the Earth is a closed system, we need new entrants. How can space help? Short answer: all these minerals can be found in space. Some are difficult to obtain, others are even more difficult, none are straightforward. The most accessible destination is near-Earth asteroids, a reservoir of over 17,000 known - and counting - giant rocks that regularly cross the orbit of our planet. They are commonly classified in three main families. The most interesting one, for our case, is that of the S-type asteroids. These are metallic bodies, containing first and foremost nickel, iron and cobalt, but also gold, ores from the platinum group. But the list doesn't stop there, many other minerals can be found in smaller amounts: iridium, silver, osmium, palladium, rhenium, rhodium, ruthenium, manganese, molybdenum, aluminium, titanium, etc. How do we get there? Let's take an example: Ryugu, formerly known as 1999 JU3. It's a C-type asteroid measured to be approximately one kilometre in size [2]. In addition to nickel, iron and cobalt, it also contains a fair share of water, nitrogen, hydrogen, and ammonia. Its total value is estimated to be approximately 80 billion USD. Fantastic! But how do we get there and, most importantly, how much does it cost? Well, we may have the start of an answer to these questions. Reaching Ryugu is a technological challenge, but it is feasible. In December 2014, the Japanese space agency has launched a spacecraft, Hayabusa2, heading to the asteroid. Its mission includes the collection of a small sample which will be sent back to the Earth, with a landing planned for December 2020. The target for the sample size is at least 100 µg. The total cost of the mission was projected to be around 200 million USD. That's 2 trillion USD per gram. Let's be optimistic and assume that the sample retrieved is pure gold. At today's rate, it is worth 42.5 USD per gram. That's a difference of over 10 orders of magnitude. Some may argue that Hayabusa2 has many other objectives that retrieving a sample. The mission does indeed include multiple landers, thorough scientific investigations, etc. There is actually another asteroid sample return mission underway, which we could you as a second point of comparison: OSIRIS-Rex, from NASA. It's heading for Bennu, also a C-type asteroid, which it will reach in August 2018. Total cost of the mission: 980 million USD. Target sample size: at least 60 g. We achieve thus roughly speaking 16 million USD per gram. Better, but still 6 orders of magnitude off compared to pure gold. It's pretty much as good as it gets with existing state-of-the-art technologies. Not much of a business case. Should we forget about it? Referring back to our earlier conclusion on resource scarcity, we had two options. Either we drastically reduce our resource consumption, to such a degree that reserves can last for longer than humanity itself, or we extend our closed system, the Earth, to nearby asteroids. In the current state of affairs, I am honestly not sure which course of action is the easiest. As they get increasingly rare, the cost of minerals will go up. On the other hand, as explained in a previous article, we can expect the cost of space activities to go steadily down. Step by step, these 6 orders of magnitude will slowly get munched away from both ends, until eventually asteroid mining becomes a viable operation. In other words: it will only become financially interesting once minerals become a thousand times more expensive and space activities a thousand times cheaper. As a point of reference, the introduction of reusable rockets by SpaceX, widely considered as one of the few truly disruptive changes in the aerospace sector in the last few decades, has "only" brought a cost reduction of 30%. While it's clearly amazing, we still need at least 220 innovations of the same calibre [3] before we can make it work (again: assuming the price of minerals simultaneously goes up by a factor of a thousand). It's therefore quite likely that space mining will not take place within our lifetime [4]. How can we accelerate the process? Firstly, we can only celebrate and support the numerous private initiatives which contribute to make that reality happen, either indirectly (e.g. launchers, space systems, etc.) or directly (e.g. in-space manufacturing, lunar exploration, etc.). Shout out to all the folks who manage to keep the flame of space exploration burning while generating profit for their investors. Secondly, space agencies and other institutional actors should continue to act as promoters of pioneering mission such as Hayabusa2, OSIRIS-REx, or DART. We can only regret that the Asteroid Redirect Mission from NASA and the Asteroid Impact Mission from ESA were not funded. From my perspective, these should actually be amongst the top priorities of our space exploration agenda. Not only are they instrumental to our understanding of the solar system, but they are also essential if we want to avoid the same fate as the dinosaurs. It's a question of survival. As a bonus, they also pave the way towards cost-efficient asteroid mining. In the meantime, we might want to consume existing resources a bit more efficiently.

#### Resource Shortages Exacerbate Conflict

Wingo 13 - Dennis Wingo, Former CTO of the Orbital Recovery Corporation, Founder & CEO of Skycorp Inc, and Greentrail Energy Inc., Co-Founder & CTO of Orbital Recovery Inc. Leader of NASA's the Lunar Orbiter Image Recovery Project (LOIRP), First in history to rescue and operate a spacecraft (ISEE-3) in interplanetary space, and University of Alabama in Huntsville Consortium for Materials Development in Space Researcher At University of Alabama in Huntsville Consortium for Materials Development in Space “Commentary | The Inevitability of Extraterrestrial Mining”, *Space News*, 7/29/2013, https://spacenews.com/36511the-inevitability-of-extraterrestrial-mining/

I am honored to provide the counterpoint to my esteemed colleague Ambassador Roger Harrison’s negative contention concerning the mining of extraterrestrial materials off of planet Earth. Let’s begin with his ending: “The conclusion is inescapable, though liable to be escaped, i.e., that raw materials will never be mined in space and sold profitably within the atmosphere or anywhere else. … Asteroids will continue unvexed in their obits, and the Moon too.” I bring a different quote, from the book “Empire Express,” the story of the intercontinental railroad, from U.S. Army Lt. Zebulon Pike, for whom Pike’s Peak is named: “In various places there were tracts of many leagues, where the wind had thrown up sand in all the fanciful forms of the ocean’s rolling wave, and on which not a spear of vegetable matter existed.” Pike’s visions of sand dunes, pathless wastes and sterile soils were reported, widely read and faithfully believed by geographers. The myth became innocently embellished by subsequent visitors, especially those in the party of Maj. Stephen H. Long, who traversed the whole area in 1820. It was reported to be “an unfit residence for any but a nomad population … forever to remain the unmolested haunt of the native hunter, the bison, and the jackal.” The delicious irony is that Mr. Harrison today lives in the shadow of Pike’s Peak, and the U.S. Air Force Academy where he teaches is in the middle of the confidently prophesied unmolested haunt. When Long’s report was written, the Erie Canal across New York was five years from completion and it was another 31 years before the first railroad was completed across the state. Mr. Harrison’s technical objections are for the most part valid today for his scenario, just as objections to a railroad across the North American continent were valid in the 1820s. However, technology is being developed today that will enable extraterrestrial mining, manufacturing and development just as technology was developed that would enable the creation of the national railroad. Mr. Harrison says it is an illusion that we are running out of resources. He is correct. That is not our claim. The claim is that extraction costs of economically viable terrestrial resources are rising dramatically and may soon exceed the cost of extraction from much more plentiful extraterrestrial sources. Today rapidly advancing costs and diminishing returns are rapidly redefining mining due to diminishing ore grades. This fact is developed in a 2012 distinguished lecture by Dan Wood before the Society of Environmental Geologists, “Crucial Challenges to Discovery and Mining — Tomorrow’s Deeper Ore Bodies.” This is a vitally important issue to solve as resource conflict has been the impetus for most wars in human history. We live in a global civilization of over 7 billion people, which will expand to over 9 billion before plateauing in mid-century. While American politicians are not paying attention to what this means, the rest of the world is noticing. Gross domestic product (GDP) growth and increasing global resource demand are addressed in “Iron Ore Outlook 2050,” a report commissioned for the Indian government. The GDP of the major powers (the United States, Europe, China, India and Japan) is forecast to rise from $48 trillion in 2010 to $149 trillion by 2050. The report’s substance is that with this massive increase in global GDP, an intensifying scramble for metal resources is inevitable. If the trend of resource consumption demand increase continues unabated, there are three likely potential outcomes. The first is collapse, forecast by the “Limits to Growth” school of thought. The second and more likely scenario is fierce national economic competition leading to wars over diminishing resources. The third, and most desirable, is to increase the global resource base by the economic and industrial development of the inner solar system. Mr. Harrison uses cost as the primary reason that extraterrestrial mining will never happen by focusing on a straw man argument related to mining asteroids in orbits far from Earth. Just as the U.S. railroad infrastructure began on shorter routes with lower capital requirements and shorter payback periods, asteroid mining can begin with our nearest neighbor, the Moon, where telepresence robotics, high-bandwidth communications and a short three-day trip for humans negate his premise. We know from the Apollo samples that plentiful metallic asteroidal materials exist in the lunar highlands. We also know from several missions that extensive water, titanium, thorium, uranium, aluminum and native iron all exist on the Moon, in easily separable oxide form. Improvements in remote sensing data from current missions and computer modeling continue to increase the amount of potential asteroidal material on the Moon, increasing confidence in the Moon first premise. The extensive resources of the Moon become the catalyst for an inner solar system-wide economy providing fuel, vehicles and the all-important experience in developing an industrial infrastructure off planet. The asteroids then become the force multiplier of inner solar system development with billions of tons of water, metals and free space energy from solar power. Mars figures in here as well as the second home of humanity, creating further demand for asteroidal resources, and providing something else that is becoming increasingly scarce on the Earth: hope for the future. The technical barriers that Mr. Harrison points to are being overcome just as those of the 19th century were. New technology developments in 3-D printing, additive manufacturing and advanced robotics are breaking down the final barriers to exploiting off-planet resources and indeed the industrial development of the inner solar system. It is not a question if, it is a question of when, and by whom. Just as the Pacific Railway Act of 1862 was a primary catalyst for a century of American economic growth, it should be the role of government to develop policies and concrete legislation to support this development for the continued health of the American economy and the future of all mankind.

#### Those Conflicts go Nuclear

Klare 13 – Michael T., professor emeritus of peace and world-security studies at Hampshire College and senior visiting fellow at the Arms Control Association in Washington, DC, " How Resource Scarcity and Climate Change Could Produce a Global Explosion", *The Nation*, 4/22/2013, <https://www.thenation.com/article/how-resource-scarcity-and-climate-change-could-produce-global-explosion/> JHW

Resource Shortages and Resource Wars Start with one simple given: the prospect of future scarcities of vital natural resources, including energy, water, land, food and critical minerals. This in itself would guarantee social unrest, geopolitical friction and war. It is important to note that absolute scarcity doesn’t have to be on the horizon in any given resource category for this scenario to kick in. A lack of adequate supplies to meet the needs of a growing, ever more urbanized and industrialized global population is enough. Given the wave of extinctions that scientists are recording, some resources—particular species of fish, animals and trees, for example—will become less abundant in the decades to come, and may even disappear altogether. But key materials for modern civilization like oil, uranium and copper will simply prove harder and more costly to acquire, leading to supply bottlenecks and periodic shortages. Oil—the single most important commodity in the international economy—provides an apt example. Although global oil supplies may actually grow in the coming decades, many experts doubt that they can be expanded sufficiently to meet the needs of a rising global middle class that is, for instance, expected to buy millions of new cars in the near future. In its 2011 World Energy Outlook, the International Energy Agency claimed that an anticipated global oil demand of 104 million barrels per day in 2035 will be satisfied. This, the report suggested, would be thanks in large part to additional supplies of “unconventional oil” (Canadian tar sands, shale oil and so on), as well as 55 million barrels of new oil from fields “yet to be found” and “yet to be developed.” However, many analysts scoff at this optimistic assessment, arguing that rising production costs (for energy that will be ever more difficult and costly to extract), environmental opposition, warfare, corruption and other impediments will make it extremely difficult to achieve increases of this magnitude. In other words, even if production manages for a time to top the 2010 level of 87 million barrels per day, the goal of 104 million barrels will never be reached and the world’s major consumers will face virtual, if not absolute, scarcity. Water provides another potent example. On an annual basis, the supply of drinking water provided by natural precipitation remains more or less constant: about 40,000 cubic kilometers. But much of this precipitation lands on Greenland, Antarctica, Siberia and inner Amazonia where there are very few people, so the supply available to major concentrations of humanity is often surprisingly limited. In many regions with high population levels, water supplies are already relatively sparse. This is especially true of North Africa, Central Asia and the Middle East, where the demand for water continues to grow as a result of rising populations, urbanization and the emergence of new water-intensive industries. The result, even when the supply remains constant, is an environment of increasing scarcity. Wherever you look, the picture is roughly the same: supplies of critical resources may be rising or falling, but rarely do they appear to be outpacing demand, producing a sense of widespread and systemic scarcity. However generated, a perception of scarcity—or imminent scarcity—regularly leads to anxiety, resentment, hostility and contentiousness. This pattern is very well understood, and has been evident throughout human history. In his book Constant Battles, for example, Steven LeBlanc, director of collections for Harvard’s Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, notes that many ancient civilizations experienced higher levels of warfare when faced with resource shortages brought about by population growth, crop failures or persistent drought. Jared Diamond, author of the bestseller Collapse, has detected a similar pattern in Mayan civilization and the Anasazi culture of New Mexico’s Chaco Canyon. More recently, concern over adequate food for the home population was a significant factor in Japan’s invasion of Manchuria in 1931 and Germany’s invasions of Poland in 1939 and the Soviet Union in 1941, according to Lizzie Collingham, author of The Taste of War. Although the global supply of most basic commodities has grown enormously since the end of World War II, analysts see the persistence of resource-related conflict in areas where materials remain scarce or there is anxiety about the future reliability of supplies. Many experts believe, for example, that the fighting in Darfur and other war-ravaged areas of North Africa has been driven, at least in part, by competition among desert tribes for access to scarce water supplies, exacerbated in some cases by rising population levels. “In Darfur,” says a 2009 report from the UN Environment Programme on the role of natural resources in the conflict, “recurrent drought, increasing demographic pressures, and political marginalization are among the forces that have pushed the region into a spiral of lawlessness and violence that has led to 300,000 deaths and the displacement of more than two million people since 2003.” Anxiety over future supplies is often also a factor in conflicts that break out over access to oil or control of contested undersea reserves of oil and natural gas. In 1979, for instance, when the Islamic revolution in Iran overthrew the Shah and the Soviets invaded Afghanistan, Washington began to fear that someday it might be denied access to Persian Gulf oil. At that point, President Jimmy Carter promptly announced what came to be called the Carter Doctrine. In his 1980 State of the Union Address, Carter affirmed that any move to impede the flow of oil from the Gulf would be viewed as a threat to America’s “vital interests” and would be repelled by “any means necessary, including military force.” In 1990, this principle was invoked by President George H.W. Bush to justify intervention in the first Persian Gulf War, just as his son would use it, in part, to justify the 2003 invasion of Iraq. Today, it remains the basis for US plans to employ force to stop the Iranians from closing the Strait of Hormuz, the strategic waterway connecting the Persian Gulf to the Indian Ocean through which about 35 percent of the world’s seaborne oil commerce passes. Recently, a set of resource conflicts have been rising toward the boiling point between China and its neighbors in Southeast Asia when it comes to control of offshore oil and gas reserves in the South China Sea. Although the resulting naval clashes have yet to result in a loss of life, a strong possibility of military escalation exists. A similar situation has also arisen in the East China Sea, where China and Japan are jousting for control over similarly valuable undersea reserves. Meanwhile, in the South Atlantic Ocean, Argentina and Britain are once again squabbling over the Falkland Islands (called Las Malvinas by the Argentinians) because oil has been discovered in surrounding waters. By all accounts, resource-driven potential conflicts like these will only multiply in the years ahead as demand rises, supplies dwindle and more of what remains will be found in disputed areas. In a 2012 study titled Resources Futures, the respected British think-tank Chatham House expressed particular concern about possible resource wars over water, especially in areas like the Nile and Jordan River basins where several groups or countries must share the same river for the majority of their water supplies and few possess the wherewithal to develop alternatives. “Against this backdrop of tight supplies and competition, issues related to water rights, prices, and pollution are becoming contentious,” the report noted. “In areas with limited capacity to govern shared resources, balance competing demands, and mobilize new investments, tensions over water may erupt into more open confrontations.” Heading for a Resource-Shock World Tensions like these would be destined to grow by themselves because in so many areas supplies of key resources will not be able to keep up with demand. As it happens, though, they are not “by themselves.” On this planet, a second major force has entered the equation in a significant way. With the growing reality of climate change, everything becomes a lot more terrifying. Normally, when we consider the impact of climate change, we think primarily about the environment—the melting Arctic ice cap or Greenland ice shield, rising global sea levels, intensifying storms, expanding desert and endangered or disappearing species like the polar bear. But a growing number of experts are coming to realize that the most potent effects of climate change will be experienced by humans directly through the impairment or wholesale destruction of habitats upon which we rely for food production, industrial activities or simply to live. Essentially, climate change will wreak its havoc on us by constraining our access to the basics of life: vital resources that include food, water, land and energy. This will be devastating to human life, even as it significantly increases the danger of resource conflicts of all sorts erupting. We already know enough about the future effects of climate change to predict the following with reasonable confidence: \* Rising sea levels will in the next half-century erase many coastal areas, destroying large cities, critical infrastructure (including roads, railroads, ports, airports, pipelines, refineries and power plants) and prime agricultural land. \* Diminished rainfall and prolonged droughts will turn once-verdant croplands into dust bowls, reducing food output and turning millions into “climate refugees.” \* More severe storms and intense heat waves will kill crops, trigger forest fires, cause floods and destroy critical infrastructure. No one can predict how much food, land, water and energy will be lost as a result of this onslaught (and other climate-change effects that are harder to predict or even possibly imagine), but the cumulative effect will undoubtedly be staggering. In Resources Futures, Chatham House offers a particularly dire warning when it comes to the threat of diminished precipitation to rain-fed agriculture. “By 2020,” the report says, “yields from rain-fed agriculture could be reduced by up to 50%” in some areas. The highest rates of loss are expected to be in Africa, where reliance on rain-fed farming is greatest, but agriculture in China, India, Pakistan and Central Asia is also likely to be severely affected. Heat waves, droughts and other effects of climate change will also reduce the flow of many vital rivers, diminishing water supplies for irrigation, hydro-electricity power facilities and nuclear reactors (which need massive amounts of water for cooling purposes). The melting of glaciers, especially in the Andes in Latin America and the Himalayas in South Asia, will also rob communities and cities of crucial water supplies. An expected increase in the frequency of hurricanes and typhoons will pose a growing threat to offshore oil rigs, coastal refineries, transmission lines and other components of the global energy system. The melting of the Arctic ice cap will open that region to oil and gas exploration, but an increase in iceberg activity will make all efforts to exploit that region’s energy supplies perilous and exceedingly costly. Longer growing seasons in the north, especially Siberia and Canada’s northern provinces, might compensate to some degree for the desiccation of croplands in more southerly latitudes. However, moving the global agricultural system (and the world’s farmers) northward from abandoned farmlands in the United States, Mexico, Brazil, India, China, Argentina and Australia would be a daunting prospect. It is safe to assume that climate change, especially when combined with growing supply shortages, will result in a significant reduction in the planet’s vital resources, augmenting the kinds of pressures that have historically led to conflict, even under better circumstances. In this way, according to the Chatham House report, climate change is best understood as a “threat multiplier…a key factor exacerbating existing resource vulnerability” in states already prone to such disorders. Like other experts on the subject, Chatham House’s analysts claim, for example, that climate change will reduce crop output in many areas, sending global food prices soaring and triggering unrest among those already pushed to the limit under existing conditions. “Increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events, such as droughts, heat waves and floods, will also result in much larger and frequent local harvest shocks around the world….These shocks will affect global food prices whenever key centers of agricultural production area are hit—further amplifying global food price volatility.” This, in turn, will increase the likelihood of civil unrest. When, for instance, a brutal heat wave decimated Russia’s wheat crop during the summer of 2010, the global price of wheat (and so of that staple of life, bread) began an inexorable upward climb, reaching particularly high levels in North Africa and the Middle East. With local governments unwilling or unable to help desperate populations, anger over impossible-to-afford food merged with resentment toward autocratic regimes to trigger the massive popular outburst we know as the Arab Spring. Many such explosions are likely in the future, Chatham House suggests, if current trends continue as climate change and resource scarcity meld into a single reality in our world. A single provocative question from that group should haunt us all: “Are we on the cusp of a new world order dominated by struggles over access to affordable resources?” For the US intelligence community, which appears to have been influenced by the report, the response was blunt. In March, for the first time, Director of National Intelligence James R. Clapper listed “competition and scarcity involving natural resources” as a national security threat on a par with global terrorism, cyberwar and nuclear proliferation. “Many countries important to the United States are vulnerable to natural resource shocks that degrade economic development, frustrate attempts to democratize, raise the risk of regime-threatening instability, and aggravate regional tensions,” he wrote in his prepared statement for the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. “Extreme weather events (floods, droughts, heat waves) will increasingly disrupt food and energy markets, exacerbating state weakness, forcing human migrations, and triggering riots, civil disobedience, and vandalism.” There was a new phrase embedded in his comments: “resource shocks.” It catches something of the world we’re barreling toward, and the language is striking for an intelligence community that, like the government it serves, has largely played down or ignored the dangers of climate change. For the first time, senior government analysts may be coming to appreciate what energy experts, resource analysts and scientists have long been warning about: the unbridled consumption of the world’s natural resources, combined with the advent of extreme climate change, could produce a global explosion of human chaos and conflict. We are now heading directly into a resource-shock world.

#### Mining solves Water Shortages

Kean 15 Sam Kean December 2015 "The End of Thirst" <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/12/the-end-of-thirst/413176/> (writer based in Washington DC for the Atlantic)//Elmer

Imagine turning on your tap and seeing no water come out. Or looking down into your village’s only well and finding it dust-dry. Much of the developing world could soon face such a scenario. According to the United Nations, 1.2 billion people already suffer from severe water shortages, and that number is expected to increase to 1.8 billion over the next decade, in part because of climate change. Developed countries probably won’t be immune. California and other states in the western U.S. are already experiencing extreme drought, and climate experts warn of even worse to come—multi-decade megadroughts. Mass migrations and wars over freshwater loom as real possibilities. Staving off disaster will require conservation, especially in agriculture, which consumes more than two-thirds of all the water humans use. Basic infrastructure maintenance would also go a long way: Some developing countries lose more than half their water through leaky pipes. But conservation and maintenance won’t solve all our water woes, especially as the planet warms and people continue to pack into cities. As a result, governments around the world are investing in new water-recycling and water-harvesting technologies. Here’s what the future of water might look like. 1. Drinking From the Sea … One obvious solution would be to drink ocean water. Converting seawater into freshwater by stripping out the salt—a process called desalination—offers several advantages. Roughly half the world’s population lives within 65 miles of an ocean, and saltwater accounts for about 97 percent of all water on Earth. Still, desalination presents obstacles. Older plants that boil seawater and collect the vapors, as many of those in the Middle East do, use ungodly amounts of energy. Newer plants that use reverse osmosis—whereby seawater is forced through membranes at high pressure—are more efficient, but still expensive and energy-intensive. The process also produces a briny waste that can harm marine life if not disposed of properly. We can nevertheless expect to see more desalination plants soon—thanks in part to Israel, which all but eliminated its chronic water shortages in the past decade by building four large reverse-osmosis plants, inspiring other countries to follow suit. A $1 billion plant operated by an Israeli company is about to open north of San Diego; it will be the largest in the Western Hemisphere, providing up to 50 million gallons of water a day to Californians. 2. … Or From the Toilet Instead of desalination, some experts favor recycling wastewater—cleaning the water from showers, washing machines, and, yes, toilets—for human consumption. Most water-recycling plants clean water in two basic ways. First, they force it through filters, some of which have holes hundreds of times narrower than a strand of human hair. These filters remove waste particles, organic chemicals, bacteria, viruses, and other dreck. Second, chemicals like hydrogen peroxide or ozone and pulses of ultraviolet light destroy any pathogens that have slipped through. Water recycling is a proven technology: California recycles hundreds of millions of gallons each day for irrigation and other uses. So what’s stopping recycled wastewater from going directly to our taps? Human psychology. The very idea of drinking it disgusts many people. They view such water as irredeemably dirty, little better than toilet water. In reality, recycled water is some of the cleanest drinking water around—as good as or better than the best bottled water. (Breweries in Oregon and California have plans to make beer with recycled water for this very reason—it’s so clean that it’s tasteless, a blank slate.) More to the point, recycled water is far purer than most tap water. By the time the water in the Mississippi reaches New Orleans, for instance, every drop has been used by cities along the river multiple times, and the treatment it gets before going through the taps is nowhere near as extensive as what a water-recycling plant provides. Singapore and Namibia have recycled water for years with no adverse health effects, and nasa began recycling water on the International Space Station in 2008. (The Russian cosmonauts there don’t recycle their pee, but they give the Americans bags of it to recycle and then drink.) In the United States, a few parched towns in Texas and New Mexico drink recycled wastewater already, and last year the city of San Diego—which gets most of its water from rivers that are running dry—approved a $3 billion recycling plant that would provide one-third of its tap water, 83 million gallons a day, by 2035. San Diego had rejected essentially the same plan in 1998, but this time the city decided it had no other choice. 3. Microbe Power Rather than filtering out organic waste, water-recycling plants might one day be able to break it down with microbes, a process that could bring an ancillary benefit: electric power. As they digest the gunk in wastewater, certain species of bacteria, called electricigens, can liberate electrons, the stuff of electricity. Producing electrons is actually common in nature—much of photosynthesis involves shuttling them around. Unlike plants, though, electricigens don’t store electrons internally. They use microscopic appendages that look like hairs to deposit the electrons onto external surfaces, usually minerals. In experimental fuel cells, scientists have replaced the minerals with wires and harvested electrons. Someday the bacteria might even generate enough power to run a water-recycling plant, making it self-sufficient. 4. Keeping It Simple Some up-and-coming water technologies are startlingly straightforward. People on arid plateaus, for instance, can string a fine plastic mesh between two posts and use it to capture water from fog that rolls through, collecting the drops in storage tanks. Existing systems in one small Guatemalan village can collect 6,300 liters a day, and more during the wet season. Scientists think that updating the mesh with new materials and tighter weaves could dramatically improve yields. People could even channel the water into hydroponic gardens to grow food. Imagine famously foggy San Francisco with a farm on every rooftop. Oil films present another low-tech opportunity. Reservoirs lose appalling amounts of water to evaporation: By some estimates, more water escapes into the air than is used by humans. But covering the surface with an extremely thin layer—even just one molecule thick—of nontoxic chemicals derived from coconut or palm oil can cut evaporative losses. Wind tends to break up layers of oil, re-exposing the water to the elements. But drones or blimps equipped with sensors could someday monitor reservoirs and signal where oil needed to be re-applied. In one recent test, spreading oil over a lake in Texas (via boats) appears to have cut evaporation by about 15 percent. 5. Making It Rain Of course, for every modest proposal to save water, there’s an audacious one floating around. Take weather modification. Advocates of the idea hope to significantly boost precipitation using a process called “cloud seeding”: spraying clouds with a chemical like silver iodide, which acts as a nucleus around which water droplets collect. The droplets then fall to Earth as rain or snow. That’s the theory, at least. The first large-scale experiments, in the 1940s, generated a lot of excitement. More recently, weather modification has been dogged by accusations of hype and questions about its reliability. A six-year program in Wyoming claimed to have squeezed 5 to 15 percent more precipitation out of the clouds it seeded. Unfortunately, conditions were suitable for seeding only 30 percent of the time, so the total increase in precipitation was closer to 3 percent. That’s not nothing, especially during droughts. But weather modification may be the flying car of water technology—a tantalizing idea that’s forever on the horizon. 6. The Moon Shot If Earth does run dry, we might be able to save ourselves by mining water from asteroids and comets. Scientists have landed probes on these space rocks to study them. Future landers could mine them in deep space or possibly even drag them back toward Earth. Though the idea sounds far-fetched, space-mining companies already exist, and one of them, Planetary Resources, expects to start harvesting resources from asteroids in about a decade. According to Planetary Resources, a single 1,600-foot-wide asteroid could yield more platinum than has ever been mined in human history. But water could prove to be the real prize for space-mining companies. Some astronomers believe that the asteroid Ceres, which sits between Jupiter and Mars, may contain more freshwater (as ice) than all of Earth does. In addition to quenching people’s thirst, this water could be turned into fuel for interplanetary spaceships. In that case, an ample supply of water would be the key to a happy future not just down here on the ground, but up among the stars as well.

#### Indo-Pak Water War goes Nuclear
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Interstate conflict over water might occur, the ICA indicated, when several states rely on a shared river system for much of their water supply and one or more of the riparian states sought to maximize the river’s flow for their own benefit at the expense of other states in the basin, amplifying any scarcities already present there. “We judge that as water shortages become more acute beyond the next ten years, water in shared basins will increasingly be used as leverage,” the ICA stated. An upstream state enjoying superior control over a river’s flow might exploit its advantage, say, to extract advantage in international negotiations or to attract international aid for infrastructure projects. As the ICA further noted, “…we assess that states will also use their inherent ability to construct and support major water projects to obtain regional influence or preserve their water interests.”16

The utilization of a state’s superior position in a shared river system to extract political or economic advantage can prove especially destabilizing, the ICA suggested, when weaker states in the system (typically the downstream countries) are especially vulnerable to water scarcity because of long-standing social, economic, and political conditions. Without identifying any particular states by name, the study suggested that this could occur when downstream states suffer from endemic corruption, poor water management practices, and systemic favoritism when it comes to the allocation of scarce water supplies. In such cases, any reduction in the flow of water by an upstream country could easily combine with internal factors in a downstream country to provoke widespread unrest and conflict. “Water shortages, and government failures to manage them, are likely to lead to social disruptions, pressure on national and local leaders, and potentially political instability,” the report noted.17

Although most discussion of the climate and water security nexus has continued to emphasize the risk of internal conflict arising from warming-related water scarcities, some analysts have pursued the line of inquiry introduced by the 2012 ICA, focusing on interstate tensions arising within shared river basins. This was a prominent theme, for example, of a 2013 study conducted by the National Research Council (NRC) on behalf of the IC. Entitled Climate and Social Stress: Implications for Security Analysis, the 2013 NRC report sought to better identify the links between global warming, pre-existing social vulnerabilities, and the likelihood of conflict. While it echoed earlier studies by the CNA and NIC in identifying internal factors like poverty, ethnic discord, and governmental ineptitude as likely pre-conditions for climate-related conflict, it also examined dangers arising from dependence on shared river systems, especially in cases where cooperation among the riparian powers in managing the system is limited and global warming is expected to reduce future water flows.18

For the NRC, the river systems of greatest concern in this respect were those that originate in the Himalayan Mountains and depend, for a significant share of the annual flow, on meltwater from the Himalayan glaciers. These glaciers are an important source of meltwater for many of Asia’s major rivers, including the Indus, Ganges, Brahmaputra, and

Mekong Rivers. These rivers originate in China but travel through India, Pakistan, Nepal, Bangladesh, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, and Vietnam—countries with a combined population of over 3.4 billion people, or approximately 44 percent of the world’s total population.19 A large share of the population in these countries depends on agriculture for its livelihood, so ensuring access to adequate supplies of water is a prime local and national priority. During the monsoon season, heavy rains provide these rivers with abundant water, but during dry seasons they are dependent on glacial meltwater—and, with the rise in global temperatures, the Himalayan glaciers are melting, jeopardizing future water availability in these river basins. Given a history of ethnic and social discord within many of these countries and long-standing tensions among them, analysts fear that such shortages could aggravate both internal and external tensions and ignite interstate as well as intrastate conflict.20

As was the case of previous IC-initiated studies, the authors of the 2013 NRC report were reluctant to identify specific countries in their findings, referring again to “countries of security concern” or other such euphemisms. However, they did select one of these countries in particular: Pakistan. They chose that country for special analysis, the report indicated, because “Pakistan presents a clear example of a country where social dynamics and susceptibility to harm from climate events combine to create a potentially unstable situation.”21 Pakistan was said to suffer from multiple risk factors: Its economy is largely dependent on agriculture; much of the water used for irrigation purposes comes from just one source, the Indus River; control over the allocation of irrigation waters is often exercised by privileged elites, leaving millions of Pakistanis vulnerable to water shortages; and much of the water flowing into the Indus comes from China or from tributaries originating in India, leaving Pakistan in an unfavorable (downstream) position in the system. These conditions have led, in the past, to internal squabbles over water rights and to tensions with India over control of the Indus; now, with the likelihood of diminished meltwater from the Himalayan glaciers, the risk of water scarcity triggering violent conflict of one sort or another becomes that much greater.22

Pakistan, the Indus, and U.S. Security

There is no doubt that Pakistan is considered by U.S. security analysts as a “state important to U.S. national security interests,” the term used by the Defense Intelligence Agency to describe countries of concern in the 2012 ICA on water. Not only is Pakistan a critical—if not always wholehearted—partner in the global war on terror, but it also possesses a substantial arsenal of nuclear weapons whose security is a matter of enormous concern to American leaders.23 Should those munitions wind up with rogue elements of the Pakistani military (some of whose members are believed to maintain clandestine links to radical Islamic organizations), or even worse, should Pakistan descend into civil war and the weapons fall into untrustworthy or hostile hands, the safety of India and other US allies—as well as of American forces deployed in the region—would be at grave risk.24 Ensuring Pakistan’s stability therefore, has long been a major U.S. security objective, prompting regular deliveries of American arms and other military aid. Yet, despite billions of dollars in American aid, Pakistan remains vulnerable to social and ethnic internal strife.25

As noted, farming is the principal economic activity in Pakistan, and ensuring access to water is an overarching public and government concern. This means, above all, managing the use of the Indus—the country’s main source of water for irrigation and its major source of power for electricity generation. Pakistan’s rising population and growing cities, with their rings of factories, are placing an immense strain on the Indus, leading to competition between farmers, industrialists, and urban consumers. With water and power shortages becoming an increasingly frequent aspect of daily life, public protests—sometimes turning violent—have erupted across the country. In one particularly intense bout of rioting, following a prolonged power outage in June 2012, protestors burned trains, blocked roads, looted shops, and damaged banks and gas stations.26

However bad things might be in Pakistan today, climate change is likely to make conditions far worse in the years ahead. Prolonged droughts, climate scientists believe, will occur with increasing regularity, posing a severe threat to the nation’s agricultural sector and further reducing the supply of hydroelectric power. At the same time, warming is expected to increase the intensity of monsoon downpours, resulting in massive flooding (as occurred in 2010) and the loss of valuable topsoil, further adding to Pakistan’s woes. As the Himalayan glaciers melt, moreover, water flow through the Indus will diminish.27 With the competition for land and water resources bound to increase and with Pakistan already divided along ethnic and religious lines, widespread civil strife will become ever more likely, possibly jeopardizing the survival of the state.

It is impossible to predict exactly how the United States might respond to a systemic breakdown of state governance in Pakistan. One thing is clear, however: At the earliest sign that the country’s nuclear weapons are at risk of falling into the hands of hostile parties, the American military would respond with decisive force. In fact, research conducted by the nonpartisan Nuclear Threat Initiative (NTI) has revealed that the Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC) and specialized Army units have been training for such contingencies for some time and have deployed all the necessary gear to the region. In the event of a coup or crisis, the NTI revealed, “U.S. forces would rush into the country, crossing borders, rappelling down from helicopters, and parachuting out of airplanes, so they can secure known or suspected nuclear-storage sites.” Recognizing that any such actions by American forces could trigger widespread resistance by the Pakistani army and/or various jihadist groups, the U.S. Central Command, which has authority over all American forces in the region, has developed plans for backing up JSOC personnel with full-scale military support.28

Another scenario that has some analysts worried is the possibility that a time of sharply reduced water flow through the Indus will coincide with efforts by India to exploit its advantageous position as the upper riparian on three key tributaries of the Indus—the Ravi, the Beas, and the Sutlej—to divert water for its own use, thereby depriving downstream Pakistan of vital supplies and provoking a war between these two countries. India was granted control over the three tributaries under the Indus Water Treaty of 1960, and various Indian leaders have threatened at times to dam the rivers or otherwise reduce their flow into Pakistan as a reprisal for Pakistani attacks on Indian bases in the disputed territory of Kashmir (through which the tributaries flow); this, in turn, has provoked counter-threats from Pakistani leaders.29 What analysts fear most, in such a situation, is that India, possessing superior conventional forces, would overpower Pakistan’s equivalent armies, leading Pakistan’s leaders to order the use of nuclear weapons against India, igniting a regional nuclear war. Such a conflict, scientists have calculated, would result in 50 to 125 million fatalities, and produce a dust cloud covering much of the Earth, decimating global agriculture—an outcome with enormous implications for American national security.30

## Case

### T/L

#### Multiple multilat args in space people still circumvent it

#### Warrant in McSweeney 20 card is that investors will be scared but if that happened companies wouldn’t be violating actual law means plan doesn’t solve.

### Debris

#### Alt cause – broad space privatization and existing debris.
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The last decade has seen rapid growth and change in the space industry, and an explosion of commercial and private activity. Terms like NewSpace or democratized space are often used to describe this global trend to develop faster and cheaper access to space, distinct from more traditional government-driven activities focused on security, political, or scientific activities. The easier access to space has opened participation to many more participants than was historically possible. This new activity could profoundly worsen the space debris environment, particularly in low Earth orbit (LEO), but there are also signs of progress and the outlook is encouraging. Many NewSpace operators are actively working to mitigate their impact. Nevertheless, NewSpace represents a significant break with past experience and business as usual will not work in this changed environment. New standards, space policy, and licensing approaches are powerful levers that can shape the future of operations and the debris environment.

2. Characterizing NewSpace: a step change in the space environment

In just the last few years, commercial companies have proposed, funded, and in a few cases begun deployment of very large constellations of small to medium-sized satellites. These constellations will add much more complexity to space operations. Table 1 shows some of the constellations that have been announced for launch in the next decade. Two dozen companies, when taken together, have proposed placing well over ~~20,000~~ [twenty thousand] satellites in orbit in the next ~~10~~ [10]years. For perspective, fewer than ~~8100~~[eight thousand one hundred] payloads have been placed in Earth orbit in the entire history of the space age, only 4800 [1] remain in orbit and approximately 1950 [2] of those are still active. And it isn't simply numbers – the mass in orbit will increase substantially, and long-term debris generation is strongly correlated with mass.

[Table 1 Omitted]

This table is in constant flux. It is based largely on U.S. filings with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and various press releases, but many of the companies here have already altered or abandoned their original plans, and new systems are no doubt in work. Although many of these large constellations may never be launched as listed, the traffic created if just half are successful would be more than double the number of payloads launched in the last 60 years and more than 6 times the number of currently active satellites.

Current space safety, space surveillance, collision avoidance (COLA) and debris mitigation processes have been designed for and have evolved with the current population profile, launch rates and density of LEO space.

By almost any metric used to measure activity in space, whether it is payloads in orbit, the size of constellations, the rate of launches, the economic stakes, the potential for debris creation, the number of conjunctions, NewSpace represents a fundamental change.

3. Compounding effects of better SSA, more satellites, and new operational concepts

The changes in the space environment can be seen on this figurative map of low Earth orbit. Fig. 1 shows the LEO environment as a function of altitude. The number of objects found in each 10 km “bin” is plotted on the horizontal axis, while the altitude is plotted vertically. Objects in elliptical orbits are distributed between bins as partial objects proportional to the time spent in each bin. Some notable resident systems are indicated in blue text on the right to provide an altitude reference. The (dotted) red line shows the number of objects in the current catalog tracked by the U.S. Space Surveillance Network (SSN). All the COLA alerts and actions that must be taken by the residents are due to their neighbors in the nearby bins, so the currently visible risk is proportional to the red line.

The red line of the current catalog does not represent the complete risk; it indicates the risk we can track and perhaps avoid. A rule of thumb is that the current SSN LEO catalog contains objects about 10 cm or larger. It is generally accepted that an impact in LEO with an object 1 cm or larger will cause damage likely to be fatal to a satellite's mission. Therefore, there is a large latent risk from unobserved debris. While we cannot currently track and catalog much smaller than 10 cm, experiments have been performed to detect and sample much smaller objects and statistically model the population at this size [3]. The (solid) blue line represents the model of the 1 cm and larger debris that is likely mission-ending, usually called lethal but not trackable. If LEO operators avoid collisions with all the objects in the red line, they are nonetheless inherently accepting the risk from the blue line. This risk is already present.

The (dashed) orange line is an estimate of the population at 5 cm and larger and is thus an estimate of what the catalog might conservatively be a few years after the Space Fence, a new radar system being built by the Air Force, comes on line (currently planned for 2019) [4]. Commercial companies offering space surveillance services, such as LeoLabs, ExoAnalytics, Analytic Graphics Inc., Lockheed, and Boeing, might also add to the number of objects currently tracked. Space Policy Directive 3 (SPD-3) [13] specifically seeks to expand the use of commercial SSA services.

Existing operators can expect a sharp increase in the number of warnings and alerts they will receive because of the increase in the cataloged population. Almost all the increase will come from newly detected debris [5].

The pace of safety operations for each satellite on orbit will significantly change because of the increase in the catalog from the Space Fence. This effect is compounded because the NewSpace constellations described in Table 1 will drastically change the profile of satellites in LEO. The green bars in Fig. 1 represent the number of objects that will be added to the catalog (red or orange lines) from only the NewSpace large LEO constellations at their operational altitudes. This does not include the rocket stages that launch them, or satellites in the process of being phased into or removed from the operational orbits. Neighbors of one of these new constellations may face a radically different operations environment than their current practices were designed to address.

Satellites in these large LEO constellations typically have planned operational lifetimes of 5–10 years. Some companies have proposed to dispose of their satellites using low thrust electric propulsion systems, which would spiral satellites down over a period of months or years from operating altitudes as high as 1500 km through lower orbits where the Hubble Space Telescope, the International Space Station, and other critical LEO satellites operate [6]. Similar propulsive techniques would raise replacement satellites from lower launch injection orbits to higher operational orbits. These disposal and replenishment activities will add thousands of satellites each year transiting through lower altitudes and posing a risk to all resident satellites in those lower orbits. More importantly, failures will occur both among transiting satellites and operational constellations, potentially leaving hundreds more stranded along the transit path.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. **No ‘space war’ – Insurmountable barriers and everyone has an interest in keeping space peaceful**

**Dobos 19** [(Bohumil Doboš, scholar at the Institute of Political Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic, and a coordinator of the Geopolitical Studies Research Centre) “Geopolitics of the Outer Space, Chapter 3: Outer Space as a Military-Diplomatic Field,” Pgs. 48-49] TDI

Despite the theorized potential for the achievement of the terrestrial dominance throughout the utilization of the ultimate high ground and the ease of destruction of space-based assets by the potential space weaponry, the utilization of space weapons is with current technology and no effective means to protect them far from fulfilling this potential (Steinberg 2012, p. 255). In current global international political and technological setting, the utility of space weapons is very limited, even if we accept that the ultimate high ground presents the potential to get a decisive tangible military advantage (which is unclear). This stands among the reasons for the lack of their utilization so far. Last but not the least, it must be pointed out that the states also develop passive defense systems designed to protect the satellites on orbit or critical capabilities they provide. These further decrease the utility of space weapons. These systems include larger maneuvering capacities, launching of decoys, preparation of spare satellites that are ready for launch in case of ASAT attack on its twin on orbit, or attempts to decrease the visibility of satellites using paint or materials less visible from radars (Moltz 2014, p. 31). Finally, we must look at the main obstacles of connection of the outer space and warfare. The first set of barriers is comprised of physical obstructions. As has been presented in the previous chapter, the outer space is very challenging domain to operate in. Environmental factors still present the largest threat to any space military capabilities if compared to any man-made threats (Rendleman 2013, p. 79). A following issue that hinders military operations in the outer space is the predictability of orbital movement. If the reconnaissance satellite's orbit is known, the terrestrial actor might attempt to hide some critical capabilities-an option that is countered by new surveillance techniques (spectrometers, etc.) (Norris 2010, p. 196)-but the hide-and-seek game is on. This same principle is, however, in place for any other space asset-any nation with basic tracking capabilities may quickly detect whether the military asset or weapon is located above its territory or on the other side of the planet and thus mitigate the possible strategic impact of space weapons not aiming at mass destruction. Another possibility is to attempt to destroy the weapon in orbit. Given the level of development for the ASAT technology, it seems that they will prevail over any possible weapon system for the time to come. Next issue, directly connected to the first one, is the utilization of weak physical protection of space objects that need to be as light as possible to reach the orbit and to be able to withstand harsh conditions of the domain. This means that their protection against ASAT weapons is very limited, and, whereas some avoidance techniques are being discussed, they are of limited use in case of ASAT attack. We can thus add to the issue of predictability also the issue of easy destructibility of space weapons and other military hardware (Dolman 2005, p. 40; Anantatmula 2013, p. 137; Steinberg 2012, p. 255). Even if the high ground was effectively achieved and other nations could not attack the space assets directly, there is still a need for communication with those assets from Earth. There are also ground facilities that support and control such weapons located on the surface. Electromagnetic communication with satellites might be jammed or hacked and the ground facilities infiltrated or destroyed thus rendering the possible space weapons useless (Klein 2006, p. 105; Rendleman 2013, p. 81). This issue might be overcome by the establishment of a base controlling these assets outside the Earth-on Moon or lunar orbit, at lunar L-points, etc.-but this perspective remains, for now, unrealistic. Furthermore, no contemporary actor will risk full space weaponization in the face of possible competition and the possibility of rendering the outer space useless. No actor is dominant enough to prevent others to challenge any possible attempts to dominate the domain by military means. To quote 2016 Stratfor analysis, "(a) war in space would be devastating to all, and preventing it, rather than finding ways to fight it, will likely remain the goal" (Larnrani 20 16). This stands true unless some space actor finds a utility in disrupting the arena for others.

#### dSpace debris creates existential deterrence and a taboo

Bowen 18 [(Bleddyn, lecturer in International Relations at the University of Leicester) “The Art of Space Deterrence,” European Leadership Network, February 20, 2018, https://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/commentary/the-art-of-space-deterrence/] TDI

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.

#### Alliances check miscalc – too costly

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

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

#### No miscalc – ev Johnson indicates 300,000

#### AT Scoles:

#### 1] The real danger is from NASA’s mission to transplant rocks --- plan doesn’t affect, and there’s other methods of mining - rehighlighting

Sarah Scoles 15, “Dust from asteroid mining spells danger for satellites,” New Scientist, 5-27-2015, https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg22630235-100-dust-from-asteroid-mining-spells-danger-for-satellites/

NASA chose the second option for its Asteroid Redirect Mission, which aims to pluck a boulder from an asteroid’s surface and relocate it to a stable orbit around the moon. But an asteroid’s gravity is so weak that it’s not hard for surface particles to escape into space. Now a new model warns that debris shed by such transplanted rocks could intrude where many defence and communication satellites live – in geosynchronous orbit. According to Casey Handmer of the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena and Javier Roa of the Technical University of Madrid in Spain, 5 per cent of the escaped debris will end up in regions traversed by satellites. Over 10 years, it would cross geosynchronous orbit 63 times on average. A satellite in the wrong spot at the wrong time will suffer a damaging high-speed collision with that dust. The study also looks at the “catastrophic disruption” of an asteroid 5 metres across or bigger. Its total break-up into a pile of rubble would increase the risk to satellites by more than 30 per cent (arxiv.org/abs/1505.03800). That may not have immediate consequences. But as Earth orbits get more crowded with spent rocket stages and satellites, we will have to worry about cascades of collisions like the one depicted in the movie Gravity. Handmer and Roa want to point out the problem now so that we can find a solution before any satellites get dinged. “It is possible to quantify and manage the risk,” says Handmer. “A few basic precautions will prevent harm due to stray asteroid material.”

#### 2] 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.

#### 3] Concedes Asteroid Mining can be regulated to still be allowed to occur – says “possible to … manage risk” – no solvency deficit to the CP.

#### AT McKnight – It’s not talking abt Asteroid Mining – it’s talking about status quo debris from current dust and rockets – inserted the table below – their evidence isn’t predictive, it’s descriptive – means current dust thumps.

McKnight 17 Dr. Darren McKnight 17, Ph.D., Technical Director for Integrity Applications, Previously Senior Vice President and Director of Science and Technology Strategy at Science Applications International Corporation, “Proposed Series of Orbital Debris Remediation Activities,” 3rd International Conference and Exhibition on Satellite & Space Missions, 5/13/2017, https://iaaweb.org/iaa/Scientific%20Activity/debrisminutes03166.pdf [graphics omitted]
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#### Means D/B – either Squo Debris Thumps or disproves the I/L – past Debris didn’t trigger escalations

#### On Biggs 18: no impact, even if we have data countries wont follow thru, we already have tons of climate data and no one does anything about it so more data wont change anything

#### But going for the ! turn -- debris is good—

#### Satellite loss shuts down global fracking

Les Johnson 13, Deputy Manager for NASA's Advanced Concepts Office at the Marshall Space Flight Center, Co-Investigator for the JAXA T-Rex Space Tether Experiment and PI of NASA's ProSEDS Experiment, Master's Degree in Physics from Vanderbilt University, Popular Science Writer, and NASA Technologist, Frequent Contributor to the Journal of the British Interplanetary Sodety and Member of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, National Space Society, the World Future Society, and MENSA, Sky Alert!: When Satellites Fail, p. 99-105

Energy, environment, farming, mining, land use. All of these areas and more are now inextricably linked to satellite data and would be devastated should that flow of data stop. Environmental Monitoring Oh how complacent we've become. We take for granted that we will have instant images from space showing a volcanic eruption somewhere in the South Pacific within hours of learning that it happened. When the BP oll spill happened in the Gulf of Mexico in 2010, satellite images were used in conjunction with aircraft and ships to monitor the extent and evolving nature of the spill (Figures 10.1 and 10.2). The data were also used to direct the ships that were attempting to clean up the spill, to warn fishermen of areas in which it would be dangerous to fish, and to generally monitor the extent of the disaster. This is the type of data we get from space in a field known as remote sensing. Remote sensing is, well, exactly what its name implies. With it, you gather data, or sense, usually in the form of electromagnetic radiation (light), remotely - that is, you are not physically touching what you are looking at. Satellite remote sensing began shortly after we began launching satellites and many industries are now totally dependent upon having the capability. We use satellites, like the venerable Landsat series, to study the Earth m unprecedented detail. Since 1972, Landsat satellites have taken millions of high resolution images of the Earth's surface, allowing comprehensive studies of how the land has changed due to human intervention (deforestation, agriculture, settlement, etc.) and natural processes (desertification, floods, etc.). The best way to understand how useful Landsat and similar data can be to governments at all levels is best illustrated by looking at 14then and now" photographs. For example, Africa's Lake Chad has been shrinking for 40 years, as the desert has encroached on this once plentiful inland freshwater lake. Forty years ago, there were about 15,000 square miles of water within the lake. Now, it is less than 500 square miles (Figure 10.3) [1]. And what is the practical side of this particular bit of information? Governments use this type of satellite imagery to avoid human tragedy. Hundreds of thousands of people, if not millions, depend upon the waters of Lake Chad for agriculture, industry, and personal hygiene. With the lake going dry, how has this impacted on their livelihoods, their families, and their very lives? The European Space Agency (ESA) is freely providing satellite data to developing countries as they search for new sources of drinking water. For example, ESA assessed data obtained from space over Nigeria to find over 90 new freshwater sources within that country. After ground teams visited the new sites, all were confirmed to contain fresh water. This was no accident. These were satellites with sensors developed for just such purposes in mind [2]. Desertification is but one example of changing climates affecting people's everyday lives. What about more direct observations of our impact on the planet? Figures 10.4 and 10.5 show the scarring of the Earth's surface as a result of surface mining in West Virginia. This is not a polemic against mining; rather, it is an observation that we can use satellite imagery to monitor such mining and be mindful of its impact on the environment. Other than taking pictures of surface features, like lakes and open pit mines, how are satellites monitoring the Earth's changing climate? In just about every way, by: monitoring global land, sea, and atmospheric temperatures; measuring yearly average rainfall amounts just about everywhere on the globe; measuring glaciation rates; measuring sea surface heights; and more. Remote sensing is more than taking pictures of the Earth in the visible part of the spectrum. We can learn a great deal from looking at part of the spectrum that our eyes cannot see - but our instruments can. Shown in Figure 10.6 is a composite image of the Earth's surface showing the average land-surface temperature at night. The data came from two NASA satellites, Terra and Aqua, as they orbit the Earth in a polar orbit. (This means that they circle the Earth from top to bottom, passing over both the North and South Poles with each complete orbit.) Terra's orbit is such that it passes from the north to the south across the equator in the morning; Aqua passes south to north over the equator in the afternoon. Taken together, they observe the Earth's surface in its entirety every two days. Data sets such as this exist for just about any day of the year and can show either night-time lows or daytime highs. By looking in different parts of the spectrum, like the infrared light discussed above, we can make observations as described in Table 10.1. Pollution Monitoring As emerging countries industrialize, they also become polluters. Many of these countries are not exactly forthright about releasing air-pollution details to the media, so much of our awareness of the rising pollution there is anecdotal - typically m the form of stories told by people who have visited these countries and seen the extreme pollution at first hand. This, by the way, is not exactly scientific. Using satellites, and not relying on either the governments in question or second-hand stories, we can accurately assess the pollution levels there and elsewhere. Using satellite images to measure the amount of light absorbed or blocked by fine particulates in the atmosphere, otherwise known as air pollution, you can determine not only what the airborne pollutant might be, but also its size. And, by looking at the overall light blockage, an accurate estimate of the amount of pollution in the air can also be made. Recent studies show that many of these countries are covered in a pollution cloud that countries in the developed world would deem extremely harmful. And how do we know this with scientific certainty? From satellite measurements. Energy Production The recent boom in the production of shale oil in the United States and elsewhere is due in large part to the identification and geolocation of promising geologic formations for test drilling and fracking. "Fracking" is a somewhat new term that comes from the phrase "hydraulic fracturing". In fracking, massive amounts of previously unusable reservoirs of oil and natural gas are released for capture, sale, and transport from deposits deep within the Earth - many located at least a mile below the surface. In the United States alone, there may be as much as 750 trillion cubic feet of natural gas within shale deposits releasable by fracking [3]. How do energy companies know where to look for these deposits? In large part, by analyzing satellite imagery. According to Science Daily (26 February 2009), a new map of the Earth's gravitational field based on satellite measurements makes it much less resource intensive to find new oil deposits. The map will be particularly useful as the ice melts in the oil-rich Arctic regions. The easy-to-find oilfields have already been found. To fuel the growing world economy, those harder-to-find deposits must be located and tapped - which is why satellite imagery is so important. Take away this and other satellite-dependent techniques of oil and gas exploration and the world economy will feel the impact through higher oil and natural gas prices.

#### Fracking makes extinction inevitable---try-or die to shut it off

Rev. Mac Legerton 18, Co-Founder and Executive Director of the Center for Community Action, Member of the Board of Directors of the NC Climate Solutions Coalition, Member of the Board of Directors of the Windcall Institute, “Will The U.S. Blaze A Trail To Mass Extinction?”, APPPL News, 1/15/2018, https://www.apppl.org/news/will-the-u-s-blaze-a-trail-to-mass-extinction/

As an elder, I now realize that there is even a greater threat to humanity and life on Earth than nuclear war—though, unlike a nuclear exchange, this threat is a slow-motion catastrophe. Can you guess what it is? Here’s a clue: it is something with which most people don’t have a personal relationship. Tragically, some persons remain in total denial of its validity, much less its present danger. And that’s the problem – that’s why this threat needs to be more seriously addressed on the local, state, national, and international level.

What is it? It’s the slow-motion but rapidly growing catastrophe of climate change. There’s now good news amidst this seemingly overwhelming challenge. But the answer may surprise you. Today we know what is the #1 preventable cause of climate change. It’s not coal, it’s not nuclear, and it’s not oil and gasoline. It’s actually the use of the very fuel that is touted as being cleaner, greener, and cheaper than all the rest. This fuel is called “Natural Gas”.

Let’s start with its name – “Natural Gas”. What is “natural gas”? There’s actually nothing “natural” about it when it is forcibly extracted from the ground through hydraulic fracturing, commonly known as “fracking”. When something is forcibly ruptured from deep within the earth with the use of toxic chemicals, the last name you would use for it is “natural”.

Fracking disrupts the geologic fault lines causing earthquakes, uses millions of gallons of fresh water that becomes permanently poisoned by unknown, cancer-producing chemicals added to it, creates air pollution during the drilling process, increases the risk of injury and explosions, raises major health risks to both people and place in close proximity to it, and changes the nature of both neighborhoods and landscapes. Fracking also leaves a massive carbon footprint of drilling wells as deep as 8,000 feet and then drilling horizontally over 10,000 feet; On top of all this, it leaks major amounts of gas into the environment.

So, what is this gas? It is 90-95% methane gas which is a hydrocarbon compound made up of one carbon atom and four hydrogen atoms (CH4). It releases carbon into the atmosphere and produces carbon dioxide (C02) just like coal does when it is burned. Methane is not its trace element–it is its undisputed compound of this fossil fuel product. If a compound is 90-95% of a product, it makes sense to call it by that name. Doesn’t it? Well, actually not if you want people to believe and think that it is something that it is not. It is un-natural methane gas produced under massive and highly toxic pressure and hazardous conditions.

Now that we know what this gas is, what does it do to the atmosphere and climate that is so dangerous? This hydrocarbon has properties that block the radiation of heat from Earth’s surface 100 times more effectively than CO2 (released from burning coal) during its first 10 years of release and 86 times more effectively in its first 20 years. Because of the climate emergency underway, the first 10 or 20 years matter most.

When utility companies and the larger fossil fuel companies state that they are committed to lowering carbon emissions, this just isn’t true. They are radically escalating the most dangerous and worst of all fossil fuels in relation to its impact on the climate. Now the industry wants to expand production of methane gas all over the world by calling it “the most environmentally friendly fossil fuel”and a “bridge fuel” that we can safely use until we transition to 100% renewable energy sources.

Why would a major business industry want to call its product by another name? Perhaps for the same reason that the tobacco industry did not like the term “coffin nails” or “cancer sticks” for cigarettes. Honestly, there’s a striking similarity between what are called cigarettes and natural gas. When both were produced and named, their harm was not fully known. Once the industries promoting them learned of their significant harm, they did everything they could to hide this knowledge from the public. They even hired scientists to deny their dangers. The tobacco industry was eventually sued, the truth was acknowledged, and billions of dollars were paid out in the tobacco settlement.

This same scenario that occurred with the tobacco industry needs to occur with methane gas and the fossil fuel industry. The major difference in these two scenarios is that that this fossil fuel product doesn’t just threaten the lives of individuals who voluntarily breathe it in – it threatens the lives of not only every human being, but also all life on the planet. The outcome of this scenario needs to be a moratorium and eventual end to all use of methane gas as an energy source. For the sake of all of us, our communities, and world, the sooner the better. This abomination is different. There is no time to waste.

#### Loss of satellites shuts down drones

Daniel Ventre 11, Engineer for CNRS and Researcher for CESDIP, Cyberwar and Information Warfare, p. 198-199

The introduction of cyberspace operations is part of a specific context; a major evolution in the operation environment and the nature of the conflicts, which make irregular wars the rule, and make regular actors the exception to the rule. But the battle against unconventional, non-state governed, irregular actors raises specific problems: there are multiple actors, unpredictable at that, who do not abide by the same rules. New orders in conflicts are imposing the implementation of an ever more important need for information, and information collection and processing. Networks now have an incredible importance. The document refers to the growing threats against American heritage: the USA is a target and the increasing amount of attacks against their networks is indeed the proof of this. There are many obstacles which need to be removed before they can achieve real superiority and freedom to act, especially as vulnerable points may originate within the very operations of the armed forces. An example of this is the vulnerability of using products (software and hardware), commercial products (off-the-shelf), and sometimes even foreign products123. This brings to mind the fact that the US Air Force uses commercial, even foreign, applications for its cyberspace operations.

Information space extends to space124, particularly via communication and observation satellites125. Satellites are the keystone to the cyberspace and communication systems, but also the security system: monitoring (Echelon network is the symbol), observation, communication. These are at the heart of the C4ISR systems, without which a concept such as network-centric warfare could not exist. There would be no drones without satellites. It is even a question of extending the Internet to extra-atmospheric space. Projects in this vein (Interplanetary Networks) were being formed in the 1990s, but ran into several technical difficulties (delays in important transmissions due to high distances and costs) [GEL 06]. NASA dedicates a few pages on its website to this project126. The development of communication systems based on the infrastructures in extra-atmospheric space will also raise questions for legal, geopolitical and geostrategic domains: questions of seizing this space, questions of regulation of human activity in this space, of sovereignty, new territoriality and independence.

#### Drolif means every hotspot goes nuclear.

Zenko and Kreps, PhDs, 14 \*Micah - Douglas Dillon fellow in the Center for Preventive Action at the Council on Foreign Relations, PhD in political science from Brandeis University; \*Sarah - Stanton nuclear security fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, assistant professor in the department of government and an adjunct professor at Cornell Law School, BA from Harvard University, MSc from Oxford University, and PhD from Georgetown University; “Limiting Armed Drone Proliferation," Council on Foreign Relations, June 2014, http://aspheramedia.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Limiting\_Armed\_Drone\_Proliferation\_CSR69.pdf

The inherent advantages of drones will not alone make traditional interstate warfare more likely—such conflicts are relatively rare anyway, with only one active interstate conflict in both 2012 and 2013.20 Nor will the probable type, quantity, range, and lethality of armed drones that states possess in coming decades make a government more likely to attempt to defeat an opposing army, capture or control foreign territory, or remove a foreign leader from power. However, misperceptions over the use of armed drones increase the likelihood of militarized disputes with U.S. allies, as well as U.S. military forces, which could lead to an escalating crisis and deeper U.S. involvement. Though surveillance drones can be used to provide greater stability between countries by monitoring ceasefires or disputed borders, armed drones will have destabilizing consequences. Arming a drone, whether by design or by simply putting a crude payload on an unarmed drone, makes it a weapon, and thereby a direct national security threat for any state whose border it breaches. Increased Frequency of Interstate and Intrastate Force For the United States, drones have significantly reduced the political, diplomatic, and military risks and costs associated with the use of military force, which has led to a vast expansion of lethal operations that would not have been attempted with other weapons platforms. Aside from airstrikes in traditional conflicts such as Libya, Iraq, and Afghanistan—where one-quarter of all International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) airstrikes in 2012 were conducted by drones—the United States has conducted hundreds in non-battlefield settings: Pakistan (approximately 369), Yemen (approximately 87), Somalia (an estimated 16), and the Philippines (at least 1, in 2006).21 Of the estimated 473 non-battlefield targeted killings undertaken by the United States since November 2002, approximately 98 percent were carried out by drones. Moreover, despite maintaining a “strong preference” for capturing over killing suspected terrorists since September 2011, there have been only 3 known capture attempts, compared with 194 drone strikes that have killed an estimated 1,014 people, 86 of whom were civilians.22 Senior U.S. civilian and military officials, whose careers span the pre– and post–armed drone era, overwhelmingly agree that the threshold for the authorization of force by civilian officials has been significantly reduced. Former secretary of defense Robert Gates asserted in October 2013, for example, that armed drones allow decision-makers to see war as a “bloodless, painless, and odorless” affair, with technology detaching leaders from the “inevitably tragic, inefficient, and uncertain” consequences of war.23 President Barack Obama admitted in May 2013 that the United States has come to see armed drones “as a cure-all for terrorism,” because they are low risk and instrumental in “shielding the government” from criticisms “that a troop deployment invites.”24 Such admissions from leaders of a democratic country with a system of checks and balances point to the temptations that leaders with fewer institutional checks will face. President Obama and his senior aides have stated that the United States is setting precedents with drones that other states may emulate.25 If U.S. experience and Obama’s cautionary words are any guide, states that acquire armed drones will be more willing to threaten or use force in ways they might not otherwise, within both interstate and intrastate contexts. States might undertake cross-border, interstate actions less discriminately, especially in areas prone to tension. As is apparent in the East and South China Seas, nationalist sentiments and the discovery of untapped, valuable national resources can make disputes between countries more likely. In such contested areas, drones will enable governments to undertake strike missions or probe the responses of an adversary—actions they would be less inclined to take with manned platforms. According to the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), there are approximately 430 bilateral maritime boundaries, most of which are not defined by formal agreements between the affected states.26 Beyond the cases of East Asia, other cross-border flashpoints for conflict where the low-risk proposition of drone strikes would be tempting include Russia in Georgia or Ukraine, Turkey in Syria, Sudan within its borders, and China on its western periphery. In 2013, a Chinese counternarcotics official revealed that his bureau had considered attempting to kill a drug kingpin named Naw Kham, who was hiding in a remote region in northeastern Myanmar, by using a drone carrying twenty kilograms of dynamite. “The plan was rejected, because the order was to catch him alive,” the official recalled.27 With armed drones, China might make the same calculation that the United States has made—that killing is more straightforward than capturing—in choosing to target ostensibly high-threat individuals with drone strikes. China’s demonstrated willingness to employ armed drones against terrorists or criminals outside its borders could directly threaten U.S. allies in the region, particularly if the criterion China uses to define a terrorist does not align with that of the United States or its allies. Domestically, governments may use armed drones to target their perceived internal enemies. Most emerging drone powers have experienced recent domestic unrest. Turkey, Russia, Pakistan, and China all have separatist or significant opposition movements (e.g., Kurds, Chechens, the Taliban, Tibetans, and Uighurs) that presented political and military challenges to their rule in recent history. These states already designate individuals from these groups as “terrorists,” and reserve the right to use force against them. States possessing the lower risk—compared with other weapons platforms—capability of armed drones could use them more frequently in the service of domestic pacification, especially against time-sensitive targets that reside in mountainous, jungle, or other inhospitable terrain. Compared with typical methods used by military and police forces to counter insurgencies, criminals, or terrorists—such as ground troops and manned aircraft— unmanned drones provide significantly greater real-time intelligence through their persistent loiter time and responsiveness to striking an identified target. Increased Risk of Misperception and Escalation Pushing limits in already unstable regions is complicated by questions raised regarding rules of engagement: how would states respond to an armed drone in what they contend is their sovereign airspace, and how would opposing sides respond to counter-drone tactics? Japanese defense officials claim that shooting down Chinese drones in what Japan contends is its airspace is more likely to occur than downing manned aircraft because drones are not as responsive to radio or pilot warnings, thereby raising the possibility of an escalatory response.28 Alternatively, Japan might misidentify a Chinese manned fighter as an advanced drone and fire on it, especially if the aircraft’s radar signature is not sufficiently distinctive or if combat drones routinely fly over the disputed area. Thus, the additional risks associated with drone strikes, combined with the lack of clarity on how two countries would react to an attempted downing of a drone, create the potential for miscalculation and subsequent escalation. As U.S. Air Force commanders in South Korea noted, a North Korean drone equipped with chemical agents would not have to kill many or even any people on the peninsula to terrorize the population and escalate tensions.29 This scenario points to the spiraling escalatory dynamic that could be repeated—likely intensified in the context of armed drones—in other tension-prone areas, such as the Middle East, South Asia, and Central and East Africa, where the mix of low-risk and ambiguous rules of engagement is a recipe for escalation. Not all of these contingencies directly affect U.S. interests, but they would affect treaty allies whose security the United States has an interest in maintaining. Compared with other weapons platforms, current practice repeatedly demonstrates that drones make militarized disputes more likely due to a decreased threshold for the use of force and an increased risk of miscalculation. Increased Risk of Lethality The proliferation of armed drones will increase the likelihood of destabilizing or devastating one-off, high-consequence attacks. In March 2013, Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) observed of drones: “In some respects it’s a perfect assassination weapon. . . . Now we have a problem. There are all these nations that want to buy these armed drones. I’m strongly opposed to that.”30 The worst-case contingency for the use of armed drones, albeit an unlikely circumstance, would be to deliver weapons of mass destruction. Drones are, in many ways, the perfect vehicle for delivering biological and chemical agents.31 A WMD attack, or even the assassination of a political leader, another troubling though unlikely circumstance, would have tremendous consequences for regional and international stability. Deterring such drone-based attacks will depend on the ability of the United States and other governments to accurately detect and attribute them. Technical experts and intelligence analysts disagree about the extent to which this will be possible, but the difficulties lie in the challenges of detecting drones (they emit small radar, thermal, and electron signatures, and can fly low), determining who controlled it (they can be programmed to fly to a preset GPS coordinate), or assigning ownership to a downed system (they can be composed of commercial, off-the-shelf components).32 It is equally noteworthy that civilian officials or military commanders have almost always used armed drones in ways beyond their initially intended applications. Drones do not simply fulfill existing mission requirements; they create new and unforeseen ones, and will continue to do so in the future. Furthermore, U.S. officials would be misguided to view future uses of armed drones solely through the prism of how the United States has used them—for discrete military operations in relatively benign air-defense environments. The potential for misperception is compounded by the fact that few governments seeking or acquiring armed drones have publicly articulated any strategy for how they will likely use them. Conversely, the uncertainty about how other countries will use drones provides the United States with an opportunity to shape drone doctrines, especially for U.S. allies interested in procuring drones from U.S. manufacturers.

### Multilat

#### 1hNo internal link to multilat – Beard isn’t reverse causal – it just says countries like China and Russia are not involved in space governance now, not that including all countries boosts cred

#### Heg turns multilat – US leadership is comparatively better, multilateralism won’t be able to constrain china – anything else waters down alliances and doesn’t provide a deterrent

#### No terminal impact – cards make vague references to disease and warming or different war scenarios but no reason why those cause extinction

#### AT Wall – They can’t solve – they don’t re-vitalize the UN OST – they go through a new treaty which doesn’t solve the governance unravelling U/Q they’ve identified.

#### AT Beard – Disconnect from their U/Q which is about the US – either

#### a] Space Governance is high now.

Stuart 17 Jill Stuart 1-27-2017 "The Outer Space Treaty has been remarkably successful – but is it fit for the modern age?" <https://theconversation.com/the-outer-space-treaty-has-been-remarkably-successful-but-is-it-fit-for-the-modern-age-71381> (Visiting Fellow, Department of Government, London School of Economics and Political Science)//Elmer

Space exploration is governed by a complex series of international treaties and agreements which have been in place for years. The first and probably most important of them celebrates its 50th anniversary on January 27 – The Outer Space Treaty. This treaty, which was signed in 1967, was agreed through the United Nations, and today it remain as the “constitution” of outer space. It has been signed and made official, or ratified, by 105 countries across the world. The treaty has worked well so far but challenges have increasingly started to crop up. So will it survive another 50 years? The Outer Space Treaty, like all international law, is technically binding to those countries who sign up to it. But the obvious lack of “space police” means that it cannot be practically enforced. So a country, individual or company could simply ignore it if they so wished. Implications for not complying could include sanctions, but mainly a lack of legitimacy and respect which is of importance in the international arena. However it is interesting that, over the 50 years of it’s existence, the treaty has never actually been violated. Although many practical challenges have been made – these have always been made with pars of the treaty in mind, rather than seeking to undermine it entirely.

#### OR b] OTHER exclusions of Russia and China from multilateral agreements thump – they have no mining spill-over which means no solvency – here’s the re-cutting

Jack M. Beard 17, Assistant Professor of Law at the University of Nebraska College of Law, Space, Cyber & Telecommunications Law Program, LLM from Georgetown University, JD from the University of Michigan School of Law, and Former Associate Deputy General Counsel (International Affairs) at the Department of Defense, Former Lieutenant Colonel in the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the U.S. Army Reserve, “Soft Law's Failure on the Horizon: The International Code of Conduct for Outer Space Activities”, University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law, Spring 2017, 38 U. Pa. J. Int'l L. 335, Lexis

Russia and China thus continue to lie beyond the reach of the Code, defeating efforts by proponents to make the Code a widely subscribed and broadly accepted instrument and greatly diminishing its purported "norm-setting" capabilities. Whatever benefits soft law instruments are asserted to have in addressing security matters, participation by only a fraction of states in the Code, particularly a fraction that fails to include all the major space-faring countries, will not provide a sound basis for establishing new norms or help to identify or isolate aggressors and other non-participating, misbehaving states. Furthermore, states facing perceived security threats in space are not likely to be assured by a fractional version of the Code in which their potential adversaries do not even participate. In some areas of international cooperation, such as the protection of human rights, persuading only a fraction of states to initially sign multilateral instruments may be viewed as a positive, progressive [\*394] step of achievement (particularly since human rights agreements are not focused on reciprocal obligations). 240 As an arms control initiative for space, however, the Code's failure to include Russia and China and other major space stakeholders is a fundamental flaw. The absence of powerful, potential adversaries makes multilateral conventions addressing arms control or disarmament issues highly problematic for those states contemplating joining such regimes and making potentially dangerous, non-reciprocal commitments. 241 [FOOTNOTE] 241 Richard L. Williamson Jr., Hard Law, Soft Law, and Non-Law in Multilateral Arms Control: Some Compliance Hypotheses, 4 Chi. J. Int'l L 59, 61-62 (2003) ("Other matters can affect a treaty's effectiveness, such as the degree to which essential nations become parties to the treaty. If key parties remain outside the treaty, it increases pressure on the other states to withdraw or cheat"). [END FOOTNOTE] To the extent that soft law arrangements such as the proposed Code seek to promote arms control measures in the face of severe security dilemmas and the threat of arms races, the non-participation of powerful adversaries clearly undermines such efforts. If the proposed Code is adopted by states in its current state of limited acceptance, a fractional soft law product will emerge which will present its own particular disadvantages and problems (beyond those associated with soft law arrangements generally). Not only would a fractionalized Code fail to identify aggressors and isolate rogue states, it could instead lead to de facto competing legal regimes in space, as subscribing states respect their own "rules of the road" while other non-participating states - especially major, non-participating space powers - seek to advance their own interests through different or less restrictive approaches. Attempts to later successfully persuade non-participating states to accede to the Code will be challenging, if not impossible, and could risk further weakening rather than improving the Code. 242

#### AT Pelton – This card says space good NOT that space governance is good – there isn’t a spill-over argument or a coherent solvency chain/brink for how they cause action in outer space.

#### Space Multilateralism fails – free-riding.

Knopf 18 - professor at the Middlebury Institute of International Studies at Monterey, chair of the M.A. program in Nonproliferation and Terrorism Studies (Jeffrey, After diffusion: Challenges to enforcing nonproliferation and disarmament norms, *Contemporary Security Policy*, Vol. 39, Issue 3, February 9th, pages 367-398)

A second challenge that **complicates efforts to enforce** international **norms** is the well-known **collective action problem** (Olson, 1965). In many cases, effective enforcement will require the participation of more than one actor. Unless one state has unusual economic leverage, for example, economic sanctions usually **require multilateral enforcement** to be effective. Otherwise, the target state can evade sanctions by trading with those states that choose not to participate in the sanctions effort. **Even military enforcement** often **depends on** the involvement of **multiple states**. Take the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq in 2003 for example. Although often seen as a case of U.S. unilateralism, this is not entirely accurate. The United States relied on earlier UN Security Council resolutions for legal justification, so at minimum the United States needed other members of the Security Council to have voted in favor of relevant resolutions. It also sought a so-called second resolution that would have explicitly authorized the use of force, and the U.S. failure to obtain Security Council passage of this authorization reduced international support for the U.S.-led operation (Thompson, 2009). In addition, the United States sought to enlist other partners in the “coalition of the willing” that conducted the military operation. The United States could have gone it alone if it chose to, but it clearly had a strong preference to obtain as much legitimacy as it could from the presence of coalition partners. In short, effective unilateral enforcement is likely to be **rare**; norm enforcement will typically be more effective as a multilateral enterprise. **Multilateral cooperation is not automatic** however. By the familiar logic of collective action, states will be tempted to **free ride** on the enforcement efforts of others. As long as others enforce the nonproliferation or disarmament norm in question, free riders still enjoy the benefits. But free riders do not have to pay the costs of enforcement, in trade forgone, in diplomatic frictions with the target or its friends, or in potential casualties should military force come into play. If all states give in to the temptation to free ride, however, then **effective enforcement will not happen.** In some cases, a lack of participation in collective action may arise less from states deliberately free riding than from a **lack of consensus** about whether or not a particular state is actually violating a particular norm. There can be ambiguity about the standards for ascertaining norm compliance or about the evidence of a violation. When this occurs, states can come to **different interpretations** of whether the situation even calls for an effort at enforcement (for examples involving NPT safeguards, see Goldschmidt, 2010) The end result will be similar to when free riding occurs, in that many **states will choose not to join in collective action**. The collective action problem is accentuated by **global power asymmetries**. The **U**nited **S**tates is so much more powerful than most other states, and has demonstrated such an obvious commitment to enforcing nonproliferation in certain cases, **that other states may hope that the** **U**nited **S**tates **will shoulder the entire burden** of enforcement. This creates an especially strong temptation to free ride. To the extent that the **U**nited **S**tates cannot on its own bring about **norm compliance**, however, the collective action problem will become a major barrier to enforcement of nonproliferation norms.

#### AT Borgwardt – 1] They haven’t read Brink U/Q that Nuke Terror is happening/possible and 2] This assumes a Trump administration lash-out to Nuke Terror NOT a universal claim about how every country would react – no escalation scenario.

#### Normal Means requires amending the OST – that causes a runaway amendment convention.

Vedda 18 Jim Vedda May 2018 <https://aerospace.org/sites/default/files/2018-05/OuterSpaceTreaty.pdf> (senior policy analyst, PhD in Political Science at University of Florida)//Elmer

Treaty Amendment. If decisionmakers conclude that the Outer Space Treaty isn’t broken but is just showing its age, targeted changes are an obvious solution—especially in the areas of orbital debris, space salvage, and resource rights, as noted earlier; however, the process of reaching consensus on changes would entail years of diplomatic effort, with no guarantee that the end result would be better than (or as good as) what exists today. The amendment process may not remain limited to the one or two issues that prompted it. The U.N. Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space has 84 member countries,11 any of which could bring up its own amendments, which could be objectionable to the major stakeholders. Several countries, including China and Russia, have proposed treaty language that would ban all weapons in space,12 a position opposed by the United States. There is a strong possibility that similar language would be submitted as an amendment if the treaty were to be opened for revision. This could bog down the process and derail prospects for achievement in the specific areas originally targeted. In May 2017, the Senate space subcommittee held a hearing on the Outer Space Treaty,13 specifically asking whether it needed amendment to remove roadblocks to space commerce. All seven witnesses—with backgrounds in law, business consulting, and space entrepreneurship—testified that there is no need to amend the treaty, and attempting to do so could leave industry worse off. They described the treaty as minimally burdensome, and emphasized that priority should be given instead to making the U.S. licensing and regulation regime for space commerce more stable, predictable, and transparent. This is not to suggest that amendments should never be attempted, but rather that the amendment process must be undertaken with eyes wide open. The Outer Space Treaty and other space agreements exist in a dynamic environment. Technology continues to advance, and the amount and type of space activity keeps changing— so treaties may need periodic updating. But at present, higher priority should be assigned to development of a well-reasoned and comprehensive national space strategy.

#### That wrecks the OST.

Melroy 17 Pamela Melroy 5-23-2017 “Reopening the American Frontier: Exploring How the Outer Space Treaty Will Impact American Commerce and Settlement in Space” <https://www.hsdl.org/?abstract&did=807259> (Retired NASA Astronaut)//Elmer

There are many exciting activities and proposals in commercial space. With respect to the Outer Space Treaty, I am deeply concerned that we would be opening a Pandora’s Box by attempting to change it. My concern is that the likely outcome would be a lack of consensus, resulting in no amendments. Instead, we will have a weakened dedication to the Principles of the Treaty and the sustainability of space. Great changes are occurring and many countries are developing capabilities that previously were the purview of only a few nation states. Our ability to compete both economically and technologically in space is crucial. These Principles form the basis for the dialog that we have with other countries about what is appropriate and what is not. Without them, the dialog becomes chaos