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#### Plan – The appropriation of outer space through the production of space debris by private entities is unjust.

#### Revising the Outer Space Treaty curbs the impact of space debris – timeframe is crucial.

Shah 20 – Sachin, 8/30/20, [“Aug 30 The International Legal Regulation of Space Debris,” CORNELL UNDERGRADUATE LAW & SOCIETY REVIEW, Administrative, Policy, Technology, <https://www.culsr.org/articles/the-international-legal-regulation-of-space-debris>] Justin

The body of legal regulations regarding the use of space (space being defined as the area above the jurisdiction of air law) by public and private entities is referred to as space law. Currently, there are only about five such regulations of space, the most significant of those being the United Nations’ Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (hereinafter referred to as the Outer Space Treaty) of 1967. In this article, I would like to specifically describe and analyze the laws and regulations’ handling of the increasingly prevalent issue of space debris in orbit around Earth. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) defines space debris as “any man-made object in orbit about the Earth which no longer serves a useful function.” [1] However, a major point of confusion discussed below is that the Outer Space Treaty does not explicitly define what it refers to as “space objects,” nor does it mention whether space debris are space objects. An excessive clustering of space debris is a problem for a few reasons. It may result in a phenomenon known as the Kessler Syndrome, in which there is a “cascade created when debris hits a space object, creating new debris and setting off a chain reaction of collisions that eventually closes off entire orbits.” [2] This endangerment of Earth’s future ability to explore extraterrestrial planets and life must be avoided at all costs. Furthermore, space debris in orbit around Earth limits the amount of available space for satellites to orbit, which may result in the Tragedy of the Commons: multiple actors will aggressively vie, in an arms race, for their right to space as it is a limited resource. [3] Space debris is thus a potentially pressing issue in our increasingly technological world. In this essay, I will analyze the existing regulation of space debris as outlined in the Outer Space Treaty, point out the issues with these regulations of space debris and discuss potential solutions, and, finally, discuss legal considerations for private enterprises as well.

The Outer Space Treaty of 1967 remains today’s leading regulation on the governance of outer space activities. A salient aspect of the Cold War was the space race between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) that occurred in the late 1960s. Before the nations engaged in their race to the moon, the United Nations enacted the Outer Space Treaty to ensure international peace by making the use of space equitable and fair. Articles VII and IX most closely deal with concepts of space debris, but it is important to note here that the Treaty does not specifically define space debris, and rather, governs the use of “space objects.” Article IX of the Treaty states that States “shall conduct all their activities in outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, with due regard to the corresponding interests of all other States Parties to the Treaty,” and that exploration of outer space should avoid its “harmful contamination.” [4] Many scholars believe that conducting activities with regard to other States involves leaving areas free of space debris, and further that space debris constitutes a harmful contamination to the space environment. Article VII of the Treaty provides that each State is “internationally liable for damage to another State Party to the Treaty or its natural or juridical persons by such object or its component parts on the Earth.” [5] Thus, regulations are in place to incentivize States to mitigate the amount of space debris they create for fear of severe financial penalties. There are also four other international treaties on space governance: the Rescue Agreement, the Liability Convention, the Registration Convention, and the Moon Agreement. These treaties, while also important, all have fewer signatory parties and were often created for more specific activities, whereas the Outer Space Treaty was general in scope and widely adopted. [6]

While many scholars agree that the Outer Space Treaty provides rudimentary regulation of the problem of space debris, therein lies the problem: it is only rudimentary. One of the most often cited problems with the Outer Space Treaty is that it was signed in 1967 (53 years ago) and that the technological climate of the space travel industry was not as advanced as it is today, reflected in a marked lack of specificity in the writing of these laws. [7] This lack of specificity highlights another issue: the imprecise language of the Treaty leaves unclear the definition of space debris, which leaves the regulation open to interpretation. Rather than agree with most scholars that space debris constitute “space objects,” scholar Chelsea Muñoz-Patchen uses the UN Space Debris Mitigation Guidelines’ definition of space debris along with the fact that space debris is non-functional and its ownership often untraceable in order to argue that space debris should be classified as “abandoned property” instead. [8] Furthermore, non-governmental private enterprises may be inclined to legally define space debris as something other than “space objects” in order to avoid the Outer Space Treaty’s aforementioned financial penalties, as will be explained below. The Outer Space Treaty also does not account for the fact that the space debris problem, especially as of late, has been becoming worse over time. As collisions between debris and satellites continue to occur, more debris is strewn across Earth’s orbit, endangering future spacecraft from safely orbiting Earth, supporting the theory of the Kessler Syndrome. [9] Thus, the Outer Space Treaty is not a very effective legal instrument with regards to mitigating the amount of space debris in orbit around Earth.

Due to the Treaty’s weakness, many of the aforementioned scholars support revising the Outer Space Treaty by clearly defining space debris, increasing its technology-specific language to combat space debris issues, and outlining specific punishments to negate the complete lack of enforcement built into the current Treaty. While nations do recognize the danger that space debris pose to orbital operations, stronger laws must be enacted in order to de-escalate an imminent arms race and incentivize them to mitigate their debris. [10] Believing that one convention or treaty would be insufficient, N. Jasentuliyana recommends the creation of a regulatory regime to solve the growing problem of space debris. Such a regime would “effectively deal with these technical problems and establish international legal rules, standards and procedures on a continuing basis.” [11] Thus, one potential solution to the legal lack of space debris mitigation is establishing a lawmaking agency which specifically focuses on the issue of space debris. In addition to the creation of a legal agency which could hold actors accountable for the amount of space debris produced, international laws guiding the actions of private companies’ activities may also provide an answer, as will be discussed in greater detail below.

Although there do exist international laws and regulations governing the use of space for states and governmental entities (albeit weak ones), the private enterprises sending objects into space are subject to even less stringent regulations than states are. SpaceX, for example, to authorize their sending of 42,000 Starlink satellites into orbit, only had to submit paperwork to the U.S. Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and the International Telecommunication Union (ITU). [12] Paul Larsen posits that, in the face of less stringent regulations, nongovernmental satellite companies send many satellites into orbit in order to maximize their profit, which is their primary objective. Unlike the vagueness and lack of enforcement that came with written law (which is apparent in the Outer Space Treaty), the unwritten market-oriented incentives for profit by large-scale satellite providers and operators provide a reason for actors to mitigate space debris in orbit around Earth. Larsen states that “They have huge sums of money invested in each satellite, perhaps as much as a half-billion dollars, when all costs are included. Loss of one satellite is a major event. They want their assets to be safe.” [13] Thus, these satellite companies have a major stake in space traffic management and their market incentives do a better job of mitigating space debris than the existing legal regulation does. The company SpaceX, as mentioned above, plans to send 42,000 satellites into space. While doing so would likely result in significant profits for the company, many believe this will diminish astronomical visibility as well as increase the chance of collisions with space debris. [14] Due to these effects, scientists and space law experts alike have called for a legal delay to the ITU’s decision on whether or not to accept SpaceX’s proposal to launch more satellites. If these parties are successful, a precedent-setting legal case regarding space debris mitigation and satellite use in space may well provide a solution to the outdated Outer Space Treaty of 1967.

#### Private entities are non-governmental.

Dunk 11 – Frans G. von der Dunk, 2011, [“The Origins of Authorisation: Article VI of the Outer Space Treaty and International Space Law,” University of Nebraska] Justin

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 of the 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” responsibility,18 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.

#### Removal efforts are complements to the plan not the silver bullet.

Rada Popova 18, European Space Agency Project Co-Manager and PhD Faculty of Law @ Universitat zu Koln, “The Legal Framework for Space Debris Remediation as a Tool for Sustainability in Outer Space,” *Aerospace*, MDPI, doi:10.3390/aerospace5020055 \*adr = active debris removal, \*\*sdr = space debris remediation, \*\*OOS = on orbit servicing

In outer space, any launch creates space debris. Since the first man-made object was launched into space in 1957, more than 5600 launches have taken place [2]. In addition, incidents and collisions create additional space debris. As a result, human activities have caused significant negative effects on outer space, as during the past six decades near-Earth orbits have been filled with functional and non-functional objects, the overwhelming majority of which are debris. Of course, this observation is not relevant for the whole of outer space. For the purposes of this article, and of space law in general, the subject of interest is naturally restricted to the orbital regions that are accessible for man-made spacecraft and are used for space activities. The farthest space mission so far—Voyager-I—has left the solar system and entered interstellar space. Nevertheless, most human activities take place in low-Earth orbit (LEO) in an altitude between 200 and 2000 km used for the International Space Station, Earth observation satellites as well as some telescopes, medium-Earth orbit (MEO) in an altitude approximately between 2000 and 36,000 km mostly used for navigation, geodetic and communication satellites as well as geostationary Earth orbit (GEO) at approximately 36,000 km. Currently, there are 1738 functional satellites, of which 1071 are in LEO, 531 in GEO, 97 in MEO and 39 in elliptical orbits [3]. Currently, only 6% of the catalogued orbital population are functional objects. The number of non-functional objects that are trackable and contained in the Space Surveillance Network catalogue show that there are more than 21,000 larger than 10 cm. For smaller sizes, the estimates are based on statistical models, such as the NASA Standard Breakup Model [4] and in-situ measurements. The estimates include 150 million objects larger than 1 mm and 600,000 objects up to 1 cm. Moreover, 700,000 to 750,000 pieces of space debris larger than 1 cm have resulted from more than 200 on-orbit defragmentations [5]. As a consequence of the vast orbital velocity in LEO (8 km/s = 28,800 km/h), impacts with the smallest objects of 1 mm might cause degradation and damage to functional spacecraft. So far, shielding options have been developed, but they are only effective for fragments not larger than 1 cm. Impacts with larger objects have the potential to destroy functional satellites. This is linked to the decisive factor for the constant growth in debris: the ‘Kessler syndrome’—a cascade effect describing the fact that collisions between space debris result in an exponential growth in the orbital debris population which, once collisional break-up begins, will increase even if no new launches take place [6,7]. In the near future, a further “growth factor” which might additionally influence space debris propagation are so-called ‘mega-constellations’ that will consist of hundreds of small satellites with a short operational lifetime and restricted manoeuvring capability [8,9,10]. Table 1 lists recently announced satellite constellations aiming to provide global internet communications which have attracted much publicity. Some commonalities include: (1) the orbital altitudes above the popular 800–900 km Sun-synchronous orbits where atmospheric drag is non-existent; and (2) the compact mass of objects below 500 kg which suggests low-thrust electrical propulsions for orbital manoeuvers. The list of announced constellations could easily be extended. However, it is unlikely that all announced plans turn into reality. In such global business scenarios, typically the first-in-the-market along with two or three competitors apportion the market among themselves. This happened in the 1990s, when several global communication LEO constellation systems were announced of which only Iridium, Globalstar and Orbcomm made it into orbit. Keeping in mind that approximately 1000 active satellites are in LEO today, with the announced OneWeb mega-constellation this number will almost double [11], and if all three constellations on the list are launched, this would result in a tenfold increase in the LEO satellite population. The scope of challenges posed by orbital debris pollution is further underlined by the restricted cataloguing possibilities and the relative effectiveness of space situational awareness systems. The catalogue maintained by the US Space Surveillance Network provides information on 16,000 objects [13]. The Space Awareness System of the European Space Agency (ESA) can track objects bigger than 10 cm in low-Earth orbits and 0.3–1 m in geostationary orbits [14]. Thus, only a small fraction of the overall debris population can be detected. Furthermore, even if a collision probability can be calculated, manoeuvring may not be feasible, e.g., due to restricted time for reaction or lack of manoeuvring capabilities or control over the satellite. Unlike the environment of the Earth that might be cleaned-up and restored to a previous state, outer space is governed by celestial mechanics which make it practically impossible to clean-up debris through natural orbital decay and thereby bring the orbital environment to its original state. The natural decay of space debris is dominated by the drag caused by the residual atmosphere. The effect is dependent on the mass, the cross-sectional area, and the orbital position of the space object. Space debris at 800 km may remain in orbit for the next few centuries [15] and space debris orbiting at more than 1500 km will practically remain in outer space forever as there is not enough drag from Earth’s atmosphere any more at this altitude [16]. All of these factors make for an alarming picture. In general, one can distinguish between collisions (in which two objects are involved) and break-up events (which can occur if a satellite is breaking up by itself because of residual fuel in the tanks or a self-destruct mechanism). Although so far only a few on-orbit collisions have occurred [17] (e.g., the 2007 anti-satellite missile test conducted by China on its Feng-Yun 1C satellite and the 2009 collision between the inactive Russian satellite Cosmos 2251 and the active US satellite Iridium 33), a dramatic growth in the space debris population has been caused by these accidents. Alone the 2009 collision led to the creation of a space debris cloud of 2000 pieces of debris larger than 10 cm and thousands of smaller pieces which might remain in orbit for years [18]. The number of collisions that will lead to further incidents will grow over time. This risk is particularly high for near-polar LEO orbits at around 800–900 km and the GEO region, as approximately 62% of functional satellites are in LEO and 31% in GEO [3,19]. As LEO is the region of greatest concern for the uncontrolled growth of debris, currently, the following mechanisms are considered vital to mitigate the debris population to a sustainable level: (1) post-mission disposal; (2) passivation; and, (3) active debris removal. While a few years ago, less than 50% of the missions in GEO were compliant with space debris mitigation standards [20], in 2016, more than 80% successful clearance attempts were undertaken in GEO and 66% in LEO [21]. It has been estimated that compliance with mitigation rules, e.g., through ensuring that 90% of the launches are in compliance with the 25-year rule of post-mission disposal as provided by the Space Debris Mitigation Guidelines of the Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee (IADC) [22] and no new on-orbit explosions occur, will not be enough to reverse the negative trend in the most used orbits. These findings were studied in detail by the IADC in simulation campaigns among the participating partners, and recently confirmed by reference simulation in the frame of the H2020-ReDSHIFT project [23]. Furthermore, even if up to 10 large objects are removed from low-Earth orbit per year, the debris growth in LEO is still likely to evolve negatively in the next 200 years [1]. Long-term reference scenarios conducted recently within the H2020-ReDSHIFT project used a space debris population from LEO to GEO and a projection time frame of 200 years. Assuming 2–3 self-induced in-orbit explosions over the next 15 years, a post-mission disposal success rate of 60% (on 25-year orbits in LEO and to graveyard orbits in GEO) and collision avoidance against all objects in LEO, the results show that remediation of two objects per year decreases 12% of the final population [24]. Thus, it is expected that a combination of mitigation and remediation measures is needed to overcome the negative trends which will, with time, evolve into a catastrophic state if no effective action is undertaken. While an established (voluntary) framework for non-binding mitigation measures and some state practice exists through the adoption of specific measures for space debris mitigation in the national space laws of some states [25], the legal implementation of space debris remediation (SDR) is still in the making. The reasons for the slow pace of this development are, on the one hand, of a technological nature and, on the other, are due to the complex legal problems posed by SDR. In the following sub-section, an overview of the legal framework and the main challenges for establishing rules on SDR will be given. 2.2. The Legal Framework for Space Activities The legal framework for outer space activities consists of five international treaties (the 1967 Outer Space Treaty (OST) [26], the 1968 Rescue Agreement [27], the 1972 Liability Convention [28], the 1975 Registration Convention [29], and the 1979 Moon Agreement [30]) adopted in the period between 1967 and 1979, resolutions of the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted since 1982, and the national space legislation of more than 20 countries. Since 1996, a tendency can be observed to adopt sets of measures and instruments on the international level that re-interpret concepts entailed in earlier Treaties [31]. The Outer Space Treaty is sometimes referred to as a “Constitution” of space law as it contains the basic principles for space activities, provides the basis for the next four treaties, and has gained significant support, with 107 signatories as of January 2018 [32]. Thereby the Outer Space Treaty is considered to contain principles of customary international law, which bind not only state parties to the treaty but also non-signatories [33]. Such customary principles are Articles I–IV, VI, VII, VIII and arguably also Art. IX OST and have served as a basis for the development of the further treaties on space law. International law designates outer space and celestial bodies the status of a global common—a domain beyond national jurisdiction which is not subject to national sovereignty. This is laid down in Art. I para. 1 of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty [26], according to which the use and exploration and use of outer space should be regarded as the ‘province of all mankind’. While it is difficult to define this notion in concrete terms, there is no doubt that outer space should be open to the use of all states, regardless of their current economic or technological development [34]. Thus, the use of outer space as a global common, including economic and non-economic uses as well as scientific exploration of outer space and celestial bodies, should be free—in the sense of remaining accessible for all states and their nationals on the same terms, without discrimination of any kind. Accessibility as a means to carry out space activities should be preserved not only in the short-term perspective, but on a long-term basis as the dependency of humans on outer space will only grow in the future. As a consequence, the sustainability of space activities must be ensured. It is, therefore, worthwhile discussing whether, if such activities are endangered by the negative consequences of orbital pollution, the rights of states to freely exercise their activities in outer space as stipulated in the Outer Space Treaty can be safeguarded. ● The Freedoms vs. the Usability of Outer Space The principles contained in the Outer Space Treaty and the subsequent four treaties on space law set out a framework for human activities in space that can be characterized as a system of freedoms and limitations. Art. I of the OST provides that there shall be freedom of the exploration, use and scientific investigation of outer space and celestial bodies. “Use” means both the economic and non-economic use of outer space [35]. The term “exploration”, however, stipulates not so much consuming or profiting from space but rather the discovery of something new or yet unknown. Scientific investigation might but must not necessarily overlap with “exploration” as scientific activities might be aimed also at already discovered objects or areas. The term “freedom” means that all addressees of these provisions (primarily states and also nationals of states, in as much as states entitle them to do so through national space legislation) are entitled to use, explore or scientifically investigate outer space without the need to ask for permission from other states or an international entity. At the same time, this means that such activities shall not be hampered, e.g., by harmful interference or other impairment. However, the freedoms of outer space are not absolute, as they are not limitless. Limitations are certain exceptions contained in Article I of the OST itself as well as in other treaty provisions of the corpus iuris spatialis. Such as, inter alia, the common benefit clause (Art. I para 1 OST), Art. III OST and Article 2 UN Charter, Art. IV para 1 OST, Art. VII OST and Art. 2 and 3 Liability Convention. Some of these limitations are specifically relevant for the sustainable use and exploration of outer space and celestial bodies, and thus for SDR, as sustainability is an indispensable condition for the usability of outer space. It is thereby required that the use of outer space by present generations takes place on the basis of responsibility towards future generations, which is reiterated by the specific nature of outer space as a global common. ● The notion of the “province of mankind” In Art I para 1 of the OST and Art. 4 of the Moon Agreement the use and exploration of space and celestial bodies are declared to be the “province of mankind”. Although no definition of the term “mankind” has been provided, this notion is an expression of the equal right of all states (regardless of the fact that they are space-faring or developing countries) and all generations (present and future) in the use and exploration of outer space and celestial bodies [36]. ● The Common Heritage of Mankind (CHM) concept (Art I para 1 OST, Art. 11 MOON) The purpose of this doctrine, which is not restricted only to space law, is the protection of certain areas of great importance outside national territory and ensuring their integrity for future generations. It is reflected the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea [37] and can also be found in the Preamble of the Antarctic Treaty [38] without being explicitly mentioned there. As with the province of mankind clause, the notion of CHM brings forward the particular status of outer space as a domain which should be open and preserved for all states and generations. ● Military uses of outer space Another important limitation to the freedoms of outer space is contained in Art. IV of the OST. Certain military uses of outer space, such as the placement of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction in orbit around the Earth, their installment as well as the establishment of military bases and the testing of weapons on celestial bodies or their stationing anywhere in space, are prohibited. Furthermore, para 2, Art. IV provides that outer space may be used for “peaceful purposes only”. While the exact meaning of the term “peaceful purposes” is contested, the leading opinion interprets it as non-aggressive, meaning that some military activities are acceptable if exercised lawfully (e.g., the right to self-defence, Art. 51 UN Charter) [39]. This provision is relevant especially as e.g., anti-satellite testing and other military destructive activities can produce a considerable amount of debris. ● The environmental protection of outer space A further limitation is contained in Art. IX of the OST, which is considered the basis for the environmental protection of outer space. By providing that states parties “shall conduct all their activities in outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, with due regard to the corresponding interests of all other states” [40], this provision reaffirms the common character of outer space. Furthermore, it provides that the “harmful contamination” of outer space and celestial bodies shall be avoided (Art. IX sent. 2 OST) and, in case activities can potentially cause “harmful interference with activities of other states parties”, consultations should be undertaken before the activity is carried out or continued (Art. IX sent. 3 and 4 OST). Although the concepts used in Art. IX are difficult to define, it expresses the idea that there shall be protection of space activities from all forms of interference that might cause harm or pose a risk of harm to other states [40]. Thereby, Art. IX of the OST contains the principle of co-operation (Art. IX sent. 1 OST) which is also found in Articles III and X of the OST and was further developed in the other four treaties on space law. However, no specific requirements for states as to how to exercise their activities in a manner that would ensure that the standard of care towards of activities of other states are provided. Thus, the legal framework provides for some general direction for co-operation between the users of outer space but concrete instruments on how to ensure sustainability need to be formulated in more detail. In fact, the treaties on space law neither expressly prohibit the creation of space debris nor impose an obligation on states and their space actors to remove space objects from orbit. Mitigation measures have so far only been adopted as voluntary, non-binding instruments and have been partly adopted in the national laws of some states [25]. In sum, it can be stated that a general obligation to protect the environment of outer space results from the common interest of the community of states to access and use outer space. If a narrow interpretation of the theory of erga omnes obligations is followed, it is the currently 107 State parties to the OST [32] which represent the community having a common interest in the protection of the usability of outer space. If the view is followed, that due to the broad support and the principle-based character of some of its norms, the Outer Space Treaty has at least partly customary character, it can be argued that the 107 State Parties represent the global community so that the global community has a legal interest in the environmental protection of outer space., but a concrete, binding way of action for SDR cannot be derived from existing space law [41]. 2.3. The Future of the Outer Space Environment 2.3.1. Sustainability as a Condition for the Usability of Outer Space What, then, can be done? In the context of the work of the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (UNCOPUOS), the sustainability of outer space is defined by the stability and safety of its environment which shall be “open for exploration, use and international cooperation by current and future generations (…)” [42], based on non-discrimination. Thus, sustainability is a condition for any future access to and use of outer space. On the technical level, both mitigation and remediation concepts **have been developed** in order to facilitate the protection of near-Earth space from space debris aiming to “maintain the conduct of space activities indefinitely in the future” [43]. Out of the factors playing a role in the creation and distribution of space debris (orbit dynamics, air-drag on the residual atmosphere, on-orbit explosions, collisions, surface degradation slag from solid rocket motor firings, launch rates of future missions, operational practices and mitigation practices) a few will be tackled here that are the direct result of man-made activities. In the style of the “leave no trace” paradigm of sustainable outdoor activities in nature here on Earth, several guidelines have been formulated as well for space activities; for instance, guidelines for the disposal of defunct satellites which are to be removed from LEO within 25 years after their end-of-life. In practice, this typically is realized by a final orbit maneuver which lowers the perigee as much as possible to ensure it will re-enter within 25 years. Such an action at the end of a mission is also beneficial with respect to another paradigm, which calls for a minimum impact on the environment. In a last orbit maneuver, all the leftover fuel can be used, which is one element of the passivation of satellites at their end-of-life. In general, passivation covers all forms of stored energy on board, let it be kinetics of the gyros, charge of batteries, and also fuel in the tanks. Passivation aims at the minimization of self-induced break-ups and it is expected that the number of explosions can be controlled very well by proper passivation and their severity can be significantly reduced (because e.g., the residual fuel cannot self-ignite when the tank corrodes and lead to a complete destruction). That said, post-mission disposal considerations are to be seen in opposition to the space mission operators’ desire to extend the nominal mission operation. Naturally, this is also a sustainable approach. It is usually better in terms of global sustainability to continue using old equipment (and accepting additional maintenance to a certain economic level) instead of throwing it away and replacing it. In space, however, maintenance is not easily done. Therefore, the risk of a critical failure on-board a satellite increases towards longer mission durations. From the sustainability point of view, it remains unclear when it is best to simply extend a mission and accept the higher risk of losing control over the satellite and not being able to perform disposal at all or to terminate the mission with a proper disposal maneuver and passivation. The aforementioned example highlights that, as in other domains, there is a usually a conflict of interest between the immediate needs of spacecraft operators and the higher good of preserving the space environment in accordance with the treaties on space law. Space mission designers will always assess the collision probability due to space debris and define a tolerated risk threshold for their assets. In case the desired target orbit is already too densely populated with debris, it is possible to re-design and move to other, higher orbits. What is yet to be done is to strike an agreement at a global level to define acceptable inflictions on the space environment that are tolerable. An analogy can be drawn to the consensus on the two-degree goal in climate change. Maybe it is possible to discuss and formulate similarly memorable and easily understandable goals for the outer space environment. Although it is unlikely that the final sentence will state “Two collisions per year are tolerable”, such goals would provide the necessary foundation for further action. 2.3.2. The Need to Act As any significant accident in outer space leads to irreparable damage in orbital stability, it is not enough to mitigate the production of new space debris. In particular, the fact that in higher altitudes objects may remain over hundreds or even thousands of years, means that a potentially catastrophic effect for functional objects remains. Mitigation can indeed contribute to stabilizing the outer space environment, but further measures are necessary. For example, in LEO mitigation measures can only slow down the pace of growth but are not enough to stop it. Therefore, further measures aiming at reducing the existing space debris population through remediation are needed if the most used orbits are to remain usable. For example, a long-term scenario with five ADR missions per year clearly shows that remediation for large objects would lower the number of collisions in densely populated orbital regions from 10 to 5 and is, thus, advantageous [23].

#### Exemptions destroy the coercive power of legal regimes – causes circumvention across the board.

Hickman and Dolman 2 – John and Everett, 2002, Associate professor in the Department of Government and International Studies at Berry College in Mt. Berry, [“Resurrecting the Space Age: A State–Centered Commentary on the Outer Space Regime,” Volume 21 Number 1, <https://doi.org/10.1080/014959302317350855>] Elmer Recut Justin

Thus a state party need merely announce its intention to withdraw and then wait one year. Withdrawal of a single state party to the treaty, however, would not necessarily terminate the treaty between the other state parties. Yet, the decision of an important state not to be bound by a regime–creating treaty obviously endangers the entire treaty. The decision of the United States or China to withdraw from the OST would have far greater implications for the survival of the international space regime than the same decision by Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, or Papua New Guinea—the equality of states under international law remains nothing more than a useful  ction. For the OST to remain good international law, it must be accepted as such by the major space faring states of the 21st Century: the United States, Russia, the European Union, Japan, and China. One defection from the regime by a member of this group would no doubt lead to its effective collapse, as the remaining space faring states are unlikely to use the kind of coercion necessary to enforce the regime. A more likely response to such a defection is a scramble to make similar claims to sovereignty, based on historical precedent and effective occupation. Similar rushes to stake claims for territory sovereignty in other celestial bodies might follow.

### 1AC – Adv – Debris

#### The advantage is Debris –

#### Privatization of space leads to unchecked debris.

Muelhaupt et al. 19 – Theodore, Marlon Sorge, Jamie Morin, and Robert Wilson, 6/18/19, Center for Orbital and Reentry Debris Studies, Center for Space Policy and Strategy, The Aerospace Corporation, 30 year Space Systems Analyst and Operator, [“Space traffic management in the new space era,” Journal of Space Safety Engineering, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S246889671930045X?via%3Dihub>] Justin

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 satellites in orbit in the next 10 years. For perspective, fewer than 8100 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. Some announced NewSpace constellations. Operator Number of satellites Altitude (km) Country SpaceX V-band 7518 335–345 US Capella 48 350–650 US Planet Swift 6 350–650 US Black Sky 60 450 US Satellogic NuSat 300 500 Argentina Kepler 140 550 US SpaceX Starlink 1584 550 US Skybox 30 576 US Fleet 100 580 Australia Amazon Kuiper 3236 590–630 US Commsat 800 600 China Kineis 20 600 France Yalini 135 600 Canada Spire 100 651 US Planet Doves 150 675 US Orbcomm 31 750 US Iridium 72 780 US Theia 112 800 US Lucky Star 156 1000 China Telesat LEO 72 1000 Canada Hongyan 300 1100 China Xinwei 32 1100 China SpaceX Starlink 2825 1110–1325 US OneWeb 720 1200 ESA Telesat LEO 45 1248 Canada Astrome Tech 600 1400 India LeoSat 108 1400 US Globalstar 40 1412 US 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.



Fig. 1. Objects in LEO orbit by altitude per 10 km altitude bin. Elliptical orbit objects distributed by portion spent in each bin. Some notable existing resident systems are listed on the right. New residents, including some replacement systems, are on the left. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.) 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. Aerospace studies [7–9] have shown that failed satellites, whether they fail during operations or fail during disposal, can pose as great or even greater risk than the many thousands of operational satellites (Fig. 2). Given the rapid flux in the proposed large LEO constellations (LLC), we created a Future Constellations Model (FCM) with elements that represented the characteristics of the different systems being proposed. In our models, almost all the collisions and the resulting debris from those collisions occur because of failed systems. Most large constellation operators intend to perform active collision avoidance for active systems, whether operational or in some stage of check-out or disposal, but failed satellites are assumed to be incapable of maneuver. Fig. 2 also shows that satellites in the disposal phase can contribute to collisions similarly to satellites in the operational phase. Fig 2 Download : Download full-size image Fig. 2. Collisions during operations and disposal over 10 years for various NewSpace Future Constellation Models (FCMs). 4. A notional illustration of workload The highest risk to operational satellites comes from the lethal but non-trackable debris that is depicted in the blue line in Fig. 2. However, operators perform collision avoidance only on the objects that can be tracked and cataloged. Advances in tracking and NewSpace launches will both act to increase this workload. A key element of the problem is that an increase in the LEO population will lead to an increase in close approaches to existing satellites [5], and the potential for accidental collisions. Conjunction prediction, collision probability (Pc), and maneuver planning for most existing satellite operators is a time- and personnel-intensive operation. Orbit analysts, and propulsion, navigation, and communications systems personnel are involved in evaluating and planning maneuvers over several days and must do so even if the ultimate decision is to “fly through” a close approach. Since most existing systems have small numbers of vehicles and the number of conjunctions any given operator experiences is relatively small, COLA remains a manual process. For systems not designed with automated maneuver planning, a COLA assessment that progresses all the way to a maneuver plan can consume considerable effort, whether or not the maneuver is executed. If a large constellation is deployed next to an existing resident system, the existing system may experience many conjunctions and alerts due to its close proximity of the dense new constellation. A sufficiently large constellation will, in effect, form a “shell” where frequent opportunities for conjunctions will be created. For example, Fig. 3 depicts a fictional scenario where 1225 “New” satellites are distributed in 35 planes in circular orbits at 1000 km altitude, at 98° inclination. These are placed near a hypothetical “Old” six-satellite constellation operating in a nearly circular orbit at the same altitude and 63° inclination. Following a common operations practice, we assume that the Old satellite operators flag a conjunction at Pc> 10−7, start COLA assessment with additional tracking at Pc> 10−6, and plan a COLA maneuver when the Pc> 10−5. A conjunction with Pc > 10−4 would typically be considered a significant risk leading most operators to maneuver. Fig 3 Download : Download full-size image Fig. 3. “New” large LEO constellation at same average altitude as “Old” existing constellation. Currently, the Old system in this example would typically see a warning (Pc > 10−6) a few times a month at this altitude, and of those, a few per year might cross the maneuver threshold. For the operations center, this would be multiplied by the number of satellites in the constellation. When the New system parks nearby, the number of COLA alerts jumps substantially. But the number of alerts depends entirely on the error bubble, (covariance) used. If the typical errors of the public external tracking data and the orbit propagation methods that are widely available (General Perturbations, or GP) are used for both constellations, over a 30-day period we see 129 conjunctions that cross the threshold for COLA assessment (Pc> 10−6), and 53 that cross the maneuver planning threshold (Pc> 10−5) (Fig. 4). This is nearly 2 per day. This could be an enormous workload for a manual process. If a high accuracy catalog (Special Perturbations, or “SP”) and a high-fidelity propagator with its typical covariances is used, the number of conjunctions goes from 129 to a more manageable 10. SP data is maintained by the Air Force, but it is not widely available. It is interesting to note that nine of those 10 crossed the maneuver-planning threshold, and of those, four crossed the Pc> 10−4 where many operators would choose to execute a maneuver. Compared to GP, the SP-quality data resulted in far fewer warnings and flagged four very close conjunctions. The operations center would have been able to concentrate on fewer “false alarms”. We also computed the case where GPS-quality owner-operator data was used for both systems, in which we assumed near-real-time owner-operator position data of very high quality was provided by both operators and used in the collision analysis. In this case, NONE of the conjunctions resulted in a warning and no COLA alerts were generated. The closest approach was 99 m, with a Pc of 3.7 × 10−7 using SP. But because of the quality of the GPS-based position data, this conjunction did not raise an alert because the fully-informed operators could be confident that a collision would not occur. Fig 4 Download : Download full-size image Fig. 4. Number of COLA alerts in 30 days for various qualities of position knowledge when a fictional new system is deployed near an existing one. In the example, an operations center for the Old constellation of six satellites could go from about one COLA assessment a week to nearly one per day per satellite, if only the published satellite catalog is available. If a new constellation operates too close to an existing system, the operator workload may become unreasonable using existing processes. But high accuracy data makes this manageable, and GPS-quality owner-operator data for both systems makes the problem vanish. Since these constellations are likely to be operated by different companies or governments, sharing high-quality position data would likely require an active space traffic management organization. Existing operators will not necessarily have large constellations parked nearby, but they will nonetheless be affected by the new activity. The new large constellations’ satellites typically will have relatively short lifetimes and will need frequent replenishment. The traffic transiting up and down will be substantial, and failures could leave stranded objects at intermediate altitudes, permanently increasing the collision risk. 5. Conjunction warning overload NewSpace operators will face a different challenge due to the vast increase in numbers of satellites. While there are likely as many operational plans as there are operators, a large constellation must consider close approaches with itself. Even if there are no neighboring systems, self-conjunctions can occur between two members of the same constellation. Depending on the configuration, a given operator could see hundreds to thousands of self-conjunctions that cross typical warning thresholds each day using current practices. This could be an issue for a space traffic management (STM) agency, even if it is not an issue for the operator. Aerospace models show that for one possible NewSpace constellation, more than 500,000 self-conjunctions each year could result that cross the typical Pc > 10−6 warning threshold. If no action were taken, we would expect 2–3 collisions per year. This is clearly unacceptable. Thus, current tracking accuracy and processes might produce millions of warnings per year for NewSpace operators to prevent half a dozen actual collisions. Under current practices operators would need to sort through an enormous haystack to find the needles, and because a handful of actual collisions will occur, the warnings cannot be ignored.

#### Feedback loops of technology cause increasing development and debris.

Bernat 20 – Pawel, 2020, Military University of Aviation, [“ORBITAL SATELLITE CONSTELLATIONS AND THE GROWING THREAT OF KESSLER SYNDROME IN THE LOWER EARTH ORBIT,” SAFETY ENGINEERING OF ANTHROPOGENIC OBJECTS, Volume 4, PDF] Justin

The second decade of the 21st century has brought a dynamic and somewhat surprising development of the space industry. Since 1972 – the Apollo 17 crew mission to the Moon, the humankind has not left the safe environment of Earth’s orbit, and for years the global space sector has been progressing in slow but steady pace run by a few largest space agencies like American NASA, European ESA, Japanese JAXA, and Chinese CNSA. The most significant achievement of the “old ways” of managing outer space exploration is the International Space Stations (ISS) that has facilitated more than 20 years of continuous crewed operations. The situation started to change at the turn of the century when new generations of private entrepreneurs began to invest in and develop space technologies like rocket boosters, spaceships, and what most important for the subject of the paper – satellites and their constellations. This new shift is known among the space industry as “Space 2.0”, and its emergence is dated around 2000-2002 when the companies like SpaceX, Blue Origin, and Virgin Galactic were established. (Pyle, 2019). The real change, however, came in 2012 when the first SpaceX commercial mission was successfully launched to the ISS (NASA, 2012). Since then, the participation of the private sector in the space industry has skyrocketed, especially in the United States. Today, SpaceX is the only entity that provides reusable rockets (first stage and fairings) that is capable of vertical launch and landing. Their current flagship rocket – Falcon 9 has carried out 23 successful missions in 2020 (SpaceX, 2020) and another four are planned for December of that year (Weitering, 2020). Moreover, thanks to Crew Dragon spaceship developed by the company, Americans have regained this year the capacity of sending astronauts from their own soil after nine years of buying the seats on Russian Soyuz capsule. SpaceX is now in the process of building a communication satellites constellation that will be addressed and analyzed in the paper. Nowadays, in the space industry, we witness a very productive cybernetic feedback look between the development of space technologies, the democratization of those technologies, and a substantial reduction of prices. The latter is even more significant if we compare the cost of launching cargo into orbit now and 20 years ago – Falcon 9 is over ten times cheaper than Space Shuttle (Jones, 2018). This, of course, directly translates into the mass and number of objects that we are able to put in the orbit viably. Once the constellations consisting of thousands of satellites were unthinkable, but in the current environment, they become a reality. Space 2.0 also has brought new threats and challenges in the sphere of national and international security. The increase in launch capacity, among other factors, has led to progressive militarization and weaponization of space and new arms race (Bernat, 2019), which has also contributed to the growing numbers of orbiting objects. The goal of the paper is to present the argumentation that the threat posed by the cascading collisions in the Earth’s orbit (Kessler syndrome) is becoming more severe due to the construction of orbital satellite constellations; the threat that presents a real danger for people during their EVAs and orbital infrastructure, which may bare immediate consequences for safety and security systems on Earth. In order to provide the theoretical context for the above claim, the following issues will be presented and discussed: (1) space debris, (2) the Kessler syndrome, (3) orbital debris models, (4) the legal issues related to space debris and mitigation actions against their proliferation, and (5) the planned and being currently developed orbital satellite constellations and how they contribute to the growing threat of the Kessler syndrome.

#### Privatization exponentially increases the curve but ending dangerous missions stops it.

Bernat 20 – Pawel, 2020, Military University of Aviation, [“ORBITAL SATELLITE CONSTELLATIONS AND THE GROWING THREAT OF KESSLER SYNDROME IN THE LOWER EARTH ORBIT,” SAFETY ENGINEERING OF ANTHROPOGENIC OBJECTS, Volume 4, PDF] Justin

5. Orbital satellite constellations and the growing threat of the Kessler syndrome Space 2.0 – the new era of space exploration that we witness now in the 21st century means, in words of Buzz Aldrin, “moving human enterprise into space” (Pyle, 2019, p. xiv). The process of commercialization of outer space has already begun and is not limited to private companies providing technologies and services for national or international space agencies, as it was in the past. On the contrary, private companies from the space sector have now matured to carry out their own independent projects. As for 2020, SpaceX is a company that serves as the best example – it launches satellites to the orbit, both for state and private contractors, it successfully realized two crew missions to the International Space Station, and is in the process of constructing Starlink satellite constellation that will provide high-speed internet access across the planet. Each satellite weighs around 260 kg, is equipped with an ion propulsion system, autonomous collision avoidance system, and orbits Earth at approximately 540-560 km altitude (Starlink, 2020). At the beginning of November 2020, more than 860 Starlink satellites were orbiting the Earth (Jewett, 2020). Immediate plans include launching 12,000 satellites, but they assume a potential later extension to 42,000 (Henry, 2019a). Of course, SpaceX has employed, at least declaratively, all necessary measures to keep the space clean – the satellites are equipped with the deorbiting system, and in the event of inoperability of the propulsion system (Starlink, 2020). The orbital collisions are, however, inevitable. As it was shown before, the possibility of collisions grows with the number of orbital objects. Bastida Virgili with the team compared (2016, p. 154-155) orbital debris environment development without and with a large hypothetical constellation consisting of merely 1080 satellites, distributed across 20 orbital planes at 1,100 km altitude (Fig. 5).
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It has to be noted that although SpaceX’s Starlink is the only constellation that is being built in orbit, it is not the only one planned. There are at least a few initiatives aiming at the same goal – to construct internet infrastructure at the Earth’s orbit. The planned Kuiper Systems LLC, which is a subsidiary of Amazon and intends to place 3,236 broadband satellites in the LEO, is one of Starlink’s biggest competitors (Henry, 2019b). Now, there is even a rivalry between the two companies because Kuiper’s lowest orbital shell is planned to be 590 km, with a tolerance of 9 km either above or below (Cao, 2020), which is the altitude of Starlink satellites. Moreover, the race for space in orbit is now at the beginning. The outer space is vast. It increasingly becomes more cluttered with both operational satellites and space debris. The threat of collisions increases and no institution or body has enough power to license, coordinate and regulate what is sent to the orbit. The UNOOSA has not such power. National states decide what the companies from the space industry can launch to space. In the United States, which is most advanced in the area of private constellations, it is the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) that issues the appropriate approvals. The race to put broadband internet satellites bears similarities to the gold rush – there are no rules, at the global level, apart from first-come, first-served.

#### Models are rigorous and robust.

---To clarify this is the methodology for above chart.

Virgili et al. 16 – Bastida, J.C. Dolado, H.G. Lewis, J. Radtke, H. Krag, B. Revelin, C. Cazaux b , C. Colombo, R. Crowther, M. Metz, 4/26/16, [“Risk to space sustainability from large constellations of satellites,” Act Astranautica, <https://sci-hub.se/10.1016/j.actaastro.2016.03.034>.] Justin

1.3. Simulation approach and result analysis A Monte Carlo (MC) approach was used to simulate the evolution of the object population over a period of 200 years under different post-mission disposal requirements, with four different tools (MEDEE – Modelling the Evolution of Debris on Earth's Environment [9], LUCA – Long Term Utility for Collision Analysis [10], DAMAGE – Debris Analysis and Monitoring Architecture to the Geosynchronous Environment [11] and DELTA – Debris Environment Long Term Analysis [12]). For analysis purposes, the effective number of objects was used where the contribution to the population by each object was weighted by the proportion of the orbital period spent in LEO. In a first step, four different evolutionary models performed an analysis of two reference scenarios. One scenario considered only the evolution of the background population and non-constellation traffic. The second scenario augmented the first with the addition of the representative constellation, with the requirement that 90% of the constellation satellites achieved post-mission disposal to orbits with remaining lifetimes of 25 years. The manoeuvres performed at the mission end to meet the disposal requirement are assumed to be impulsive (i.e. instantaneous) and result in an eccentric orbit with the apogee near the original (constellation) altitude and the perigee at an altitude such that the effects of atmospheric drag would cause the orbit to decay within 25 years. Two of the models considered an apogee remaining at the operational constellation altitude, while the other two reduced the apogee by 50 km. The purpose of these scenarios is to provide a cross-comparison of the models in terms of their predictions of the total object population, which take into account the effects of the constellation. As the distribution of the MC results for the models is of the same nature and the results are independent, a bootstrapping [20] approach is used to derive the mean, the standard deviation and the confidence levels at 95% of the combined results of all the MC runs from the four models (cf. Fig. 1), although not all the models performed the same number of MC runs (see Table 1). The main source of variation inside a particular model's MC runs included the randomness in collision activity, while the different models used their own solar activity forecast.

#### Debris triggers miscalculated war.

Peter Dockrill 16. Award-winning science & technology journalist. “Space Junk Accidents Could Trigger Armed Conflict, Study Finds.” <https://www.sciencealert.com/space-junk-accidents-could-trigger-armed-conflict-expert-warns>.

The increasingly crowded space in Earth's low orbit could set the stage for an international armed conflict, says a new study. Researchers from the Russian Academy of Sciences warn that accidents stemming from the steady rise in space junk floating around the planet could incite political rows and even warfare, with nations potentially mistaking debris-caused incidents as the results of intentional aggressive acts by others. In a paper published in Acta Astronautica, the team suggests that space debris in the form of spent rocket parts and other fragments of hardware hurtling at high speed pose a "special political danger" that could dangerously escalate tensions between nations. According to the study, destructive impacts caused by random space junk cannot easily be told apart from military attacks. "The owner of the impacted and destroyed satellite can hardly quickly determine the real cause of the accident," the authors write. The risks of such an event occurring are compounded by the sheer volume of debris now orbiting Earth. Recent figures from NASA indicate that there are more than 500,000 pieces of space junk currently being tracked in orbit, travelling at speeds up to 28,160 km/h (17,500 mph). The majority of those objects are small – around the size of a marble – but some 20,000 of them are bigger than a softball. In addition to these 500,000 or so fragments – which are big enough for scientists to know about them – NASA estimates that there are millions of undetectable pieces of debris in orbit that are too small to be monitored. But even extremely small fragments such as these pose a threat – in fact, they're considered a greater risk than trackable debris, as their invisible status means spacecraft and satellites can't do anything to avoid them until it's too late. As NASA observed in 2013: "Even tiny paint flecks can damage a spacecraft when travelling at these velocities. In fact a number of space shuttle windows have been replaced because of damage caused by material that was analysed and shown to be paint flecks… With so much orbital debris, there have been surprisingly few disastrous collisions." While we may have been lucky in the past, we can't rely on that to continue. The study by the Russian team cites the repeated sudden failures of defence satellites in past decades that were never explained. The researchers attribute two possible causes: either unrecorded collisions with space junk, or aggressive actions from adversaries. "This is a politically dangerous dilemma," the authors write.

#### Goes nuclear.

Les Johnson 14. Baen science fiction author, popular science writer, and NASA technologist. “Living without satellites”. <https://www.baen.com/living_without_satellites>.

Satellite imagery is used by the military and our political leaders to maintain the peace. When your potential adversaries can’t hide what they’re doing, where their armies are moving and what they are doing with their civilian and military infrastructure, then the danger of surprise attack is diminished. In our nuclear age with instant death only minutes away by missile attack, the doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) only works if both sides know whether or not they are being attacked. The launch of missiles or a bomber fleet can easily be seen from space far in advance of either reaching their potential targets halfway around the globe. The danger of surprise attack is therefore small, making an accidental war far less likely. So what does all this mean? And what do we do about it? First of all, it means that the advocates of space development, exploration and commercialization have succeeded far beyond their initial expectations and dreams. The economies and security of countries in the developed world are now dependent on space satellites. We space advocates should celebrate our success and be terrified of it at the same time. Should we lose these fragile assets in space, our economy would experience a disruption like no other: ship, air and train travel would stop and only restart/operate in a much-reduced capacity for years (GPS loss). Many banking and retail transactions would cease (VSAT loss). Distribution of news and vital national information would be crippled (communications satellite loss). Lives would be put at risk and the productivity of our farming would dramatically decrease (weather satellite loss). The risk of war, including nuclear war, would increase (loss of spy satellites) and our military’s ability to react to crises would be significantly reduced (loss of military logistics and intelligence gathering satellites).

#### Convergence of factors guarantee space escalation.

Thomas González Roberts 17. A space security researcher at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, and host of [Moonstruck](https://www.moonstruckpodcast.com/), a podcast about humans in space. "Why We Should Be Worried about a War in Space ," 12-15-2017. Atlantic, <https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2017/12/why-we-should-be-worried-about-a-war-in-space/548507/>

One hundred miles above the Earth’s surface, orbiting the planet at thousands of miles per hour, the six people aboard the International Space Station enjoy a perfect isolation from the chaos of earthly conflict. Outer space has never been a military battleground. But that may not last forever. The [debate in Congress](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1e6zH3AfZHs4hLpGaKwmxAVxR-LfWk0110THq9tIhgOU/edit?ts=5a2f95e8?utm_source=masthead-newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=member-newsletter-20171213-20&silverid=%25%25RECIPIENT_ID%25%25) over whether to create a Space Corps comes at a time when governments around the world are engaged in a bigger international struggle over how militaries should operate in space. Fundamental changes are [already underway](https://www.csis.org/analysis/congress-creating-military-space-corps?utm_source=masthead-newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=member-newsletter-20171213-20&silverid=%25%25RECIPIENT_ID%25%25). No longer confined to the [fiction shelf](https://best-sci-fi-books.com/23-best-military-science-fiction-books/?utm_source=masthead-newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=member-newsletter-20171213-20&silverid=%25%25RECIPIENT_ID%25%25), space warfare is likely on the horizon. While agreements for how to operate in other international domains, like the open sea, airspace, and even cyberspace, have already been established, the major space powers—the United States, Russia, and China—have not agreed upon a rulebook outlining what constitutes bad behavior in space. It’s [presumed](http://intercrossblog.icrc.org/blog/twmzia1cp84kv2c29bi4iz6q4u03in?utm_source=masthead-newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=member-newsletter-20171213-20&silverid=%25%25RECIPIENT_ID%25%25) that International Humanitarian Law would apply in outer space—protecting the civilian astronauts aboard the International Space Station—but it’s unclear whether damaging civilian satellites or the space environment itself is covered under the agreement. With only a limited history of dangerous behavior to study, and few, [outdated guidelines](http://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/spacelaw/treaties/introouterspacetreaty.html?utm_source=masthead-newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=member-newsletter-20171213-20&silverid=%25%25RECIPIENT_ID%25%25) in place, a war in space would be a war with potentially more consequences, but far fewer rules, than one on Earth. Although there has never been a military conflict in space, the history of human activity above our atmosphere is not entirely benign. In 1962, the United States [detonated a 1.4 megaton nuclear weapon](https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/going-nuclear-over-the-pacific-24428997/?utm_source=masthead-newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=member-newsletter-20171213-20&silverid=%25%25RECIPIENT_ID%25%25) 250 miles above the Earth’s surface. The blast destroyed approximately one third of satellites in orbit and poisoned the most used region of space with radiation that lasted for years. Although the United States, Russia, and others soon agreed to a treaty to prevent another nuclear test in space, China and North Korea never signed it. In 2007, China [tested an anti-satellite weapon](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/01/18/AR2007011801029.html?utm_source=masthead-newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=member-newsletter-20171213-20&silverid=%25%25RECIPIENT_ID%25%25), a conventionally-armed missile designed to target and destroy a satellite in orbit. In the process, it annihilated an old Chinese weather satellite and created high-velocity shrapnel that still threatens other satellites. Even though demonstrations like this have consequences for everyone, countries are free to carry them out as they see fit. No treaties address this kind of test, the creation of space debris, or the endangerment of other satellites. The U.S. has the most to lose in a space-based conflict With by far the most satellites in orbit, the U.S. has the most to gain by establishing norms, but also the most to lose. Almost half of all operational satellites are owned and operated by the United States government or American commercial companies. That’s twice as many as Russia and China, combined. Space may seem distant, but what happens there affects our everyday lives on the ground. When we use our phones to plan a trip, we depend on American GPS satellites to guide us. When the U.S. military deploys troops overseas, satellite communications connect forces on the ground to control centers. When North Korea launches an intercontinental ballistic missile, the U.S. and its allies depend on early-warning satellites to detect it. On one hand, if the global space powers agreed to put limits on space-based weapons and other related technologies, it could make space safer for everyone. But because the U.S. may have spent time and resources [developing](https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2017/05/why-so-secretive/525969/?utm_source=masthead-newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=member-newsletter-20171213-20&silverid=%25%25RECIPIENT_ID%25%25) exactly the type of weapons that a code of conduct would ban**,** it could also curtail the most advanced space-based developments, erasing years of research and progress. There are more players in space—and less consensus In the [first space age](https://www.csis.org/analysis/escalation-and-deterrence-second-space-age?utm_source=masthead-newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=member-newsletter-20171213-20&silverid=%25%25RECIPIENT_ID%25%25), from the launch of the first human-made satellite in 1957 through the fall of the Soviet Union, the United States and the USSR were responsible for over 90 percent of all satellites. Their race to perfect space technology, dominated by both national security interests and scientific discovery, far outpaced everyone else. The second space age, from 1990 to today, looks remarkably different. Now, more satellites are operated by private companies than militaries, and more space launches and new satellites come from countries other than the United States and Russia. More players in space—particularly more unpredictable players—means more opportunities for aggressive behavior, like developing anti-satellite technologies or hacking satellite communications. Countries like Iran or North Korea that are newer to space can choose to operate in a way we’ve never seen before. And if their nuclear programs on Earth are [any guide](https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2017/10/iran-northk-korea-nuclear/542673/?utm_source=masthead-newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=member-newsletter-20171213-20&silverid=%25%25RECIPIENT_ID%25%25), they could pose serious threats if left unchecked. Efforts have been made to create a modern-day space rulebook, but so far none have gained traction. In 2008, when Russia and China both proposed norms of behavior, the United States [refused to sign on](https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2017/04/space-war/521910/?utm_source=masthead-newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=member-newsletter-20171213-20&silverid=%25%25RECIPIENT_ID%25%25). Similarly, when the United States supported a 2014 European Union proposal to govern the use of conventional weapons in orbit, Russia and China didn’t agree with the terms. Since the congressional debate about a Space Corps, people have been taking the prospect of a war in space seriously, in a way we haven’t seen before. Now we should start talking about how to avoid that war. To prevent conflict in the upper atmosphere, all potential adversaries—the United States, China, North Korea, Iran, Russia, the EU—need to align, and agree on norms of behavior. They need rules.

#### Any nuclear war causes extinction – ice age and famine.

Steven Starr 15 [Director of the University of Missouri’s Clinical Laboratory Science Program, as well as a senior scientist at the [Physicians for Social Responsibility](http://www.psr.org/). He has worked with the Swiss, Chilean, and Swedish governments in support of their efforts at the United Nations to eliminate thousands of high-alert, launch-ready U.S. and Russian nuclear weapons. “Nuclear War: An Unrecognized Mass Extinction Event Waiting To Happen.” Ratical. March 2015. <https://ratical.org/radiation/NuclearExtinction/StevenStarr022815.html>] TG

A war fought with 21st century strategic nuclear weapons would be more than just a great catastrophe in human history. If we allow it to happen, such a war would be a mass extinction event that [ends human history](https://ratical.org/radiation/NuclearExtinction/StarrNuclearWinterOct09.pdf). There is a profound difference between extinction and “an unprecedented disaster,” or even “the end of civilization,” because even after such an immense catastrophe, human life would go on. But extinction, by definition, is an event of utter finality, and a nuclear war that could cause human extinction should really be considered as the ultimate criminal act. It certainly would be the crime to end all crimes. The world’s leading climatologists now tell us that nuclear war threatens our continued existence as a species. Their studies predict that a large nuclear war, especially one fought with strategic nuclear weapons, would create [a post-war environment in which for many years it would be too cold and dark to even grow food](http://climate.envsci.rutgers.edu/pdf/RobockToonSAD.pdf). Their findings make it clear that not only humans, but most large animals and many other forms of complex life would likely vanish forever in a nuclear darkness of our own making. The environmental consequences of nuclear war would attack the ecological support systems of life at every level. Radioactive fallout, produced not only by nuclear bombs, but also by the destruction of nuclear power plants and their spent fuel pools, would poison the biosphere. Millions of tons of smoke would act to [destroy Earth’s protective ozone layer](https://www2.ucar.edu/atmosnews/just-published/3995/nuclear-war-and-ultraviolet-radiation) and block most sunlight from reaching Earth’s surface, creating Ice Age weather conditions that would last for decades. Yet the political and military leaders who control nuclear weapons strictly avoid any direct public discussion of the consequences of nuclear war. They do so by arguing that nuclear weapons are not intended to be used, but only to deter. Remarkably, the leaders of the Nuclear Weapon States have chosen to ignore the authoritative, long-standing scientific research done by the climatologists, research that predicts virtually any nuclear war, fought with even a fraction of the operational and deployed nuclear arsenals, will leave the Earth essentially uninhabitable.

### 1AC – Framing

#### The meta-ethic is moral naturalism.

#### 1] Non-natural moral facts are epistemically inaccessible

Papineau 7 [David, Academic philosopher. He works as Professor of Philosophy of Science at King's College London, having previously taught for several years at Cambridge University and been a fellow of Robinson College, Cambridge, “Naturalism”. [http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/naturalism/](http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/naturalism/))]

Moore took this argument to show that moral facts comprise a distinct species of non-natural fact. However, any such non-naturalist view of morality faces immediate difficulties, deriving ultimately from the kind of causal closure thesis discussed above. If **all physical effects are due to a limited range of natural causes, and if moral facts lie outside this range, then it follow that moral facts can never make any difference to what happens in the physical world** (Harman, 1986). At first sight **this** may seem tolerable (perhaps moral facts indeed don't have any physical effects). But it **has** **very awkward epistemological consequences.** For beings like us, **knowledge of the spatiotemporal world is mediated by physical processes involving our sense organs and cognitive systems. If moral facts cannot influence the physical world, then [we can’t] it is hard to see how we can have any knowledge of them.**

#### Thus, the standard is maximizing expected wellbeing. Pleasure and pain *are* intrinsic value and disvalue – everything else *regresses* – robust neuroscience.

Blum et al. 18 – Kenneth Blum, 1Department of Psychiatry, Boonshoft School of Medicine, Dayton VA Medical Center, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, USA 2Department of Psychiatry, McKnight Brain Institute, University of Florida College of Medicine, Gainesville, FL, USA 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA 5Department of Precision Medicine, Geneus Health LLC, San Antonio, TX, USA 6Department of Addiction Research & Therapy, Nupathways Inc., Innsbrook, MO, USA 7Department of Clinical Neurology, Path Foundation, New York, NY, USA 8Division of Neuroscience-Based Addiction Therapy, The Shores Treatment & Recovery Center, Port Saint Lucie, FL, USA 9Institute of Psychology, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary 10Division of Addiction Research, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC. North Kingston, RI, USA 11Victory Nutrition International, Lederach, PA., USA 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA, Marjorie Gondré-Lewis, 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA 13Departments of Anatomy and Psychiatry, Howard University College of Medicine, Washington, DC US, Bruce Steinberg, 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA, Igor Elman, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, David Baron, 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA, Edward J Modestino, 14Department of Psychology, Curry College, Milton, MA, USA, Rajendra D Badgaiyan, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, Mark S Gold 16Department of Psychiatry, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA, “Our evolved unique pleasure circuit makes humans different from apes: Reconsideration of data derived from animal studies”, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 28 February 2018, accessed: 19 August 2020, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6446569/>, R.S.

**Pleasure** is not only one of the three primary reward functions but it also **defines reward.** As homeostasis explains the functions of only a limited number of rewards, the principal reason why particular stimuli, objects, events, situations, and activities are rewarding may be due to pleasure. This applies first of all to sex and to the primary homeostatic rewards of food and liquid and extends to money, taste, beauty, social encounters and nonmaterial, internally set, and intrinsic rewards. Pleasure, as the primary effect of rewards, drives the prime reward functions of learning, approach behavior, and decision making and provides the **basis for hedonic theories** of reward function. We are attracted by most rewards and exert intense efforts to obtain them, just because they are enjoyable [10]. Pleasure is a passive reaction that derives from the experience or prediction of reward and may lead to a long-lasting state of happiness. The word happiness is difficult to define. In fact, just obtaining physical pleasure may not be enough. One key to happiness involves a network of good friends. However, it is not obvious how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to an ice cream cone, or to your team winning a sporting event. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure [14]. Pleasure as a hallmark of reward is sufficient for defining a reward, but it may not be necessary. A reward may generate positive learning and approach behavior simply because it contains substances that are essential for body function. When we are hungry, we may eat bad and unpleasant meals. A monkey who receives hundreds of small drops of water every morning in the laboratory is unlikely to feel a rush of pleasure every time it gets the 0.1 ml. Nevertheless, with these precautions in mind, we may define any stimulus, object, event, activity, or situation that has the potential to produce pleasure as a reward. In the context of reward deficiency or for disorders of addiction, homeostasis pursues pharmacological treatments: drugs to treat drug addiction, obesity, and other compulsive behaviors. The theory of allostasis suggests broader approaches - such as re-expanding the range of possible pleasures and providing opportunities to expend effort in their pursuit. [15]. It is noteworthy, the first animal studies eliciting approach behavior by electrical brain stimulation interpreted their findings as a discovery of the brain’s pleasure centers [16] which were later partly associated with midbrain dopamine neurons [17–19] despite the notorious difficulties of identifying emotions in animals. Evolutionary theories of pleasure: The love connection BO:D Charles Darwin and other biological scientists that have examined the biological evolution and its basic principles found various mechanisms that steer behavior and biological development. Besides their theory on natural selection, it was particularly the sexual selection process that gained significance in the latter context over the last century, especially when it comes to the question of what makes us “what we are,” i.e., human. However, the capacity to sexually select and evolve is not at all a human accomplishment alone or a sign of our uniqueness; yet, we humans, as it seems, are ingenious in fooling ourselves and others–when we are in love or desperately search for it. It is well established that modern biological theory conjectures that **organisms are** the **result of evolutionary competition.** In fact, Richard Dawkins stresses gene survival and propagation as the basic mechanism of life [20]. Only genes that lead to the fittest phenotype will make it. It is noteworthy that the phenotype is selected based on behavior that maximizes gene propagation. To do so, the phenotype must survive and generate offspring, and be better at it than its competitors. Thus, the ultimate, distal function of rewards is to increase evolutionary fitness by ensuring the survival of the organism and reproduction. It is agreed that learning, approach, economic decisions, and positive emotions are the proximal functions through which phenotypes obtain other necessary nutrients for survival, mating, and care for offspring. Behavioral reward functions have evolved to help individuals to survive and propagate their genes. Apparently, people need to live well and long enough to reproduce. Most would agree that homo-sapiens do so by ingesting the substances that make their bodies function properly. For this reason, foods and drinks are rewards. Additional rewards, including those used for economic exchanges, ensure sufficient palatable food and drink supply. Mating and gene propagation is supported by powerful sexual attraction. Additional properties, like body form, augment the chance to mate and nourish and defend offspring and are therefore also rewards. Care for offspring until they can reproduce themselves helps gene propagation and is rewarding; otherwise, many believe mating is useless. According to David E Comings, as any small edge will ultimately result in evolutionary advantage [21], additional reward mechanisms like novelty seeking and exploration widen the spectrum of available rewards and thus enhance the chance for survival, reproduction, and ultimate gene propagation. These functions may help us to obtain the benefits of distant rewards that are determined by our own interests and not immediately available in the environment. Thus the distal reward function in gene propagation and evolutionary fitness defines the proximal reward functions that we see in everyday behavior. That is why foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding. There have been theories linking pleasure as a required component of health benefits salutogenesis, (salugenesis). In essence, under these terms, pleasure is described as a state or feeling of happiness and satisfaction resulting from an experience that one enjoys. Regarding pleasure, it is a double-edged sword, on the one hand, it promotes positive feelings (like mindfulness) and even better cognition, possibly through the release of dopamine [22]. But on the other hand, pleasure simultaneously encourages addiction and other negative behaviors, i.e., motivational toxicity. It is a complex neurobiological phenomenon, relying on reward circuitry or limbic activity. It is important to realize that through the “Brain Reward Cascade” (BRC) endorphin and endogenous morphinergic mechanisms may play a role [23]. While natural rewards are essential for survival and appetitive motivation leading to beneficial biological behaviors like eating, sex, and reproduction, crucial social interactions seem to further facilitate the positive effects exerted by pleasurable experiences. Indeed, experimentation with addictive drugs is capable of directly acting on reward pathways and causing deterioration of these systems promoting hypodopaminergia [24]. Most would agree that pleasurable activities can stimulate personal growth and may help to induce healthy behavioral changes, including stress management [25]. The work of Esch and Stefano [26] concerning the link between compassion and love implicate the brain reward system, and pleasure induction suggests that social contact in general, i.e., love, attachment, and compassion, can be highly effective in stress reduction, survival, and overall health. Understanding the role of neurotransmission and pleasurable states both positive and negative have been adequately studied over many decades [26–37], but comparative anatomical and neurobiological function between animals and homo sapiens appear to be required and seem to be in an infancy stage. Finding happiness is different between apes and humans As stated earlier in this expert opinion one key to happiness involves a network of good friends [38]. However, it is not entirely clear exactly how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to a sugar rush, winning a sports event or even sky diving, all of which augment dopamine release at the reward brain site. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure. Remarkably, there are pathways for ordinary liking and pleasure, which are limited in scope as described above in this commentary. However, there are **many brain regions**, often termed hot and cold spots, that significantly **modulate** (increase or decrease) our **pleasure or** even produce **the opposite** of pleasure— that is disgust and fear [39]. One specific region of the nucleus accumbens is organized like a computer keyboard, with particular stimulus triggers in rows— producing an increase and decrease of pleasure and disgust. Moreover, the cortex has unique roles in the cognitive evaluation of our feelings of pleasure [40]. Importantly, the interplay of these multiple triggers and the higher brain centers in the prefrontal cortex are very intricate and are just being uncovered. Desire and reward centers It is surprising that many different sources of pleasure activate the same circuits between the mesocorticolimbic regions (Figure 1). Reward and desire are two aspects pleasure induction and have a very widespread, large circuit. Some part of this circuit distinguishes between desire and dread. The so-called pleasure circuitry called “REWARD” involves a well-known dopamine pathway in the mesolimbic system that can influence both pleasure and motivation. In simplest terms, the well-established mesolimbic system is a dopamine circuit for reward. It starts in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) of the midbrain and travels to the nucleus accumbens (Figure 2). It is the cornerstone target to all addictions. The VTA is encompassed with neurons using glutamate, GABA, and dopamine. The nucleus accumbens (NAc) is located within the ventral striatum and is divided into two sub-regions—the motor and limbic regions associated with its core and shell, respectively. The NAc has spiny neurons that receive dopamine from the VTA and glutamate (a dopamine driver) from the hippocampus, amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex. Subsequently, the NAc projects GABA signals to an area termed the ventral pallidum (VP). The region is a relay station in the limbic loop of the basal ganglia, critical for motivation, behavior, emotions and the “Feel Good” response. This defined system of the brain is involved in all addictions –substance, and non –substance related. In 1995, our laboratory coined the term “Reward Deficiency Syndrome” (RDS) to describe genetic and epigenetic induced hypodopaminergia in the “Brain Reward Cascade” that contribute to addiction and compulsive behaviors [3,6,41]. Furthermore, ordinary “liking” of something, or pure pleasure, is represented by small regions mainly in the limbic system (old reptilian part of the brain). These may be part of larger neural circuits. In Latin, hedus is the term for “sweet”; and in Greek, hodone is the term for “pleasure.” Thus, the word Hedonic is now referring to various subcomponents of pleasure: some associated with purely sensory and others with more complex emotions involving morals, aesthetics, and social interactions. The capacity to have pleasure is part of being healthy and may even extend life, especially if linked to optimism as a dopaminergic response [42]. Psychiatric illness often includes symptoms of an abnormal inability to experience pleasure, referred to as anhedonia. A negative feeling state is called dysphoria, which can consist of many emotions such as pain, depression, anxiety, fear, and disgust. Previously many scientists used animal research to uncover the complex mechanisms of pleasure, liking, motivation and even emotions like panic and fear, as discussed above [43]. However, as a significant amount of related research about the specific brain regions of pleasure/reward circuitry has been derived from invasive studies of animals, these cannot be directly compared with subjective states experienced by humans. In an attempt to resolve the controversy regarding the causal contributions of mesolimbic dopamine systems to reward, we have previously evaluated the three-main competing explanatory categories: “liking,” “learning,” and “wanting” [3]. That is, dopamine may mediate (a) liking: the hedonic impact of reward, (b) learning: learned predictions about rewarding effects, or (c) wanting: the pursuit of rewards by attributing incentive salience to reward-related stimuli [44]. We have evaluated these hypotheses, especially as they relate to the RDS, and we find that the incentive salience or “wanting” hypothesis of dopaminergic functioning is supported by a majority of the scientific evidence. Various neuroimaging studies have shown that anticipated behaviors such as sex and gaming, delicious foods and drugs of abuse all affect brain regions associated with reward networks, and may not be unidirectional. Drugs of abuse enhance dopamine signaling which sensitizes mesolimbic brain mechanisms that apparently evolved explicitly to attribute incentive salience to various rewards [45]. Addictive substances are voluntarily self-administered, and they enhance (directly or indirectly) dopaminergic synaptic function in the NAc. This activation of the brain reward networks (producing the ecstatic “high” that users seek). Although these circuits were initially thought to encode a set point of hedonic tone, it is now being considered to be far more complicated in function, also encoding attention, reward expectancy, disconfirmation of reward expectancy, and incentive motivation [46]. The argument about addiction as a disease may be confused with a predisposition to substance and nonsubstance rewards relative to the extreme effect of drugs of abuse on brain neurochemistry. The former sets up an individual to be at high risk through both genetic polymorphisms in reward genes as well as harmful epigenetic insult. Some Psychologists, even with all the data, still infer that addiction is not a disease [47]. Elevated stress levels, together with polymorphisms (genetic variations) of various dopaminergic genes and the genes related to other neurotransmitters (and their genetic variants), and may have an additive effect on vulnerability to various addictions [48]. In this regard, Vanyukov, et al. [48] suggested based on review that whereas the gateway hypothesis does not specify mechanistic connections between “stages,” and does not extend to the risks for addictions the concept of common liability to addictions may be more parsimonious. The latter theory is grounded in genetic theory and supported by data identifying common sources of variation in the risk for specific addictions (e.g., RDS). This commonality has identifiable neurobiological substrate and plausible evolutionary explanations. Over many years the controversy of dopamine involvement in especially “pleasure” has led to confusion concerning separating motivation from actual pleasure (wanting versus liking) [49]. We take the position that animal studies cannot provide real clinical information as described by self-reports in humans. As mentioned earlier and in the abstract, on November 23rd, 2017, evidence for our concerns was discovered [50] In essence, although nonhuman primate brains are similar to our own, the disparity between other primates and those of human cognitive abilities tells us that surface similarity is not the whole story. Sousa et al. [50] small case found various differentially expressed genes, to associate with pleasure related systems. Furthermore, the dopaminergic interneurons located in the human neocortex were absent from the neocortex of nonhuman African apes. Such differences in neuronal transcriptional programs may underlie a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders. In simpler terms, the system controls the production of dopamine, a chemical messenger that plays a significant role in pleasure and rewards. The senior author, Dr. Nenad Sestan from Yale, stated: “Humans have evolved a dopamine system that is different than the one in chimpanzees.” This may explain why the behavior of humans is so unique from that of non-human primates, even though our brains are so surprisingly similar, Sestan said: “It might also shed light on why people are vulnerable to mental disorders such as autism (possibly even addiction).” Remarkably, this research finding emerged from an extensive, multicenter collaboration to compare the brains across several species. These researchers examined 247 specimens of neural tissue from six humans, five chimpanzees, and five macaque monkeys. Moreover, these investigators analyzed which genes were turned on or off in 16 regions of the brain. While the differences among species were subtle, **there was** a **remarkable contrast in** the **neocortices**, specifically in an area of the brain that is much more developed in humans than in chimpanzees. In fact, these researchers found that a gene called tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) for the enzyme, responsible for the production of dopamine, was expressed in the neocortex of humans, but not chimpanzees. As discussed earlier, dopamine is best known for its essential role within the brain’s reward system; the very system that responds to everything from sex, to gambling, to food, and to addictive drugs. However, dopamine also assists in regulating emotional responses, memory, and movement. Notably, abnormal dopamine levels have been linked to disorders including Parkinson’s, schizophrenia and spectrum disorders such as autism and addiction or RDS. Nora Volkow, the director of NIDA, pointed out that one alluring possibility is that the neurotransmitter dopamine plays a substantial role in humans’ ability to pursue various rewards that are perhaps months or even years away in the future. This same idea has been suggested by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, a professor of biology and neurology at Stanford University. Dr. Sapolsky cited evidence that dopamine levels rise dramatically in humans when we anticipate potential rewards that are uncertain and even far off in our futures, such as retirement or even the possible alterlife. This may explain what often motivates people to work for things that have no apparent short-term benefit [51]. In similar work, Volkow and Bale [52] proposed a model in which dopamine can favor NOW processes through phasic signaling in reward circuits or LATER processes through tonic signaling in control circuits. Specifically, they suggest that through its modulation of the orbitofrontal cortex, which processes salience attribution, dopamine also enables shilting from NOW to LATER, while its modulation of the insula, which processes interoceptive information, influences the probability of selecting NOW versus LATER actions based on an individual’s physiological state. This hypothesis further supports the concept that disruptions along these circuits contribute to diverse pathologies, including obesity and addiction or RDS.

#### Prefer:

#### 1] Actor spec—governments must use util because they don’t have intentions and are constantly dealing with tradeoffs—outweighs since different agents have different obligations—takes out calc indicts since they are empirically denied.

#### 2] No intent-foresight distinction for states.

Enoch 07 Enoch, D [The Faculty of Law, The Hebrew Unviersity, Mount Scopus Campus, Jersusalem]. (2007). INTENDING, FORESEEING, AND THE STATE. Legal Theory, 13(02). doi:10.1017/s1352325207070048 https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/legal-theory/article/intending-foreseeing-and-the-state/76B18896B94D5490ED0512D8E8DC54B2

The general difficulty of the intending-foreseeing distinction here stemmed, you will recall, from the feeling that attempting to pick and choose among the foreseen consequences of one’s actions those one is more and those one is less responsible for looks more like the preparation of a defense than like a genuine attempt to determine what is to be done. Hiding behind the intending-foreseeing distinction seems like an attempt to evade responsibility, and so thinking about the distinction in terms of responsibility serves 39. Anderson & Pildes, supra note 38. I will use this text as my example of an expressive theory here. 40. See id. at 1554, 1564. 41. For a general critique, see Mathew D. Adler, Expressive Theories of Law: A Skeptical Overview, 148 U. PA. L. REV. 1363 (1999–2000). 42. As Adler repeatedly notes, the understanding of expression Anderson & Pildes work with is amazingly broad, so that “To express an attitude through action is to act on the reasons the attitude gives us”; Anderson & Pildes, supra note 38, at 1510. If this is so, it seems that expression drops out of the picture and everything done with it can be done directly in terms of reasons. 43. This may be true of what Anderson and Pildes have in mind when they say that “expressive norms regulate actions by regulating the acceptable justifications for doing them”; id. at 1511. http://journals.cambridge.org Downloaded: 03 Aug 2014 IP address: 134.153.184.170 Intending, Foreseeing, and the State 91 to reduce even further the plausibility of attributing to it intrinsic moral significance. This consideration—however weighty in general—seems to me very weighty when applied to state action and to the decisions of state officials. For perhaps it may be argued that individuals are not required to undertake a global perspective, one that equally takes into account all foreseen consequences of their actions. Perhaps, in other words, individuals are entitled to (roughly) settle for having a good will, and beyond that let chips fall where they may. But this is precisely what stateswomen and statesmen—and certainly states—are not entitled to settle for.44 In making policy decisions, it is precisely the global (or at least statewide, or nationwide, or something of this sort) perspective that must be undertaken. Perhaps, for instance, an individual doctor is entitled to give her patient a scarce drug without thinking about tomorrow’s patients (I say “perhaps” because I am genuinely not sure about this), but surely when a state committee tries to formulate rules for the allocation of scarce medical drugs and treatments, it cannot hide behind the intending-foreseeing distinction, arguing that if it allows45 the doctor to give the drug to today’s patient, the death of tomorrow’s patient is merely foreseen and not intended. When making a policy-decision, this is clearly unacceptable. Or think about it this way (I follow Daryl Levinson here):46 perhaps restrictions on the responsibility of individuals are justified because individuals are autonomous, because much of the value in their lives comes from personal pursuits and relationships that are possible only if their responsibility for what goes on in the (more impersonal) world is restricted. But none of this is true of states and governments. They have no special relationships and pursuits, no personal interests, no autonomous lives to lead in anything like the sense in which these ideas are plausible when applied to individuals persons. So there is no reason to restrict the responsibility of states in anything like the way the responsibility of individuals is arguably restricted.47 States and state officials have much more comprehensive responsibilities than individuals do. Hiding behind the intending-foreseeing distinction thus more clearly constitutes an evasion of responsibility in the case of the former. So the evading-responsibility worry has much more force against the intending-foreseeing distinction when applied to state action than elsewhere.

#### 3] Death is bad and o/w—ontologically destroys the subject.

Paterson 1 – Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island. (Craig, “A Life Not Worth Living?”, Studies in Christian Ethics, <http://sce.sagepub.com>)

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alter- native of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather, death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes.80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unintentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81  In conclusion, concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state that any intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility.82

#### Impact calc –

#### 1] Extinction outweighs:

#### A] Structural violence- death causes suffering because people can’t get access to resources and basic necessities

#### B] Objectivity- body count is the most objective way to calculate impacts because comparing suffering is unethical

#### C] Comes before value-to-life.

Tännsjö 11 (Torbjörn, the Kristian Claëson Professor of Practical Philosophy at Stockholm University, “Shalt Thou Sometimes Murder? On the Ethics of Killing,” <http://people.su.se/~jolso/HS-texter/shaltthou.pdf>) //BS 1-27-2018

\*\*Bracketed to avoid triggers

I suppose it is correct to say that, if Schopenhauer is right, if life is never worth living, then according to utilitarianism we should all [die] commit suicide and put an end to humanity. But this does not mean that, each of us should commit suicide. I commented on this in chapter two when I presented the idea that utilitarianism should be applied, not only to individual actions, but to collective actions as well.¶ It is a well-known fact that people rarely commit suicide. Some even claim that no one who is mentally sound commits suicide. Could that be taken as evidence for the claim that people live lives worth living? That would be rash. Many people are not utilitarians. They may avoid suicide because they believe that it is morally wrong to kill oneself. It is also a possibility that, even if people lead lives not worth living, they believe they do. And even if some may believe that their lives, up to now, have not been worth living, their future lives will be better. They may be mistaken about this. They may hold false expectations about the future.¶ From the point of view of evolutionary biology, it is natural to assume that people should rarely commit suicide. If we set old age to one side, it has poor survival value (of one’s genes) to kill oneself. So it should be expected that it is difficult for ordinary people to kill themselves. But then theories about cognitive dissonance, known from psychology, should warn us that we may come to believe that we live better lives than we do.¶ My strong belief is that most of us live lives worth living. However, I do believe that our lives are close to the point where they stop being worth living. But then it is at least not very far-fetched to think that they may be worth not living, after all. My assessment may be too optimistic.¶ Let us just for the sake of the argument assume that our lives are not worth living, and let us accept that, if this is so, we should all kill ourselves. As I noted above, this does not answer the question what we should do, each one of us. My conjecture is that we should not [die] commit suicide. The explanation is simple. If I [die] kill myself, many people will suffer. Here is a rough explanation of how this will happen: ¶ ... suicide “survivors” confront a complex array of feelings. Various forms of guilt are quite common, such as that arising from (a) the belief that one contributed to the suicidal person's anguish, or (b) the failure to recognize that anguish, or (c) the inability to prevent the suicidal act itself. Suicide also leads to rage, loneliness, and awareness of vulnerability in those left behind. Indeed, the sense that suicide is an essentially selfish act dominates many popular perceptions of suicide. ¶ The fact that all our lives lack meaning, if they do, does not mean that others will follow my example. They will go on with their lives and their false expectations — at least for a while devastated because of my suicide. But then I have an obligation, for their sake, to go on with my life. It is highly likely that, by committing suicide, I create more suffering (in their lives) than I avoid (in my life).

#### D] Mathematically outweighs.

MacAskill 14 [William, Oxford Philosopher and youngest tenured philosopher in the world, Normative Uncertainty, 2014]

The human race might go extinct from a number of causes: asteroids, supervolcanoes, runaway climate change, pandemics, nuclear war, and the development and use of dangerous new technologies such as synthetic biology, all pose risks (even if very small) to the continued survival of the human race.184 And different moral views give opposing answers to question of whether this would be a good or a bad thing. It might seem obvious that human extinction would be a very bad thing, both because of the loss of potential future lives, and because of the loss of the scientific and artistic progress that we would make in the future. But the issue is at least unclear. The continuation of the human race would be a mixed bag: inevitably, it would involve both upsides and downsides. And if one regards it as much more important to avoid bad things happening than to promote good things happening then one could plausibly regard human extinction as a good thing.For example, one might regard the prevention of bads as being in general more important that the promotion of goods, as defended historically by G. E. Moore,185 and more recently by Thomas Hurka.186 One could weight the prevention of suffering as being much more important that the promotion of happiness. Or one could weight the prevention of objective bads, such as war and genocide, as being much more important than the promotion of objective goods, such as scientific and artistic progress. If the human race continues its future will inevitably involve suffering as well as happiness, and objective bads as well as objective goods. So, if one weights the bads sufficiently heavily against the goods, or if one is sufficiently pessimistic about humanity’s ability to achieve good outcomes, then one will regard human extinction as a good thing.187 However, even if we believe in a moral view according to which human extinction would be a good thing, we still have strong reason to prevent near-term human extinction. To see this, we must note three points. First, we should note that the extinction of the human race is an extremely high stakes moral issue. Humanity could be around for a very long time: if humans survive as long as the median mammal species, we will last another two million years. On this estimate, the number of humans in existence in the The future, given that we don’t go extinct any time soon, would be 2×10^14. So if it is good to bring new people into existence, then it’s very good to prevent human extinction. Second, human extinction is by its nature an irreversible scenario. If we continue to exist, then we always have the option of letting ourselves go extinct in the future (or, perhaps more realistically, of considerably reducing population size). But if we go extinct, then we can’t magically bring ourselves back into existence at a later date. Third, we should expect ourselves to progress, morally, over the next few centuries, as we have progressed in the past. So we should expect that in a few centuries’ time we will have better evidence about how to evaluate human extinction than we currently have. Given these three factors, it would be better to prevent the near-term extinction of the human race, even if we thought that the extinction of the human race would actually be a very good thing. To make this concrete, I’ll give the following simple but illustrative model. Suppose that we have 0.8 credence that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 0.2 certain that it’s a good thing to produce new people; and the degree to which it is good to produce new people, if it is good, is the same as the degree to which it is bad to produce new people, if it is bad. That is, I’m supposing, for simplicity, that we know that one new life has one unit of value; we just don’t know whether that unit is positive or negative. And let’s use our estimate of 2×10^14 people who would exist in the future, if we avoid near-term human extinction. Given our stipulated credences, the expected benefit of letting the human race go extinct now would be (.8-.2)×(2×10^14) = 1.2×(10^14). Suppose that, if we let the human race continue and did research for 300 years, we would know for certain whether or not additional people are of positive or negative value. If so, then with the credences above we should think it 80% likely that we will find out that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 20% likely that we will find out that it’s a good thing to produce new people. So there’s an 80% chance of a loss of 3×(10^10) (because of the delay of letting the human race go extinct), the expected value of which is 2.4×(10^10). But there’s also a 20% chance of a gain of 2×(10^14), the expected value of which is 4×(10^13). That is, in expected value terms, the cost of waiting for a few hundred years is vanishingly small compared with the benefit of keeping one’s options open while one gains new information.