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### 1NC - OFF

ADR Unilat CP

#### CP Text: The United States federal government should:

#### --Substantially increase active debris removal

#### --Should declare debris in space to be abandoned property, with the right to salvage, and make our expired satellites available for salvage

#### -- Contributing to debris removal projects and establishing a space situational awareness catalogue that requires satellite declassification and notice in the case of impending collision with the governments of formal allies of the United States

#### --ensure standardization and integration of all shared space situational awareness data.

#### ADR solves comparatively better

--coop takes too long – proposed debris review in 1980 thru COPOUS and nothing happened

--timeframe is key – need to start now which flips solvency

--sufficiency - could remove 5 pieces now and make enviro more stable

--causes follow on – once we have the tech, others realize it’s feasible and do it too

--leadership is a nb – we are seen as taking moral highground to clean up
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US Leadership by Example

Need to Initiate Unilateral Action

International cooperation in space has rarely resulted in cost-effective or expedient solutions, especially in politically-charged areas of uncertain technological feasibility. The International Space Station, because of both political and technical setbacks, has taken over two decades to deploy and cost many billions of dollars—far more time and money than was originally intended. Space debris mitigation has also encountered aversion in international forums. The topic was brought up in COPUOS as early as 1980, yet a policy failed to develop despite a steady flow of documents on the increasing danger of space debris (Perek 1991). In fact, COPUOS did not adopt debris mitigation guidelines until 2007 and, even then, they were legally non-binding.

Space debris removal systems could take decades to develop and deploy through international partnerships due to the many interdisciplinary challenges they face. Given the need to start actively removing space debris sooner rather than later to ensure the continued benefits of satel- lite services, international cooperation may not be the most appropriate mechanism for instigating the first space debris removal system. Instead, one country should take a leadership role by establishing a national space debris removal program. This would accelerate technology development and demonstration, which would, in turn, build-up trust and hasten international participation in space debris removal.

POSSIBILITIES OF LEADERSHIP

As previously discussed, a recent NASA study found that annually removing as little as five massive pieces of debris in critical orbits could significantly stabilize the long-term space debris environment (Liou and Johnson 2007). This suggests that it is feasible for one nation to unilaterally develop and deploy an effective debris removal system. As the United States is responsible for creating much of the debris in Earth’s orbit, it is a candidate for taking a leadership role in removing it, along with other heavy polluters of the space environment such as China and Russia.

There are several reasons why the United States should take this leadership role, rather than China or Russia. First and foremost, the United States would be hardest hit by the loss of satellites services. It owns about half of the roughly 800 operating satellites in orbit and its military is significantly more dependent upon them than any other entity (Moore 2008). For example, GPS precision-guided munitions are a key component of the “new American way of war” (Dolman 2006, 163-165), which allows the United States to remain a globally dominant military power while also waging war in accordance with its political and ethical values by enabling faster, less costly war fighting with minimal collateral damage (Sheldon 2005). The U.S. Department of Defense recognized the need to protect U.S. satellite systems over ten years ago when it stated in its 1999 Space Policy that, “the ability to access and utilize space is a vital national interest because many of the activities conducted in the medium are critical to U.S. national security and economic well-being” (U.S. Department of Defense 1999, 6). Clearly, the United States has a vested interest in keeping the near-Earth space environment free from threats like space debris and thus assuring U.S. access to space

Moreover, current U.S. National Space Policy asserts that the United States will take a “leadership role” in space debris minimization. This could include the development, deployment, and demonstration of an effective space debris removal system to remove U.S. debris as well as that of other nations, upon their request. There could also be international political and economic advantages associated with being the first country to develop this revolutionary technology. However, there is always the danger of other nations simply benefiting from U.S. investment of its resources in this area. Thus, mechanisms should also be created to avoid a classic “free rider” situation. For example, techniques could be employed to ensure other countries either join in the effort later on or pay appropriate fees to the United States for removal services.

Recommendations for Leadership in Space Debris Removal

Going forward, the U.S. government should engage the commercial sector in space debris removal. Government contracts with several commercial firms would create a competitive environment, encouraging innovation and cost minimization. Having several companies working on the problem at the same time would also accelerate remediation as several critical orbits could be addressed at once. Furthermore, early investments in a domestic space debris removal industry would give the United States a head start in what may become a critical industry over the coming decades.

#### Causes international follow on --- Russia and China will go along separately later

--Russia and China will go along – otherwise they’d be pariahs and feel left out
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“The US government should support the development of best practices by following the lead of US commercial corporations, which have great sway internationally. For example, in human spaceflight, it is likely that US companies will lead the way in sub-orbital and orbital flights at least over the next decade. Coordination is already taking place among these companies in this regard. Similarly, asteroid mining companies are already coordinating informally on norms. The US Government could endorse these processes and begin to support these norms through its policy statements (such as the National Space Policy), enlisting other governments and their corporations to support them as well. Over time, if the bulk of Western governments and their corporations adopt such standards, China, Russia, and other possible outliers will likely find it beneficial to eventually join them. This may be easier than a straight political process.”