## 1NC—T Appropriation

#### Interpretation – appropriation means taking possession of something

**Dictionary ND**, Dictionary.com, “appropriation”, <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/appropriation>, DD AG

**the act of** appropriating or **taking possession of something**, often without permission or consent.

#### Appropriation of outer space is the exercise of exclusive control.

**Trapp 13** (TIMOTHY JUSTIN TRAPP, JD Candidate @ UIUC Law, ‘13, TAKING UP SPACE BY ANY OTHER MEANS: COMING TO TERMS WITH THE NONAPPROPRIATION ARTICLE OF THE OUTER SPACE TREATY UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LAW REVIEW [Vol. 2013 No. 4])//DebateDrills AY

The issues presented in relation to the nonappropriation article of the Outer Space Treaty should be clear.214 The ITU has, quite blatantly, created something akin to “property interests in outer space.”215 It allows nations to exclude others from their orbital slots, even when the nation is not currently using that slot.216 This is directly in line with at least one definition of outer-space appropriation.217 [\*\*Start Footnote 217\*\*Id. at 236 (“**Appropriation of outer space**, **therefore, is ‘the exercise of exclusive control or exclusive use’ with a sense of permanence, which limits other nations’ access to it.**”) (quoting Milton L. Smith, The Role of the ITU in the Development of Space Law, 17 ANNALS AIR & SPACE L. 157, 165 (1992)). \*\*End Footnote 217\*\*]The ITU even allows nations with unused slots to devise them to other entities, creating a market for the property rights set up by this regulation.218 In some aspects, this seems to effect exactly what those signatory nations of the Bogotá Declaration were trying to accomplish, albeit through different means.219 Though the legitimacy of such a regime may be questionable, it remains in effect, showing that it is at least tolerable under the edict of the nonappropriation article of the Outer Space Treaty.220 There must, therefore, be something about the ITU that differentiates it from something like the Bogotá Declaration.221 The most immediate difference is the character of the body promulgating the regulation. The Bogotá Declaration is an agreement between eight countries claiming rights to all space above them.222 The ITU’s regulations are promulgated under the auspices of the U.N.223 While the Bogotá Declaration is an international agreement, it is still a very limited cooperation.224 The ITU, through the U.N., comprises the largest possible cooperation of international actors, giving it an international character as opposed to simply a multinational character.225 Furthermore, the allocation of orbital slots by the ITU is a response to the limited character of geostationary orbits.226 While the Bogotá Declaration was probably promulgated in response to a few nations’ fears that they may be excluded from the space arena,227 **the allocation system of the ITU is a measure to make sure that the GEO resource is efficiently managed for the use of all mankind**.228

#### Violation: they defend asteroid mining, which is not about possession

#### Standards:

#### Limits: there are infinitely many combinations that entities could send into space AND resources they can use. That explodes neg prep – it’s impossible for me to research every possible technology and resource, from type of satellite to type of mineral.

#### TVA solves – just read your aff as an advantage to the whole rez. We aren’t stopping them from reading new FWs, mechanisms, or advantages. PICs don’t solve – it’s ridiculous to say that neg potential abuse justifies the aff making it impossible for me to win

### 1NC Voter – LD

#### D] Voter:

#### Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### Precision o/w – anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### Drop the debater – a) they have a 7-6 rebuttal advantage and the 2ar to make args I can’t respond to, b) it deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

#### Use competing interps – a) reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter, b) collapses to competing interps – we justify 2 brightlines under an offense defense paradigm just like 2 interps.

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms, c) chilling effect – forces you to split your 2AR so you can’t collapse and misconstrue the 2NR, d) topic ed – prevents 1AR blipstorm scripts and allows us to get back to substance after resolving theory

## 1NC

### Core

#### CP: The appropriation of outer space by private entities through asteroid mining is unjust except for private entities registered within The Republic of India.

#### The Republic of India should limit the Indian Space Research Organization’s market share to 7.5%

### 1NC—Investor Confidence

#### Private appropriation for Indian private entities is key for investor confidence.

**Sen 20** [Nilanjan Sen, who is an experienced lawyer, specialising in International Law and Arbitration, 07-26-2020,Business Insider,https://www.businessinsider.in/science/space/news/the-fault-in-our-stars-indias-bid-at-privatizing-space/articleshow/77182064.cms, 12-7-2021 amrita]

With the creation of the Indian National Committee for Space Research (now ISRO) in 1962, India has been an active patron to mankind’s space efforts. From Aryabhata to Chandrayaan-2, India has launched 113 satellites, including the first privately built and funded satellite ExceedSat-1 which was launched from USA, as a part of Elon Musk’s Space X project Falcon-9. Up **until 2016, India’**s space activities **have been the exclusive domain of the State, however, the launch of the IRNSS-1H** in 2017 was the herald of a new era in India’s Space endeavours. The IRNSS-1H **marked the** beginning of **privatisation in this area** by being the first Indian satellite, to be designed in collaboration with the private parties. In the following year, the ExseedSat-1 was to become the first privately funded and built satellite launched in collaboration with the private Space X project. Interestingly, **up until now**, all **missions have been conducted for** purposes of research, reconnaissance as well as for augmenting communication systems since there wa**s a substantial State monopoly**. With the recent announcement ofthe creation of the Indian National Space Promotion and Authorization Centre or IN-SPACeby the Government of India as part of its atma nirbhar Bharat scheme, which aims at providing a “level playing field” and a supportive regulatory regime to allow Indian private enterprises to grow and carve their own niche in the so-called “fast-growing global space sector”**, India has** in fact **shown an inclination to capitalise** on the US strategy of opening up the avidly touted space “sector” to private participation. While the initiative **sounds exhilarating** and will definitely go a long way in defining India’s image as an emerging global technology powerhouse**, it is** extremely **difficult to fathom why private players, would** be willing to readily come forward and **invest billions,** by confining their activities for research purposes alone, **without any expectation of commercial gains** or simply, return on their investment. This is so because, matters concerning space and space exploration are subject of a special branch of customary international law, that are mainly centred around five treaties and eleven agreements. The most significant of these is the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies or the Outer Space Treaty (OST) which India ratified in 1967, and which specifically lays down under Article I that outer space and space exploration including that on the moon and other celestial bodies, are to be carried out solely for, and in the interest of all countries, and that they are the province of all mankind. **Article II restricts** claims of sovereignty and national **appropriation** by any means whatsoever, Article VI **places international responsibility on all activities carried on by** governmental or by **non-governmental entities**, as well as mandates authorization and continuing supervision by the appropriate State Party. While there is considerable debate surrounding the applicability of the OST especially Article VI to private parties, since the US Supreme Court ‘s ruling in Medellin v Texas (2008) which held that Article VI is not self-executing in nature, regard must be had to the fact that these are domestic Court rulings and the fact that Space law is part of Customary International law which is affirmed by decades of State practise, cannot be denied, and neither can the fact that it is settled principle of international law that a State cannot, under the excuse of changes in domestic law, including subsequent Court rulings, renege from treaty obligations once ratified. In effect, the OST places strict checks upon the objectives behind exploring this uncharted territory by State and Non-State actors, far less allowing the possibility of even claiming rights of any kind. Moreover, it is no secret that **private corporations operate predominantly with** the object of individual gains **and** unless driven by the zeal to serve mankind and share profits with all countries, **chances are** that the **investments** made by private parties **will have little** to nil **returns,** far less any substantive protection**.**

#### Investor confidence is necessary for strong Indian private space-tech—that spills over, boosts Indian military heg, and turns case.

**Prasad 16** [Narayan Prasad has a Master of Space & Telecommunications Law, May 2016, National Academy of Legal Studies and Research University of Law Hyderabad, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305402089\_A\_POLICY\_REVIEW\_TOWARDS\_THE\_DEVELOPMENT\_OF\_A\_SPACE\_INDUSTRY\_ECOSYSTEM\_IN\_INDIA/link/578dbd2908ae5c86c9a65d05/download, 12-8-2021 amrita]

As India ramps up its space defence capabilities, **lack of a mature space industrial base will** potentially **hurt** its ambitions**.** **India** counts among the top nations in the world in terms of government space investment 4 , but **is far behind** when it comes to **creating successful private industry** that is globally reputed. India’s space budget has increased in size (Figure 2) and is one of the largest space budgets in the world; however, the lack of an active space industry at turnkey level might have an immense opportunity cost for India in manufacturing satellites and launch vehicles to service the global market.5 This in effect is also due to absence of a single Indian company among the top space companies in the world (which in itself is an alarming statistic) that needs to be addressed urgently through policy push under the several grand schemes announced by the current government, such as ‘Make in India’ and ‘Digital India’. Most of **the apprehensions** for private investment in space industry **come from** the **requirements** of high capital investment, **and** the long gestation periods of space projects to get substantial Return on Investment (RoI) for the investors. These trends have been put aside by a new breed of space companies calling themselves ‘NewSpace’, which thrive on new business models of low cost access to space by capitalising on the advancements made in recent years in small satellite technology, consumer electronics, and computing power. Tiny modular satellites called ‘CubeSats’, weighing 1-4 kgs and costing under $100,000 have revolutionised the way space products and services are delivered to end users. The movement began in Europe and US simultaneously as a by-product of university and space agency collaborated research, but it was the US which took the lead in successfully commercialising these technologies developed in laboratories. Figure 3 shows the forecast of nano satellites weighing between 1-50 kg, which are scheduled to be launched during 2014-16 globally.6The high number arises from the fact that such nano satellites have short development timelines, and provide the necessary agility for satellite operators to develop large constellations that can cater to a larger customer base with high service quality. These NewSpace companies have ushered in widespread changes in the traditional satellite manufacturing and launch services industry, with companies like RocketLabs and Firefly Systems building new launchers cheaply using innovative techniques like additive manufacturing, to reduce the cost to orbit for these satellites. The impact of these companies has been felt within the space industry, as practices from these ‘NewSpace’companies have been adopted to keep the costs low and have a factory type approach in building systems in order to cater to the increasing demand. The NewSpace revolution has now led to companies such as Google, Virgin, and Qualcomm investing in small satellite-based communication technologies. India, however, has remained shielded from the rapid changes that have happened in the global space industry over the past decade. **ISRO** has been **slow to respond on** both **commercial** and academic **fronts,** with only a handful of university-level small satellite missions being launched during the same period, none of which could transform into a full-fledged commercial opportunity for the people involved in these projects. Lack of clarity on space policy in India is to blame, and partly the lack of willingness of DoS to take up additional responsibility of creating an ecosystem that disrupts their own traditional one, without any visible incentives. In the following sections, the need and motivation to develop a strong private industry ecosystem is detailed with necessary arguments. 1.2 Motivations to Develop a Private Industry Ecosystem in India Presently, **India has inherent advantages** over other countries **due** the availability of **skilled workforce**, a stable and business friendly **government,** positive investor climate and low cost of operations**.** Because India was an early mover in space technology, it is **poised to become a major space power albeit** slight policy push towards **greater commercialisation** of the industry. Table 1 shows the PESTLE analysis of India, in lieu of the motivation to develop a strong private space industry. The PESTLE analysis shows high suitability for services-based business models to operate out of India. The government’s encouragement for private space industry within the country to develop capacity and capability in pursuing space activities should thereby be directed to both the spectrums across the industry value chain. A focused space policy mandate can have multiple direct and fringe benefits to the government, especially in the defence sector which has been the current government’s area of interest through its ‘Make in India’ initiative. Some of the direct and indirect benefits of space technology include: Civilian and Commercial **Space industry has the potential to emerge as the third** technological **success** front following the successes of the Information Technology (IT) and Biotechnology in the country. Space **has an important role in** the overall **economic development** of the country **and** in the success of the government initiatives such as Digital India and Make in India. The development of the private space industry shall **aid in rural connectivity, e-governance and** setting up of **manufacturing facilities** base for products of high technology in India, creating headways in the overall emergence of the country at the world stage. The success of the space industry will enhance capacities within the country and complement the government-driven programme, which has been historically proven in advanced space faring countries such as the US. Capacity building in the private industry at a turnkey level for both upstream and downstream shall assist theeconomic development of the country by keeping up to the pace of requirement of the marketplace (e.g. Direct-to-Home TV, Broadband Internet), while reducing the inherent dependence on foreign assets. For example, as per a recent Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG) report, only one among the seven DTH providers is leasing transponder from the INSAT system**. The** primary **reason for this disparity is** the **slow pace** at which **ISRO has added** satellite transponders **to the commercial market.** The net effect is that the DTH providers are incurring higher transponder costs on foreign satellites when INSAT could have been an equally reliable, and more cost efficient, alternative. Space has its bearings over the imagination of youth and a strong emerging local industry can revolutionise the mindset of the national talent pool and can potentially aid in reversal of brain drain from the country. Public outreach, awareness, and STEM education are some of the intangible impact that investment in space technology produces. The capacity built up within the industry shall foster Business-to-Business (B2B) collaborations within the country and with enterprises across the globe and create also a strong focus on Business-to-Customer (B2C) applications which moves from the traditional Government-to-Government (G2G) flow of development of capacity and application of technology. The B2B, B2C ecosystem in the space industry has immense potential of tapping the much successful IT infrastructure of the country and extending the IT knowledge base to core software based applications of spacebased information such as Geographical Information Systems (GIS).It shall create an environment of technological innovation which when supported and encouraged can sustain to create a secondary source of development of high-tech hardware, software and applications for the government. An ecosystem of technological innovation in space technology has the potential of creating the next generation Small and Medium Scale Enterprises (SMEs) in India which shall 17 leverage the frugal nature of engineering and can create products and services independently for local and global requirements. Military **In the development of space technology with several dual use capabilities, there exists a case for the building up a sustained indigenous industry ecosystem that shall support the safety and security apparatus of the country**. These range **from development of capabilities in upstream** such as satellite, launch vehicle development **to** creating specific downstream applicationssuch as Automatic Identification of Ships (AIS), Electronic Intelligence (ELINIT), Communication Intelligence (COMMINT) and other Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Information, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C4I2SR) applications. Space Situational Awareness (SSA) is **the ability to view, understand and predict the physical location of natural and man-made objects orbiting the Earth. SSA is a prominent concern for both military and commercial systems, mainly because of the increasing military reliance on space assets**. The debris created by the anti-satellite testing by China in 2007 and the Kosmos-Iridium collision in 2009 has raised additional concerns about the safety of space assets. India currently relies on NASA’s data, and will operationalise its own system of Multi Object Tracking Radar (MOTR) by 2017.7 Meanwhile in the US, commercial operators have established the Space Data Association (SDA) for providing satellite operators reliable and efficient data for increased safety of satellite operations; this is in addition to the Department of Defense’s (DoD) own surveillance network. **The changing space security environment and the rising international concerns over the rapid growth of military assets in space makes space security one of the most important issues to address.** The need to have a space security policy is being 7 increasingly debated in India **and** the IDSA Task force in 2009 produced a report which attempted to conceptualise such a policy. However, there is reluctance to talk about use of space for national security needs including its military applications. Though efforts are being made to synchronize the activities of ISRO which is responsible for India’s civilian space programme and the Defence Research and Development Organisation (DRDO) which works on the use of space for national security needs, **the lack of a strong private industry that can meet heightened needs for such sophisticated missions hampers the progress in this direction,** apart from the bureaucratic delay that is normally associated when two high security government agencies interact. Capacity building within the space industry shall not only drive commercial applications, but shall aid the government in situations of emergencies (e.g. natural disasters, intelligence gathering for fighting against terrorism) and can eventually develop into a foundation that could potentially contribute as a part of a strong foreign policy drive. Studying the impact of space technology on civilian life is a complicated task, especially when it comes to quantifying the tangible and intangible impact. **The spill-over of space technology is in sectors as varied as defence, agriculture and education.** There exist many ways to show the impact of investment in space technology; some of them illustrated above. **Thus, the technological and knowledge backbone for space technology creates opportunities in the marketplace to create and explore commercial applications on a global scale, which** traditionally might not be the fundamental focus a governmental space agency, as well as **create multiple intangible impacts** across various sectors such as defence, education, agriculture, energy, transportation and environment**.** India has made substantial investment in its government space programme over the years, but it is **a sustained policy push towards investments in the private space industry ecosystem that will create commercial space applications**, complementing the societal benefits motivation currently being pursued by the government.

#### Indian space military heg checks and limits Chinese heg in the Indo-Pacific.

**Bommakanti 7-15-20**[Kartik Bommakanti is a Fellow with the Strategic Studies Programme. Kartik specialises in space military issues and his research is primarily centred on the Indo-Pacific region. He also works on emerging technologies as well as nuclear, conventional and sub-conventional coercion, particularly in the context of the Indian subcontinent and the role of great powers in the subcontinent’s strategic dynamics. He has published in peer reviewed journals., The enduring significance of space weapons for India, 7-15-2020,ORF,https://www.orfonline.org/expert-speak/the-enduring-significance-of-space-weapons-for-india/, 12-8-2021 amrita]

Regardless of the Americans protestations about the Russian test**, there are important underlying implications for India particularly in the context of Chinas’ growing space and counterspace capabilities as well as the repercussions that are likely to ensue if New Delhi were to pursue a weak response to Chinese space military power.** India will need a whole set of additional KEW tests. This author made the case for sea-launched and air launched KEWs in an extensive analysis. However, it was focused mostly on earth to space KEW systems and Directed Energy Weapons (DEWs). Confining India to the acquisition of KEWS and Directed Energy Weapons (DEWs) or cyber and electronic weapons can be expanded to include co-orbital KEWs. The Russian test also illustrates why co-orbital KEWs are also critical. Investment in additional KEW capabilities assumes considerable importance especially for India because of the long-term defence related challenges presented by the People’s Republic of China (PRC). **The ongoing boundary crisis should only lend greater urgency to India’s space weapons programme, simply because space assets in India’s inventory are vital to the prosecution of a potential military campaign whether on land, sea or air against the People’s Republic China (PRC).** The PRC is known to have developed the accoutrements necessary to conduct co-orbital test. For instance, in 2008 the Chinese BX-1 microsatellite while orbiting in close proximity to its mother satellite, executed a maneuver within 45 kilometers of the International Space Station (ISS). While BX-1 did not definitively establish a PRC co-orbital ASAT capability, it did indicate the PRC’s latent capability to conduct co-orbital kinetic tests and mount attacks against a potential adversary’ space assets. India must avoid what one leading Indian space analyst prior to India’s March 2019 KEW test observed: “To date, India’s interests in space have been restricted to using space assets for reconnaissance, navigation and communication. However, China’s ASAT test could influence India’s policies in the field of counter-space capabilities. To address the concerns raised at the regional and global level about this Chinese bravado, the best option for India could be to follow the disarmament and arms control route.” The statement is a non-sequitur, **while India has conducted only but one direct ascent KEW test, it has not matched China** in developing and executing non-destructive earth to space KEW tests, let alone fully match Chinese KEW, DEW, electronic and cyber weapon capabilities to target space assets. **Pursuing the arms control and disarmament route by India will be premature** in response to the PRC’s extensive development of space **and** counterspace capabilities**.** Reinforcing this point is that the PRC’s current and evolving space weapons programme deserve a sustained response. Bringing closure to the development of space and counterspace capabilities **would imply surrender that is completely unwarranted in light of Beijing’s recent and ongoing aggressiveness,** which India is evidently bearing the brunt. Very likely Beijing will be emboldened even more in deducing that India’s skittish response to its space weapons programme should be treated as weakness **and India subjected to further aggression, not just terrestrially, but equally in space.** The External Affairs Minister S. Jaishankar stated there is an imperative for India and China to achieve some “equilibrium”, although he never fully elaborated what exactly it would look like. However, if equilibrium or more precisely a stable balance of power is to be achieved in the Indo-Pacific, military power is crucial. **Space military power has grown in importance** from reconnaissance, navigation and communications to space weapons **and will be crucial to generating an equilibrium.** Ignoring the eventual deployment of weapons in space would be foolhardy for a state such as India when pitted against the PRC**. Consequently, space military power is a key constituent element in India’s capacity to contribute to the Asian balance of power**. Thus, **investing in a direct ascent and co-orbital KEWs as well as DEWS and cyber and electronic weapons geared for destroying or disabling spacecraft is crucial**. If India were to deprive itself of offensive space weapons to take Chinese or other enemy spacecraft, New Delhi would be putting itself at a considerable disadvantage by leaving it at the mercy of a wide variety of Chinese counterspace capabilities and measures against its Imagery Intelligence (IMINT), Communications (COMMINT), Electronic Intelligence (ELINT) and Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) satellites. Indeed, it is perplexing to see arguments that call for India to restrain itself, strive for disarmament and arms control when China makes no significant effort to do so beyond rhetorical commitments. The Russian co-orbital test has underlined the importance of space borne weapons despite entreaties for the non-weaponisation of space. The Modi government must see the emerging space military competition as an opportunity to bolster India’s counterspace capabilities. **It will help cement India as a major space military power and prevent Chinese hegemony over the Indo-Pacific.** Chinese hegemony on the other hand will become a certainty, if New Delhi lapses into self-doubt and remains unduly restrained in the testing, integration and deployment of space weapons.

#### China heg is revisionist and offensive-- in the Indo-Pacific that causes draw-in.

**Brands 19** [Hal Brands is the Henry A. Kissinger Distinguished Professor of Global Affairs at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, a senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments. Zack Cooper is a research fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, an associate at Armitage International, and an adjunct assistant professor at Georgetown University, "After the Responsible Stakeholder, What? Debating America’s China Strategy." Texas National Security Review. Volume 2, Issue 2. February 2019k <https://tnsr.org/2019/02/after-the-responsible-stakeholder-what-debating-americas-china-strategy-2/> 12-10-2021 amrita]

The responsible-stakeholder paradigm offered a coherent “theory of victory”: It identified a desired outcome and employed all elements of American power to bring about that outcome. Over time, the strategy produced greater Sino-American cooperation on a range of issues, from counter-piracy to climate change. **It is increasingly clear, however, that the responsible-stakeholder strategy failed. Two of its core assumptions now appear misplaced: the idea that China’s intentions would become more benign over time, and the belief that Washington had the power to keep Chinese ambitions in check until that shift occurred.** What happened instead was that, as China rose, the Chinese Communist Party became more willing to use its newfound power in coercive and disruptive ways.3 Confounding Western hopes that China would liberalize, **the Chinese Communist Party embraced more repressive policies**, especially after Xi Jinping became general secretary in 2012. **Meanwhile, Beijing sought to control the Indo-Pacific region by** coercing its neighbors, undermining U.S. alliances, practicing mercantilist policies, steadily **increasing its presence** and influence in the South China Sea**, and modernizing its military. In the Indo-Pacific and beyond, moreover, China has engaged in a range of behaviors that challenge American interests: supporting authoritarian regimes, engaging in widespread corruption, pursuing predatory trade practices and major geo-economic projects meant to project Chinese influence further afield,** seeking to stifle international criticism of its human rights abuses, practicing massive intellectual property theft, and striving for technological dominance in critical emerging fields such as artificial intelligence.Recently, China’s confidence has been on display, with Xi stating in 2018 that “no one is in a position to dictate to the Chinese people,” after declaring in 2017 that China is ready to “take center stage in the world.”4 Rather than becoming a responsible stakeholder in a U.S.-led system, **China appears increasingly determined to compete with Washington for primacy in the Indo-Pacific and beyond.** These more assertive policies have been made possible by China’s surprisingly rapid growth**.** Between 1990 and 2016, China’s constant-dollar gross domestic product increased roughly twelve-fold and its military spending grew tenfold.5 The People’s Liberation Army rapidly developed the tools — anti-ship missiles, quiet submarines, advanced fighter aircraft, and integrated air defenses — needed to contest American supremacy in the Western Pacific and give China greater ability to shape events in its region and beyond. Surging national wealth also led to an explosion of Chinese trade, lending, and investment abroad, which enabled far more ambitious geo-economic statecraft**.** All told, **this expansion of Chinese national power is unprecedented in modern history.** It has dramatically narrowed the gap between China and the United States and made it far more difficult for Washington to shape Beijing’s behavior. No strategy can survive the invalidation of its central premises: By the end of the Obama presidency, the responsible-stakeholder concept was living on borrowed time. The Trump administration drove the final stake through the concept in its 2017 National Security Strategy. The document slammed Beijing for attempting to “shape a world antithetical to U.S. values and interests” and declared the failure of China’s “integration into the post-war international order.”6 In particular, **China’s behavior increasingly threatens three enduring U.S. interests. First, the United States seeks to maintain a favorable balance of power in the Indo-Pacific region** and to deter a military conflict — over Taiwan, Korea, or maritime Asia — that could undermine the regional order and cost American or allied lives. Second, **U.S. leaders have an interest in ensuring an open international economy conducive to American prosperity and competitiveness.** Third, **the United States seeks to preserve an international environment in which democracy, human rights, and the rule of law can** flourish, and it seeks to **strengthen** — where possible — the prevalence of those practices abroad. As Chinese power has grown and Chinese behavior has become more assertive, U.S. policymakers have come to see all three of these interests as being imperiled.

#### That goes nuclear-- extinction :/

**Hayes 18** [Peter John Hayes is the Executive Director of the Nautilus Institute for Security and Sustainability, a non-governmental policy-oriented research and advocacy group. He graduated from the University of Melbourne with a degree in History, and from University of California, Berkeley with a Ph.D. in energy and resources. #gobears, Trump and the Interregnum of American Nuclear Hegemony, November 8, 2018. [https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/25751654.2018.1532525 recut 12-10-2021](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/25751654.2018.1532525%20recut%2012-10-2021) amrita]

During a post-hegemonic era, long-standing **nuclear alliances are** likely to be **replaced by** ad hoc nuclear **coalitions**, aligning and realigning around different congeries of threat and even actual nuclear wars, **with** much **higher levels of** uncertainty and **unpredictability** than was the case in the nuclear hegemonic system. There are a number of ways that this dynamic could play out during the interregnum, and these dynamics are likely to be inconsistent and contradictory. In some instances, the sheer momentum of past policy combined with bureaucratic inertia and the potency of political, military service and corporate interests, may ensure that residual aspects of the formerly hegemonic postures are adhered to even as formal nuclear alliances rupture. Even as they reach for the old anchors, these **states may be forced to adjust** and retrench **strategically, or start** to take their own nuclear risks by **making** increasingly explicit **nuclear threats** and deployments **against nuclear-armed adversaries** – as Japan has begun to do with reference to its “technological deterrent” since about 2012.9 This period could last for many years until and **when** nuclear **war breaks out** and leads to a post-nuclear war disorder; or **a** new, post-hegemonic strategic **framework is established** to manage and/or abolish nuclear threat. Under full-blown American nuclear hegemony, fewer states had nuclear weapons, the major nuclear weapons states entered into legally binding restraints on force levels and they learned from nuclear near-misses to promulgate rules of the road and tacit understandings. The lines drawn during full-blown collisions involving nuclear weapons were stark and concentrated the minds of leaders greatly. In a nuclear duel, it was clear that only one of two sides could fire first; the only question was which one. **Now, with nine** nuclear weapons **states, and conflicts** conceivably **involving** three, four or **more of them**, no matter how much leaders concentrate, **it will not be evident** who is aiming at who, **who may fire** first, and during a volley, who fired first and even who hit whom. In a highly proliferated world, **nuclear-armed states** may **feel driven to obtain larger** nuclear **forces** able **to deter multiple adversaries** at the same time, sufficient to conduct not only a few nuclear attacks but **configured to fight more than one** protracted **nuclear war at a time, especially in** nuclear **states torn apart by civil war** and post-nuclear attack reconstruction. The first time nuclear weapons are used since 1945 will be shocking, the second time, less so, the third time, the new normal.

## Case

## AT: Space Wars

#### Transparency inevitable ---Nothing slips by in space

--Surprise attacks either fail bc they’re ragged, or are detected bc the enemy has to load a ton of stuff into space

--Launch capacity is international – would have to ask to do it

--Monitoring satellites is easy – as early as 50s elementary school classes saw stuff – remote sensing means we see everything in space or on the ground

--International nonproliferation agreements democratized site monitoring – we can see states interior regions

--Even if no guarantee, uncertainy means no state would risk it

Handberg, 17 – Faculty and Research, School of Politics, Security, and International Affairs, UCF

Roger Handberg, “Is space war imminent? Exploring the possibility,” Comparative Strategy. 2017. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/01495933.2017.1379832?needAccess=true>

Second, surprise requires that sufficient offensive space assets be placed in orbit without triggering a response by other states—the scale of such technology deployment is in itself possibly self-defeating given high costs and a likely lack of launch capacity. In addition, much launch capacity is now international rather than national, so maintaining secrecy becomes even more difficult. Space as an operational environment suffers from excessive transparency, meaning any launches can be monitored and tracked by others with strong evidence as to what is being deployed. One must remember that the original satellite launches in the 1950s were accurately tracked by a British grade-school class as a science project. In addition, at least since the early 1960s, remote sensing has increased exponentially the global capability to detect buildup of military assets of differing types, whether in space or on the ground. Commercial remote-sensing capabilities further enhance the capacity to detect militarily relevant actions. For example, commercial imagery is accessed by private parties to monitor the North Korean missile and nuclear weapons programs, in effect expanding the capacity of the world to look in on various states’ interior regions, scanning for relevant information, including weapons buildup and launch capabilities. Even construction of physical facilities for production of space assets or for other weaponry can be monitored, making surprise more difficult but not impossible, as demonstrated in earlier monitoring of North Korea and, in 1998, the nuclear tests by both Pakistan and India. That means if the ASAT weapons come from ground locations, there is a high probability that they can be detected but no guarantee exists that detection will in fact occur. The uncertainty will impact calculations of attack success.

#### Attacks don’t escalate

--no retaliation – nukes are categorically different than space bc existential

--space is like cyber – attacks are unfortunate but not worthy of a nuke response

--nuke threats not credible bc nobody thinks space is at that lvl

Lewis, 13 – Senior fellow and Program Director at the Center for Strategic and

International Studies

James A. Lewis, “Reconsidering Deterrence for Space and Cyberspace,” in Anti-satellite Weapons, Deterrence and Sino-American Space Relations, September 2013. <https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a587431.pdf>

Unlike other military technologies, nuclear weapons pose an existential threat. If used, damage and casualties would be massive. In contrast, neither cyberattacks nor ASAT attacks pose the same level of destructiveness; they certainly are not existential threats. If there was some way credibly to threaten the use of nuclear weapons after a cyberattack, deterrence might be possible. However, a nuclear threat in response to these attacks would not be proportional and the threat to use nuclear weapons is likely to be discounted by opponents. There are powerful norms that constrain the use of these weapons, and therefore, a threat to use nuclear weapons in response to cyberattacks would be dramatic but not credible. Calls for a nuclear response to cyberattacks would be dismissed as frivolous. Threats to use military force to retaliate against an act that would not be considered as justifying the use of force in self-defense under international law or practice will likely be dismissed by opponents as bluster.

#### Space Wars don’t involve terror

--space wars have no terrorist groups or failed states

--mostly robotized means few lives lost

--brief because destroying communication satellites ends conflict, also incentivizes states to innovate in a way that reduces casualties

Szoic et al 17-- Szocik, Konrad [Department of Philosophy and Cognitive Science, University of Information Technology and Management in Rzeszow], Tomasz Wójtowicz [Institute of Security and Civic Education, Pedagogical University in Cracow, Podchorążych 2 Street, 30-084 Kraków, Poland], and Leszek Baran [Chair of Internal Security, University of Information Technology and Management in Rzeszow, Poland]. "War or peace? The possible scenarios of colonising Mars." Space Policy 42 (2017): 31-36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spacepol.2017.10.002>. (AG DebateDrills)

Contrary to fourth and fifth generation warfare, space wars will be dominated by nation states and international corporations. Elon Musk, Managing Director of SpaceX, a company dealing with the manufacture of jet engines, carrier rockets, and spaceships, claimed that within the nearest 40–100 years over 1 million people might be sent to Mars. He estimated the cost of one person's reaching the Red Planet at USD 200 million [16]. According to the authors of the Mars one initiative, a sum of USD 6 billion will be needed to send the first four astronauts to Mars [6]. The need to secure such exorbitant funds virtually excludes any entities other than states and international corporations (terrorist groups, criminal organisations or failed states) from participating in space wars. It should be expected that the future space wars will entail an advanced process of conflict robotisation and dehumanisation. The prospective Mars colonisation war may proceed by means of robots – unmanned aerial vehicles. Ender's Game, an American science fiction film dating back to 2013, based on a novel by Orson Scott Card pub- lished under the same title, features scenes presenting such kind of a conflict. The film is set in 2070. The main hero, ten-year-old Andrew Wiggin, is elected leader of the invading fleet, intended to destroy the native world of a foreign life form threatening the Earth. Andrew Wiggin, believing that he is taking part in training, leads the invading fleet and defeats the enemy. The invading forces comprise only un- manned space drones controlled from a secure place [11]. The pro- gressing robotisation and dehumanisation of war will also be influenced by the strategic culture of western countries (the United States) whose societies show limited tolerance to human loss during military conflicts. As stressed by Adrian Lewis in his book The American Culture of War, abolishing the obligatory military service was the most significant change introduced in the 20th century to the U.S. war-fighting model. It triggered the professionalization of armed forces, with a mass army being replaced by mobile troops limited in numbers [14]. Along with the robotisation and dehumanisation, the future space wars should also be expected to be brief. Unless the dispute escalating between the global powers evolves into military activities located in the Earth, the conflict may end soon after the communication satellites of one of the parties are destroyed, or its space station is damaged. Considering the above, the technological arms race between the competing States, aimed at designing, as fast as possible, a weapon which will enable defeating the enemy in the first attack, without any possibility of re- taliation, will prove crucial.

#### Accidental war or miscalc is impossible

--self-deterrence – basic assumption of survival interest doesn’t require assumption of broader rationality

--opportunity for revising judgments – can “undo” escalation

--physical safeguards – Permissive Action Locks

--organizational checks – layers of communication and control double-checks

--overwhelming empirics – hundreds of near-accidents demonstrate safety, not risk

Michael **Quinlan 9**. Distinguished Former British Defence Strategist and Former Permanent Under-Secretary of State. 2009. “Thinking About Nuclear Weapons.” p. 63-69

Even if initial nuclear use did not quickly end the fighting, the supposition of inexorable momentum in a developing exchange, with each side rushing to overreaction amid confusion and uncertainty, is implausible. It fails to consider what the situation of the decisionmakers would really be. Neither side could want escalation. Both would be appalled at what was going on. Both would be desperately looking for signs that the other was ready to call a halt. Both, given the capacity for evasion or concealment which modern delivery platforms and vehicles can possess, could have in reserve significant forces invulnerable enough not to entail use-or-lose pressures. (It may be more open to question, as noted earlier, whether newer nuclear-weapon possessors can be immediately in that position; but it is within reach of any substantial state with advanced technological capabilities, and attaining it is certain to be a high priority in the development of forces.) As a result, neither side can have any predisposition to suppose, in an ambiguous situation of fearful risk, that the right course when in doubt is to go on copiously launching weapons. And none of this analysis rests on any presumption of highly subtle or pre-concerted rationality. The rationality required is plain. The argument is reinforced if we consider the possible reasoning of an aggressor at a more dispassionate level. Any substantial nuclear armoury can inflict destruction outweighing any possible prize that aggression could hope to seize. A state attacking the possessor of such an armoury must therefore be doing so (once given that it cannot count upon destroying the armoury pre-emptively) on a judgement that the possessor would be found lacking in the will to use it. If the attacked possessor used nuclear weapons, whether first or in response to the aggressor's own first use, this judgement would begin to look dangerously precarious. There must be at least a substantial possibility of the aggressor leaders' concluding that their initial judgement had been mistaken—that the risks were after all greater than whatever prize they had been seeking, and that for their own country's survival they must call off the aggression. Deterrence planning such as that of NATO was directed in the first place to preventing the initial misjudgement and in the second, if it were nevertheless made, to compelling such a reappraisal. The former aim had to have primacy, because it could not be taken for granted that the latter was certain to work. But there was no ground for assuming in advance, for all possible scenarios, that the chance of its working must be negligible. An aggressor state would itself be at huge risk if nuclear war developed, as its leaders would know. It may be argued that a policy which abandons hope of physically defeating the enemy and simply hopes to get him to desist is pure gamble, a matter of who blinks first; and that the political and moral nature of most likely aggressors, almost ex hypothesis, makes them the less likely to blink. One response to this is to ask what is the alternative—it can only be surrender. But a more positive and hopeful answer lies in the fact that the criticism is posed in a political vacuum. Real-life conflict would have a political context. The context which concerned NATO during the cold war, for example, was one of defending vital interests against a postulated aggressor whose own vital interests would not be engaged, or would be less engaged. Certainty is not possible, but a clear asymmetry of vital interest is a legitimate basis for expecting an asymmetry, credible to both sides, of resolve in conflict. That places upon statesmen, as page 23 has noted, the key task in deterrence of building up in advance a clear and shared grasp of where limits lie. That was plainly achieved in cold-war Europe. 11 vital interests have been defined in a way that is clear, and also clearly not overlapping or incompatible with those of the adversary, a credible basis has been laid for the likelihood of greater resolve in resistance. It was also sometimes suggested by critics that whatever might be indicated by theoretical discussion of political will and interests, the military environment of nuclear warfare—particularly difficulties of communication and control—would drive escalation with overwhelming probability to the limit. But it is obscure why matters should be regarded as inevitably so for every possible level and setting of action. Even if the history of war suggested (as it scarcely does) that military decision-makers are mostly apt to work on the principle 'When in doubt, lash out', the nuclear revolution creates an utterly new situation. The pervasive reality, always plain to both sides during the cold war, is 'If this goes on to the end, we are all ruined'. Given that inexorable escalation would mean catastrophe for both, it would be perverse to suppose them permanently incapable of framing arrangements which avoid it. As page 16 has noted, NATO gave its military commanders no widespread delegated authority, in peace or war, to launch nuclear weapons without specific political direction. Many types of weapon moreover had physical safeguards such as PALs incorporated to reinforce organizational ones. There were multiple communication and control systems for passing information, orders, and prohibitions. Such systems could not be totally guaranteed against disruption if at a fairly intense level of strategic exchange—which was only one of many possible levels of conflict— an adversary judged it to be in his interest to weaken political control. It was far from clear why he necessarily should so judge. Even then, however, it remained possible to operate on a general fail-safe presumption: no authorization, no use. That was the basis on which NATO operated. If it is feared that the arrangements which a nuclear-weapon possessor has in place do not meet such standards in some respects, the logical course is to continue to improve them rather than to assume escalation to be certain and uncontrollable, with all the enormous inferences that would have to flow from such an assumption. The likelihood of escalation can never be 100 per cent, and never zero. Where between those two extremes it may lie can never be precisely calculable in advance; and even were it so calculable, it would not be uniquely fixed—it would stand to vary hugely with circumstances. That there should be any risk at all of escalation to widespread nuclear war must be deeply disturbing, and decision-makers would always have to weigh it most anxiously. But a pair of key truths about it need to be recognized. The first is that the risk of escalation to large-scale nuclear war is inescapably present in any significant armed conflict between nuclear-capable powers, whoever may have started the conflict and whoever may first have used any particular category of weapon. The initiator of the conflict will always have physically available to him options for applying more force if he meets effective resistance. If the risk of escalation, whatever its degree of probability, is to be regarded as absolutely unacceptable, the necessary inference is that a state attacked by a substantial nuclear power must forgo military resistance. It must surrender, even if it has a nuclear armoury of its own. But the companion truth is that, as page 47 has noted, the risk of escalation is an inescapable burden also upon the aggressor. The exploitation of that burden is the crucial route, if conflict does break out, for managing it to a tolerable outcome—the only route, indeed, intermediate between surrender and holocaust, and so the necessary basis for deterrence beforehand. The working out of plans to exploit escalation risk most effectively in deterring potential aggression entails further and complex issues. It is for example plainly desirable, wherever geography, politics, and available resources so permit without triggering arms races, to make provisions and dispositions that are likely to place the onus of making the bigger and more evidently dangerous steps in escalation upon the aggressor who wishes to maintain his attack, rather than upon the defender. (The customary shorthand for this desirable posture used to be 'escalation dominance'.) These issues are not further discussed here. But addressing them needs to start from acknowledgement that there are in any event no certainties or absolutes available, no options guaranteed to be risk-free and cost-free. Deterrence is not possible without escalation risk; and its presence can point to no automatic policy conclusion save for those who espouse outright pacifism and accept its consequences. Accident and Miscalculation Ensuring the safety and security of nuclear weapons plainly needs to be taken most seriously. Detailed information is understandably not published, but such direct evidence as there is suggests that it always has been so taken in every possessor state, with the inevitable occasional failures to follow strict procedures dealt with rigorously. Critics have nevertheless from time to time argued that the possibility of accident involving nuclear weapons is so substantial that it must weigh heavily in the entire evaluation of whether war-prevention structures entailing their existence should be tolerated at all. Two sorts of scenario are usually in question. The first is that of a single grave event involving an unintended nuclear explosion—a technical disaster at a storage site, for example, or the accidental or unauthorized launch of a delivery system with a live nuclear warhead. The second is that of some event—perhaps such an explosion or launch, or some other mishap such as malfunction or misinterpretation of radar signals or computer systems—initiating a sequence of response and counter-response that culminated in a nuclear exchange which no one had truly intended. No event that is physically possible can be said to be of absolutely zero probability (just as at an opposite extreme it is absurd to claim, as has been heard from distinguished figures, that nuclear-weapon use can be guaranteed to happen within some finite future span despite not having happened for over sixty years). But human affairs cannot be managed to the standard of either zero or total probability. We have to assess levels between those theoretical limits and weigh their reality and implications against other factors, in security planning as in everyday life. There have certainly been, across the decades since 1945, many known accidents involving nuclear weapons, from transporters skidding off roads to bomber aircraft crashing with or accidentally dropping the weapons they carried (in past days when such carriage was a frequent feature of readiness arrangements—it no longer is). A few of these accidents may have released into the nearby environment highly toxic material. None however has entailed a nuclear detonation. Some commentators suggest that this reflects bizarrely good fortune amid such massive activity and deployment over so many years. A more rational deduction from the facts of this long experience would however be that the probability of any accident triggering a nuclear explosion is extremely low. It might be further noted that the mechanisms needed to set off such an explosion are technically demanding, and that in a large number of ways the past sixty years have seen extensive improvements in safety arrangements for both the design and the handling of weapons. It is undoubtedly possible to see respects in which, after the cold war, some of the factors bearing upon risk may be new or more adverse; but some are now plainly less so. The years which the world has come through entirely without accidental or unauthorized detonation have included early decades in which knowledge was sketchier, precautions were less developed, and weapon designs were less ultra-safe than they later became, as well as substantial periods in which weapon numbers were larger, deployments more widespread and diverse, movements more frequent, and several aspects of doctrine and readiness arrangements more tense. Similar considerations apply to the hypothesis of nuclear war being mistakenly triggered by false alarm. Critics again point to the fact, as it is understood, of numerous occasions when initial steps in alert sequences for US nuclear forces were embarked upon, or at least called for, by indicators mistaken or misconstrued. In none of these instances, it is accepted, did matters get at all near to nuclear launch—extraordinary good fortune again, critics have suggested. But the rival and more logical inference from hundreds of events stretching over sixty years of experience presents itself once more: that the probability of initial misinterpretation leading far towards mistaken launch is remote. Precisely because any nuclear-weapon possessor recognizes the vast gravity of any launch, release sequences have many steps, and human decision is repeatedly interposed as well as capping the sequences. To convey that because a first step was prompted the world somehow came close to accidental nuclear war is wild hyperbole, rather like asserting, when a tennis champion has lost his opening service game, that he was nearly beaten in straight sets. History anyway scarcely offers any ready example of major war started by accident even before the nuclear revolution imposed an order-of-magnitude increase in caution. It was occasionally conjectured that nuclear war might be triggered by the real but accidental or unauthorized launch of a strategic nuclear-weapon delivery system in the direction of a potential adversary. No such launch is known to have occurred in over sixty years. The probability of it is therefore very low. But even if it did happen, the further hypothesis of its initiating a general nuclear exchange is far-fetched. It fails to consider the real situation of decision-makers, as pages 63-4 have brought out. The notion that cosmic holocaust might be mistakenly precipitated in this way belongs to science fiction.

#### No collisions

Park 18

Ye Joo Park, citing NASA studies on orbital debris, How Dangerous is Space Debris?, Research Association for Interdisciplinary Studies, RAIS Conference Proceedings, November 19-20, 2018, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.1572516, <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3303541>

Other factors to consider concerning collisions in Space

While it’s true that there are thousands of space objects directly above Earth in an 800-kilometer band, space is so vast that it’s helpful to pause for a moment and reflect... in the area directly above the entire continental U.S., there are typically only three or four items orbiting above 3.1 million square miles. Therefore, the likelihood of collisions between satellites, spacecraft and orbiting objects is very small (NASA 2018).

In fact, in 2013 it was reported that the probability of a collision between an orbiting asset and space debris larger than 1 cm (0.4in.) will be once every 1.5-2 years, according to the Head of the Russian Hall/ History of Space Debris 8 Figure 5 [NASA] Space Agency. This compares with a 2010 estimate giving the likelihood of once every 5 years (Sorokin 2013).

The Feasibility of Practically Reducing Space Debris

Reducing orbital debris is incredibly difficult. Therefore, the most important action that space experts and policy makers currently recommend is to prevent the unnecessary creation of additional orbital debris. This can be done through prudent vehicle design and operations ((UNOOSA 2014).

The International Academy of Astronautics or IAA is a significant, global organization of scientists and space experts from many countries who meet regularly to discuss the importance of space debris as a policy issue. The subject-matter experts of the IAA published their fifth update Situation Report on Space Debris in August 2017 (Bonnal and McKnight 2017). In the executive summary, the IAA reported that if an orbiting satellite impacts with small bits of debris - even as small as 5 mm - the result will be grave, e.g. the collision would likely disrupt or terminate a satellite’s operations (Bonnal and McKnight 2017, 5).

The serious warnings expressed in this conclusion are offset by the positive findings of the IAA that there has been a reduction of the space debris created from the two extraordinary satellite destruction events (2007 and 2009) cited earlier in this paper. According to the IAF report, a large amount of debris from the satellite explosions were frictionally burned when reaching the Earth’s atmosphere after gradually sinking due to the scientific principle of atmospheric drag (in the science of Physics), which is a deterioration in the strength of an orbit because of an object hitting gas molecules in space. Small bits of space junk sink as the orbit gets weaker... then they burn. This is a positive trend “for keeping the short-term collision hazard under control at the lower altitudes (i.e., less than 650 km)” (Bonnal and McKnight 2017, 7).

#### No space wars --- dependence on space creates a de facto taboo

Triezenberg, 17

Bonnie Triezenberg, Senior engineer at RAND. Previously, she was the senior technical fellow at the Boeing Company, specializing in agile systems and software development. “Deterring Space War: An Exploratory Analysis Incorporating Prospect Theory into a Game Theoretic Model of Space Warfare,” RAND Corporation. 2017. <https://www.rand.org/pubs/rgs_dissertations/RGSD400.html>

The above discussion suggests that a likely means to achieve deterrence of acts of war in outer space is to increase civilian dependence on space to support day-to-day life—if everyone on earth is equally dependent on space, no one has an incentive to destroy space. Largely by accident, this dependence appears to have, in fact, occurred. The space age was born in an age of affluence and rapid economic expansion; space quickly became a domain of international commerce as well as a domain of national military use. Space assets and the systems they enable have transformed social, infrastructure and information uses perhaps more visibly than they have transformed military uses. In fact, in the current satellite database published by the Union of Concerned Scientists, of the 1461 satellites in orbit 40% support purely commercial ventures, while only 16% have a strictly military use.46 The first commercial broadcast by a satellite in geo-synchronous orbit was of international news between Europe and the United States.47 The first telephony uniting the far flung islands of Indonesia was enabled by satellite48. Those of us who are old enough remember the 1960s “magic” of intercontinental phone calls and international “breaking news” delivered by satellite. Today, most social and infrastructure uses of space are taken for granted – even in remote locales of Africa, people expect to be able to monitor the weather, communicate seamlessly with colleagues and to find their way to new and unfamiliar locations using the GPS in their phones. All of us use space every day.49 These unrestricted economic and social uses of space may be the best deterrent, making everyone on all sides of combat equally dependent on space and heightening the taboo against weaponizing space or threatening space assets with weapons.

### AT: Mining Imminent

#### Framing issue - the aff has zero reason mining is even close to happening in the status quo. 1AC Garcia is theoretical and cites no examples of mining happening. Any risk of a disad o/w on timeframe.

#### Barriers to mining ensure it’s never going to happen

Fickling 20 [David Fickling is a Bloomberg Opinion columnist covering commodities, as well as industrial and consumer companies. He has been a reporter for Bloomberg News, Dow Jones, the Wall Street Journal, the Financial Times and the Guardian] Bloomberg, “We’re Never Going to Mine the Asteroid Belt,” <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2020-12-21/space-mining-on-asteroids-is-never-going-to-happen>, December 21st, 2020, VM “It’s wonderful that people are shooting for the stars — but those who declined to fund the expansive plans of the nascent space mining industry were right about the fundamentals. Space mining won’t get off the ground in any foreseeable future — and you only have to look at the history of civilization to see why. One factor rules out most space mining at the outset: gravity. On one hand, it guarantees that most of the solar system’s best mineral resources are to be found under our feet. Earth is the largest rocky planet orbiting the sun. As a result, the cornucopia of minerals the globe attracted as it coalesced is as rich as will be found this side of Alpha Centauri. Gravity poses a more technical problem, too. Escaping Earth’s gravitational field makes transporting the volumes of material needed in a mining operation **hugely expensive**. On Falcon Heavy, the large rocket being developed by Elon Musk’s SpaceX, transporting a payload to the orbit of Mars comes to as little as $5,357 per kilogram — a drastic reduction in normal launch costs. Still, at those prices just lofting a single half-ton drilling rig to the asteroid belt would use up the **annual exploration budget** of a small mining company. Power is another issue. The international space station, with 35,000 square feet of solar arrays, generates up to 120 kilowatts of electricity. That drill would need a similar-sized power plant — and most mining companies operate multiple rigs at a time. Power demands rise drastically once you move from exploration drilling to mining and processing. Bringing material back to Earth would raise the costs even more. Japan’s Hayabusa2 satellite spent six years and 16.4 billion yen ($157 million) recovering a **single gram** of material from the asteroid Ryugu and returning it to Earth earlier this month.”

#### industry died in 2021 -- the aff is outdated

Dorminey 21 [Bruce Dorminey is an American science journalist and author who primarily covers aerospace, astronomy and astrophysics. He is a regular contributor to Astronomy magazine. Since March 2012, he has written a regular tech column for Forbes.com. He was also a correspondent for Renewable Energy World.] “Does Commercial Asteroid Mining Still Have A Future?,” August 31st, 2021, Forbes, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/brucedorminey/2021/08/31/does-commercial-asteroid-mining-still-have-a-future/?sh=494942421a93> VM

What happened to the space-mining industry? A decade ago, the mainstream media was full of articles about how mining asteroids for precious metals, metal composites and even rare earth metals would revolutionize the commercial space economy. There were grandiose plans to reap untold fortunes from near-Earth asteroids (NEAs), either robotically or even by sending private commercial astronauts to act as space miners. But there has been little action since. It’s precisely this kind of space hype that makes the mainstream public so cynical and weary of the best laid plans. How many times will we hear the mantra ‘it’s back to the Moon and then on to Mars,’ before anyone ever sets foot on the red planet? Much less thinks about mining Mars? Or reaping the riches from an accessible mineral-rich asteroid?”

#### Half a million objects in space now and only 15 collisions have ever happened.

**Albrecht and Graziani 16** [Mark Albrecht and Paul Graziani, 5-9-2016, "Op-ed," SpaceNews, https://spacenews.com/op-ed-congested-space-is-a-serious-problem-solved-by-hard-work-not-hysteria/]//DDPT

There are over a half million pieces of human-made material in orbit around our planet. Some are the size of school buses, some the size of BB gun pellets. They all had a function at some point, but now most are simply space debris littered from 100 to 22,000 miles above the Earth. Yet, all behave perfectly according to the laws of physics. Many in the space community have called the collision hazard caused by space debris a crisis.

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

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

So what are the facts?

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

Since we first started placing objects into space there have been 11 known low Earth orbit collisions, and three known collisions at geostationary orbit. Think of it: 135 space shuttle flights, all of the Apollo, Gemini and Mercury flights, hundreds of telecommunications satellites, 1,300 functioning satellites on orbit today, half a million total objects in space larger than a marble, and fewer than 15 known collisions. Why do people worry?

### Impact Turn

#### Asteroid mining is good:

#### 1] Resources- for Earth infrastructure and space

Sonter, 6, February, National Space Society, “Asteroid Mining: Key to the Space Economy”, Mark Sonter is an independent scientific consultant working in the Australian mining and metallurgical industries, providing advice on radiation protection, industrial hygiene, safety, and remediation of radioactively contaminated sites. His career includes 2 years as a high school science teacher, 6 years as a University Physics lecturer in Papua New Guinea, postgraduate studies in medical physics, and 28 years in uranium mining radiation safety management, including 5 years as Corporate Safety Manager for a major mining corporation.URL: <https://space.nss.org/asteroid-mining-key-to-the-space-economy/>, KR

Development and operation of future in-orbit infrastructure (for example, orbital hotels, satellite solar power stations, earth-moon transport node satellites, zero-g manufacturing facilities) will require large masses of materials for construction, shielding, and ballast; and also large quantities of propellant for station-keeping and orbit-change maneuvers, and for fuelling craft departing for lunar or interplanetary destinations.

Spectroscopic studies suggest, and ‘ground-truth’ chemical assays of meteorites confirm, that a wide range of resources are present in asteroids and comets, including nickel-iron metal, silicate minerals, semiconductor and platinum group metals, water, bituminous hydrocarbons, and trapped or frozen gases including carbon dioxide and ammonia.

As one startling pointer to the unexpected riches in asteroids, many stony and stony-iron meteorites contain Platinum Group Metals at grades of up to 100 ppm (or 100 grams per ton). Operating open pit platinum and gold mines in South Africa and elsewhere mine ores of grade 5 to 10 ppm, so grades of 10 to 20 times higher would be regarded as spectacular if available in quantity, on Earth.

Water is an obvious first, and key, potential product from asteroid mines, as it could be used for return trip propulsion via steam rocket.

About 10% of Near-Earth Asteroids are energetically more accessible (easier to get to) than the Moon (i.e. under 6 km/s from LEO), and a substantial minority of these have return-to-Earth transfer orbit injection delta-v’s of only 1 to 2 km/s.

Return of resources from some of these NEAs to low or high earth orbit may therefore be competitive versus earth-sourced supplies.

Our knowledge of asteroids and comets has expanded dramatically in the last ten years, with images and spectra of asteroids and comets from flybys, rendezvous, and impacts (for example asteroids Gaspra, Ida, Mathilde, the vast image collection from Eros, Itokawa, and others; comets Halley, Borrelly, Tempel-1, and Wild-2. And radar images of asteroids Toutatis, Castalia, Geographos, Kleopatra, Golevka and other… These images show extraordinary variations in structure, strength, porosity, surface features.

The total number of identified NEAs has increased from about 300 to more than 3,000 in the period 1995 to 2005.

The most accessible group of NEAs for resource recovery is a subset of the Potentially Hazardous Asteroids (PHAs). These are bodies (about 770 now discovered) which approach to within 7.5 million km of earth orbit. The smaller subset of those with orbits which are earth-orbit-grazing give intermittently very low delta-v return opportunities (that is it is easy velocity wise to return to Earth).

These are also the bodies which humanity should want to learn about in terms of surface properties and strength so as to plan deflection missions, in case we should ever find one on a collision course with us.

Professor John Lewis has pointed out (in Mining the Sky) that the resources of the solar system (the most accessible of which being those in the NEAs) can permanently support in first-world comfort some quadrillion people. In other words, the resources of the solar system are essentially infinite… And they are there for us to use, to invest consciousness into the universe, no less. It’s time for humankind to come out of its shell, and begin to grow!!

#### Space exploration THROUGH increased orbits prevents a laundry list of impacts

Greenblatt, Anzaldua, 19, 7/29/2019, The Space Review, “How space technology benefits the Earth”, Jeff Greenblatt is Founder and CEO of Emerging Futures, LLC, an environmental and space technology consultancy based in Berkeley, California. He is also Chief Scientist at Spacexchange, LLC, a collaboration between Emerging Futures and Finsophy Public Benefit Corporation, which provides economic, risk, and market analytics to the space industry. Jeff has a Ph.D. in chemistry from the University of California, Berkeley, and is a well-known expert in the fields of energy analysis, climate policy, and sustainable transportation. Since 2014, he has expanded his focus to include emerging space technologies. Alfred Anzaldúa is a retired US State Department diplomat and 30-plus-year veteran of space advocacy. As a US Foreign Service Officer, he carried out diplomatic and science/environment work, primarily in Latin America, the Caribbean, and Washington, DC. Alfred is the National Space Society Executive Vice President, Chair of the NSS Policy Committee, Deputy Chair of the NSS International Committee, and Tucson L5 Space Society International Relations Coordinator.URL: <https://www.thespacereview.com/article/3768/1>, KR

One reason for this recent explosion in space-related activity is the plunging cost of launch to low Earth orbit (LEO). Launching to LEO in the past has been among the most expensive element of any space endeavor. Historically, costs have averaged more than $10,000 per kilogram of launched mass. Recently, however, space companies including SpaceX, Blue Origin, and United Launch Alliance (ULA) have been successfully pursuing reusable launch vehicle technology that promises to significantly reduce the launch cost to LEO. SpaceX’s Falcon Heavy now boasts the lowest cost in the industry, with a base price of $1,655 per kilogram to LEO.[1] SpaceX’s long-term ambitions, as well as that of many others, are to lower this cost to $100 per kiogram or less.[2] Such low launch costs will continue to dramatically change the economics of many space business models, enabling a new era of capabilities once thought prohibitively expensive.

Other technologies, such as manufacturing materials in space from resources found on the Moon, Mars, or asteroids, could further improve the economics of space activities by dramatically reducing the amount, and hence cost, of material launched from Earth. A prime example is sourcing rocket propellant in space from water-rich regions of the Moon or asteroids, which could lower transportation costs to locations beyond LEO.

Space activities with positive impacts today

1. Earth observation for weather prediction and climate monitoring: Accurate weather prediction enabled by space systems has become a critically important element in our daily lives, impacting government, industry, and personal decision making. Satellites used for weather prediction almost certainly save thousands of lives each year by giving the public storm warnings. Although no one can say exactly how many lives are saved every year, it is worthwhile to note that, in 1900, a hurricane hit Galveston, Texas, killing 6,000 to 12,000 people because they had no warning. Earth observing satellites also monitor greenhouse gases and other crucial climate indicators, as well as overall Earth ecosystem health. Without this kind of environmental information coming from satellites, plans for dealing with climate change would have less scientific basis.

2. Earth resources observation: Earth observation provides information and support for agricultural production, fisheries management, freshwater management, and forestry management, as well as monitoring for harmful activities, such as illegal logging, animal poaching, fires, and environmentally pernicious mining.

3. Space-based communication services: Space communication capabilities positively impact almost every aspect of human civilization. Satellite technologies have already revolutionized banking and finance, navigation, and everyday communications, allowing international and long-distance national phone calls, video feeds, streaming media, and satellite TV and radio to become completely routine. (See point 1 in the next subheading for where we are headed in this area.)

4. Space-based Positioning, Navigation, and Timing (PNT) services: Global PNT satellite systems, which can pinpoint a location to within a few meters (or much better) anywhere on the Earth’s surface, have enhanced land and sea navigation, logistics (including ride-hailing services that are transforming personal transportation), precision agriculture, military operations, electrical grids, and many other industrial and societal aspects of Earth life. Space-based location services built into mobile phones and used by applications on mobile phones ranging from maps to dating services have become so intertwined with modern life that their abrupt cessation would be viewed as catastrophic.

5. Increasing economic opportunities in expanding commercial space and non-space sectors: Aside from long-standing commercial satellite services, our expanding space industry, in the process of moving beyond exclusive dependence on limited government budgets and cost-plus contracting, brings with it economic opportunities, not only to those working directly in the space sector but also to non-space actors, including many small businesses. Put another way, an expanding commercial space industry will not only result in high-tech jobs, but also everyday jobs connected to construction, food service, wholesale and retail, finance, and more throughout the communities hosting commercial space companies.

6. Inspiration for STEAM education: Beyond economics, a healthy space sector will continue to inspire people young and old about new frontiers, discoveries, and technologies, and foster interest in STEAM (science, technology, engineering, art, and math) disciplines, which helps create a scientifically literate society able to participate in an increasingly technology-driven world.

7. International space cooperation countering geopolitical tensions: Joint space projects among nations are sometimes the only positive force countering mutual suspicion and geopolitical rivalries. The ISS is a prime example of such a project, a source of pride to all the nations involved. Cross-border business-to-business relationships also serve the same purpose. We are a global community and space endeavors, public and private, are making us more interdependent and interconnected.

Simply affording people the opportunity to experience the Overview Effect firsthand could lead to powerful shifts in attitudes toward the environment and social welfare, and could become an important “side benefit” of a growing space tourism industry.

#### 2] Global warming -- Asteroid mining prevents over 500x more Co2 in the atmosphere

MIT Tech, 18, 10/19/2018, MIT Tech, “Asteroid mining might actually be better for the environment”, cites university of france study (in card), URL: <https://www.technologyreview.com/2018/10/19/139664/asteroid-mining-might-actually-be-better-for-the-environment/>, KR

Today, that changes thanks to the work of Andreas Hein and colleagues at the University of Paris-Saclay in France. These guys have calculated the greenhouse-gas emissions from asteroid-mining operations and compared them with the emissions from similar Earth-based activities. Their results provide some eyebrow-raising insights into the benefits that asteroid mining might provide.

The calculations are relatively straightforward. Rocket launches release significant amounts of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. The fuel on board the first stage of a rocket burns in Earth’s atmosphere to form carbon dioxide. For kerosene-burning rockets, one kilogram of fuel creates three kilograms of CO2. (The second and third stages operate outside the Earth’s atmosphere and so can be ignored.)

Reentries are just as damaging. That’s because a significant mass of a re-entering vehicle ablates in the upper atmosphere, producing NOx such as nitrous oxide (N2O), a greenhouse gas that is about 300 times more potent than CO2. By one estimate, the space shuttle released about 20% of its mass in the form of N2O every time it returned to Earth.

Hein and co use these numbers to calculate that a kilogram of platinum mined from an asteroid would release some 150 kilograms of CO2 into Earth’s atmosphere. However, economies of scale from large asteroid-mining operations could lower this to about 60 kilograms of CO2 per kilogram of platinum.

That needs to be compared with the emission from Earth-based mining. Here, platinum mining generates significant greenhouse gases, mostly from the energy it takes to remove this stuff from the ground.

Indeed, the numbers are huge. The mining industry estimates that producing one kilogram of platinum on Earth releases around 40,000 kilograms of carbon dioxide. “The global warming effect of Earth-based mining is several orders of magnitude larger,” say Hein and co.