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### 1AC: Plan

#### Plan – States ought to expand the Public Trust Doctrine to reduce private actor appropriation of Outer Space.

#### Implementing Public Trust Doctrines in Outer Space limits Appropriation and ensures Outer Space Development is sustainable.

Babcock 19 (, H., 2019. THE PUBLIC TRUST DOCTRINE, OUTER SPACE, AND THE GLOBAL COMMONS: TIME TO CALL HOME ET. [online] Lawreview.syr.edu. Available at: <https://lawreview.syr.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/H-Babcock-Article-Final-Document-v2.pdf#page=67> [Accessed 15 December 2021] Professor Babcock served as general counsel to the National Audubon Society from 1987-91 and as deputy general counsel and Director of Audubon’s Public Lands and Water Program from 1981-87. Previously, she was a partner with Blum, Nash & Railsback, where she focused on energy and environmental issues, and an associate at LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae where she represented utilities in the nuclear licensing process. From 1977-79, she served as a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Energy and Minerals in the U.S. Department of the Interior. Professor Babcock has taught environmental and natural resources law as a visiting professor at Pace University Law School and as an adjunct at the University of Pennsylvania, Yale, Catholic University, and Antioch law schools. Professor Babcock was a member of the Standing Committee on Environmental Law of the American Bar Association, and served on the Clinton-Gore Transition Team.)-rahulpenu

INTRODUCTION Space exploration is heating up. Governments and private interests are on a fast track to develop technologies to send people and equipment to celestial bodies, like the moon and asteroids, to extract their untapped resources.1 Near-space is rapidly filling up with public and private satellites, causing electromagnetic interference problems and dangerous space debris from collisions and earlier launches.2 The absence of a global management system for the private commercial development of outer space resources will allow these near space problems to be exported further into the galaxy.3 Moreover, without a governing authority or rules controlling entry or limiting despoliation, outer space could turn into the “Wild West” of the twenty-first century.4 Space treaties executed in the last century espoused the principle that space should be developed for the benefit of all mankind and banned both private ownership and militarization of space resources.5 But, they left development of a system for managing non-military activities in outer space to another day.6 Private commercial interests, which would be absorbing the risks and paying the high costs of space development, oppose any management scenario premised on that principle, as it would enable less developed countries to free ride on their investments.7 These interests, unsurprisingly, support privatizing outer space.8 But acceding to their wishes by establishing a system of property-based rules would transport Earth’s current division between haves and have-nots into outer space, and could lead to destabilizing hostilities—the exact consequences that the early treaty drafters hoped to avoid.9 To date, most scholars in this area have focused on developing management systems premised on private ownership or possession of the surface of some celestial body.10 This Article explores an alternative concept, the commons, in which no individual owns the property in question or can exclude others from it. Viewing property as a commons is closer to the principles set out in the various space treaties than implementation of a private property regime, and also offers a workable property regime. This Article demonstrates these conclusions by showing similarities between a large, Earth-bound commons, like the ocean and outer space, and how various commons management scenarios allow equitable use of resources, while preventing their despoliation and devolution into hostile disputes over entitlements to them. However, each of these commons management scenarios is flawed in some way and runs a similar risk to management approaches for private property of allowing the resource to be over-used or inequitably distributed. The public trust doctrine (**PTD**), an ancient doctrine that governments and individuals have used effectively for centuries to protect the public’s interests in terrestrial common pool resources (CPR) **and** to **fill** regulatory **gaps**, can be helpful in both respects.11 An examination of the doctrine identifies **commonalities** **between** outer **space** **and** **terrestrial** public trust **resources**.12 The **ease** and **low** **cost** of its implementation and enforcement, as well as its infinite malleability, are additional reasons to select it as a stopgap measure with some modification.13 This Article’s structure is straight forward. Part I acquaints the reader with the problem. It explains why the need to develop a management regime for space is becoming increasingly critical as advancing technology is allowing more and more private commercial interests to play at the edge of outer space with attendant negative externalities. 14 Soon these technological advances will allow private commercial interests to invade outer space with the potential for similar adverse impacts.15 Part II examines the international legal framework governing those activities and finds it lacks any capacity to regulate activities in outer space, in part because it is riddled with ambiguities and contradictions when it comes to ownership of outer space and its resources. Part III turns to that problem by discussing two types of property: private property and property owned in common with others. It examines the key features of each as well as their positive and negative attributes, how each might function in outer space, and what the consequences might be if one or the other prevailed. Because any property arrangement that results in its appropriation by the owner and the exclusion of others violates international space law, Part III also identifies various less-thanfull fee property arrangement, like leases and easements, to see if these problems can be avoided and concludes they cannot.16 It then examines property held in common to determine its viability under international space law and finds it consistent. Part IV investigates various approaches to managing property in outer space, be it held in private ownership or in common. Different approaches for managing private property in space are explored, including the right of first possession, tradable property claims, and establishing an exclusive economic zone, as well for managing an open access commons, such as the application of stewardship principles, norms, and the PTD. Each approach is evaluated in terms of its consistency with international law; its ability to promote and protect a sustainable, equitable, non-monopolistic, non-hostile environment in outer space; its efficiency; and its cost effectiveness. Only the PTD, which has been used for centuries to protect the public’s interests in CPRs and has demonstrated its ability to adapt to new circumstances, may be able to meet these goals.17 This Article finds commonalities between outer space and Earth-bound public trust resources, like the oceans. Additionally, the doctrine’s open access purpose resonates with language found in international treaties governing activities in outer space.18 This Article concludes that using the PTD will lead to a durable, equitable management regime in a commons where the wealthy are neither able to accumulate and control the resources that outer space has to offer nor over-exploit and deplete them. However, neither the doctrine nor ownership in common supplies any incentives for development, which may lead private enterprises to question whether development of outer space resources is worth the risks and costs.19 But, limited use of private property management approaches, like lotteries and tradable development claims—a form of overlapping hybridity between one type of property, a commons, and a management regime from another, private property—may fill this gap.20 This Article’s contribution to the literature on managing outer space resources and commons theory is using the PTD to bridge the gap between them and to suggest a hybrid management approach that melds commons theory with private property incentives.

#### Exemptions devastate Regulation Credibility – OST proves.

Hickman and Dolman 2 John Hickman and Everett Dolman Volume 21 Number 1 2002 “Resurrecting the Space Age: A State–Centered Commentary on the Outer Space Regime” (associate professor in the Department of Government and International Studies at Berry College in Mt. Berry)//Elmer

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

### 1AC: Sustainable Space Advantage

#### The Advantage is Sustainable Space Development:

#### Implementing the PTD for Private Appropriation results in a legally binding regime that curbs unsustainable development – ensures closing of legal loopholes.

Babcock 19 (, H., 2019. THE PUBLIC TRUST DOCTRINE, OUTER SPACE, AND THE GLOBAL COMMONS: TIME TO CALL HOME ET. [online] Lawreview.syr.edu. Available at: <https://lawreview.syr.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/H-Babcock-Article-Final-Document-v2.pdf#page=67> [Accessed 15 December 2021] Professor Babcock served as general counsel to the National Audubon Society from 1987-91 and as deputy general counsel and Director of Audubon’s Public Lands and Water Program from 1981-87. Previously, she was a partner with Blum, Nash & Railsback, where she focused on energy and environmental issues, and an associate at LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae where she represented utilities in the nuclear licensing process. From 1977-79, she served as a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Energy and Minerals in the U.S. Department of the Interior. Professor Babcock has taught environmental and natural resources law as a visiting professor at Pace University Law School and as an adjunct at the University of Pennsylvania, Yale, Catholic University, and Antioch law schools. Professor Babcock was a member of the Standing Committee on Environmental Law of the American Bar Association, and served on the Clinton-Gore Transition Team.)-rahulpenu

F. The Public Trust Doctrine (PTD) as a Gap Filling, Place-Holding Management Approach506 The PTD offers both an approach for managing an open access commons and a gap-filling tool until a regulatory regime is adopted.507 The doctrine is based on the idea that the “sovereign holds certain common properties in trust in perpetuity for the free and unimpeded use of the general public.”508 The public’s right to access and use trust resources is never lost, and neither the government nor private individuals can alienate or otherwise adversely affect those resources unless for a comparable public purpose.509 The resources the doctrine protects “have long been part of a ‘taxonomy of property’ [that recognizes] the division of natural wealth into private and public property.”510 “The doctrine places on governments ‘an affirmative, ongoing duty to safeguard the long-term preservation of those resources for the benefit of the general public,’”511 thus limiting the sovereign’s power on behalf of both present and future individuals.512 It directs the government to manage trust resources for public benefit, not private gain.513 It applies to private as well as public resources and is used to preserve the public’s access to CPRs.514 Government agencies have the non-rescindable power to revoke uses of trust resources that are inconsistent with the doctrine.515 This effectively places a permanent easement over trust resources that burdens their ownership with an overriding public interest in the preservation of those resources.516 However, trust resources can be alienated in favor of private ownership, if the alienation will still serve the public’s interest in those resources and not interfere with trust uses of the remaining land.517 The PTD, therefore, protects the “people’s common heritage,”518 just as Article 11 of the Moon Treaty protects outer space as part of the common heritage of mankind.519 The doctrine also appears to be infinitely malleable. Original uses of the doctrine were restricted to only that “aspect of the public domain below the low-water mark on the margin of the sea and the great lakes, the waters over those lands, and the waters within rivers and streams of any consequence,”520 and covered only traditional uses of those lands, like fishing and navigation.521 Over time, the scope and application of the doctrine broadened to protect more public resources and different uses.522 Thus, the **doctrine** expanded to protect new trust resources, such as dry sand beaches, inland lakes, groundwater, dry riverbeds, and wildlife,523 and passive uses of those resources, like scientific study.524 The original link to navigable water and tidelands disappeared.525 Supporters of the doctrine successfully advocated that it be applied to “wildlife, parks, cemeteries, and even works of fine art,”526 while arguing more recently its application to the atmosphere.527 A doctrine that imposes a perpetual duty on the sovereign to preserve trust resources, prevents their alienation for private benefit, assures public access to them, and can be invoked by anyone seems particularly useful as a management tool in outer space.528 The fact that **public** **access** to trust resources is so **central** to the doctrine **makes** it **reflective**, not contradictory, **of** international space **law’s** **bar** **against** **appropriation** of outer space and of the principle of space being the “province of all mankind.”529 It **avoids** the problems of alienation and **exclusion** associated with any of the management approaches associated with some form of private property and requires neither the creation of a new administrative authority nor the presence of a close-knit group of like-minded people.530 Members of the public, both rich and poor, can invoke and enforce the doctrine as easily as the sovereign.531 It is cost effective to the extent that no separate apparatus is required to implement it, and the doctrine has shown itself to be highly adaptable and innovative as different needs arise.532 It could also fill the gap in international law with respect to managing celestial property. Therefore, of all the management approaches studied here, the PTD seems the most suited to keep order in space until a regulatory regime is imposed. However, the doctrine provides no incentives for development of trust resources; rather, it might be used to limit or curtail that development, making it an imperfect, perhaps even counter-productive solution by itself to the extent that such development might be beneficial.533 Modifying the doctrine to allow limited use of private property management approaches, like tradable development claims, might buffer that effect—a form of overlapping hybridity between one type of property, a commons, and a management regime from another, private property, enabled by application of the PTD. CONCLUSION “Only a legal system that accommodates both the human need for resources and the necessary preservation of mankind’s common heritage can fulfill these criteria.”534 The future is now with regard to the development of outer space and its resources—it is no longer a question of whether humans will engage in these activities, but how soon they will. Technically advanced countries and private commercial enterprises are probing outer space and preparing for landing on an asteroid or the moon to extract their resources.535 Speculators are selling deeds to the moon’s surface and preparing to exploit the tourism potential that space offers.536 But, the legal framework for managing these initiatives is almost nonexistent.537 International treaties came into being before all this activity began in earnest and national laws that might apply are stunted by jurisdictional quandaries like the absence of national boundaries in outer space.538 Thus, there is an urgency to figure out how to control what happens in outer space before its resources are irreparably damaged or permanently monopolized by powerful countries and individuals. In the absence of regulation, much of the current debate centers on what property regime should be applied in outer space.539 The assumption is that by only allowing private property rights in space, countries and commercial enterprises will undertake the risks and costs of space development.540 However, unless international space law changes, it may prevent this from happening. If it changes, strong management controls will be necessary to prevent destruction or over-consumption of celestial resources, as well as monopolization and competitive behavior by participants, which could lead to hostilities and inequities. This Article examines various private property regimes, including those of less than full fee ownership, to see if any would avoid the conflict with the international prohibition on appropriation of outer space and its resources. It concludes that none will because each retains the right to exclude and each is insensitive to the treaties’ equity concerns. In contrast, considering outer space to be common is consistent with international space law in both respects. Hypothesizing that private property in outer space may yet prevail, this Article investigates different private property management approaches, such as the right of first possession, lotteries, and tradable development rights, to see if any would be cost effective, easy to implement and equitable, and would also prevent over-consumption, monopolization or the slide into rivalrous behavior. The Article concludes that each comes up short in some respect. Social norms as a management tool for property held in common, although compliant with international law, are also not up to the task. Instead, although ancient, the PTD, with its malleability, easy and cost-effective implementation and enforcement, non-consumption principle, and consistency with the goals that animate international space treaties, seems best suited to the task of protecting the public’s interests in the global commons that is outer space as it has done for centuries in Earth-bound commons. But, as its principal terrestrial use has been to protect trust resources from development, the doctrine needs some modification to encourage development of celestial resources. Hence, this Article suggests that modifying the PTD to allow the application of private property management tools, like tradable development rights, will not only allow development, but also will assure that when it happens, it will not be just profitable for a few, but will also be sustainable and equitable.

#### Sustainable development embedded in law solves security, debris, traffic and SSA.

Aganaba-Jeanty 16 (, T., 2016. Space Sustainability and the Freedom of Outer Space. [online] Taylor & Francis. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14777622.2016.1148463> [Accessed 15 December 2021] Timiebi is an assistant professor of Space and Society, in the School for the Future of Innovation in Society, an affiliate faculty with the Interplanetary Initiative, a senior global futures scientist with the Global Futures Lab, and holds a courtesy appointment at the Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law, all at Arizona State University. Timiebi was a post-doctoral fellow and is a senior fellow at the Centre for International Governance Innovation (CIGI) based in Waterloo, Ontario Canada where she focused on environmental and space governance. Timiebi was Executive Director of the World Space Week Association coordinating the global response to the UN 1999 declaration that World Space Week should be celebrated Oct 4-10 annually. She is currently on the Advisory Board for the Space Generation Advisory Council supporting the UN Programme on Space Applications. She is also on the Science Advisory Board of World View Enterprises and the SETI Institute. - pp. 10-13.)-rahulpenu

---Critique of status quo polices for space sustainability

---New regimes key

---Sustainability needs to be in law

---Perm VS Global South Ks

Definitions of space sustainability The Secure World Foundation defines space sustainability as “ensuring that all humanity can continue to use outer space for peaceful purposes and socioeconomic benefit.”39 It is also described as “the ability of all humanity to continue to use outer space for peaceful purposes and socioeconomic benefit over the long term.” It is proposed that, read together, these broad definitions take as their premise that: (1) all humanity thus far is using space for peaceful purposes and for socioeconomic benefit; (2) this use is threatened; (3) measures must be taken to protect it; and (4) all humanity currently possesses the ability, in the sense of having a skill or the capacity, to ensure space sustainability for peaceful purposes. Under this conceptualization, the negative effect of not using space sustainably is primarily economic.40 Bearing in mind the governmental origins of space exploitation, where market economics did not play a primary role in decision making, the growing focus on the economic perspective in space affairs acknowledges Carolyn Deere’s opinion that problems emerge in the international domain from an absence of powerful economic interests.41 Of course, as more space applications are developed, economic interests become more prevalent in that market protectionism then underlies the rationales for many positions taken. Space sustainability is also conceptualized as defining good behavior, its boundaries, and disincentives for negative behavior in space.42 Space sustainability then becomes a much more limited political concept calling for specific measures to strengthen norms.43 Some notable examples follow: An International Code of Conduct—the European Union proposed a non-binding voluntary code whose purpose is “security, safety, sustainability” for all space activities providing for general measures on space operations and space debris.44 The Scientific and Technical Subcommittee of UNCOPUOS working group objective of establishing guidelines for the long-term sustainability of outer space activities. Proposed International Civil Aviation Organization for Space—the establishment of an international organization focused on space safety and the establishment of binding safety standards similar to the International Civil Aviation Organization.45 Industry efforts for a global space situational awareness database Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Transparency and Confidence Building Measures. Depending on the forum for discussion and in line with the previously mentioned initiatives, the concept of space sustainability is also used interchangeably with the following: (1) space security, which entails access to space and freedom from threats;46 (2) space stability addressing space situational awareness;47 (3) space safety, which is protection from all unreasonable levels of risk (primarily protection of humans or human activities);48 and (4) responsible uses of space.49 These all reflect the two components of space sustainability as described by the founder of Secure World Foundation: “the first is the physical environment, which includes management of space debris, electromagnetic and physical crowding and congestion, and space weather.... The second component is the political environment, and includes promoting stability and preventing conflict between nations.”50 Bearing this in mind and notwithstanding the potential confusion caused by the interchangeability of terms used, at the core of all proposals conceptualizing space sustainability or related concepts are the notions that: (1) space assets are kept safe and secure, and that the assets are not harmed or interfered with; (2) peaceful space activities continue as free from purposeful/intentional or unintentional harmful interference; (3) the space environment is preserved for peaceful uses; and (4) international cooperative efforts are required. These four points are understood to be the current core conditions for and of space sustainability. It must be acknowledged that space sustainability, in this context, is severed from the ecological roots of sustainable development. Rationale for space sustainability The proposed baseline conditions for the current conception for space sustainability coincide with Gallagher’s analysis of the logic for space cooperation as “Space Governance for Global Security” where all space actors seek “to secure the space domain for peaceful use; to protect space assets from all hazards; and to derive maximum value from space for security, economic, civil, and environmental ends.”51 Based on this understanding, the current conception of and rationale for space sustainability ties more clearly to global security than to sustainable development. This logic emphasizes that “the more different countries, companies, and individuals depend on space for a growing array of purposes, the more they need equitable rules, shared decision-making procedures, and effective compliance mechanisms to maximize the benefits that they all can gain from space, while minimizing risks from irresponsible space behaviors or deliberate interference with legitimate space activities.”52 While it is acknowledged that such a need exists, the difficulty in reaching agreement on how to bring it about is one reason why some states are more focused on producing a dialogue on long-term sustainability. This is seen in the proliferation of reports outlining best practices and options that enhance sustainability through increased information sharing, as well as a focus on technical issues rather than on the creation of any new legal regimes. To minimize some of the risks of non-sustainable space use, Weeden53 proposes a three-pillar technical approach to space sustainability: (1) debris mitigation; (2) debris removal; and (3) space traffic management. This is conjoined with an immediate need for data in support of conjunction assessment and collision avoidance. This emphasis on data sharing/collection includes enabling research into potential solutions to the problem of space debris, and enhancing transparency and cooperation among states. Weeden also suggests that this narrow approach to space sustainability serves both to educate space actors about the severity of the space debris problem and to provide stability to reduce the likelihood of conflict. A common approach to data also serves as verification for a potential code of conduct in space, setting the stage for future space governance models. These proposals follow the logic of sustainability for global security. While this logic is in line with the dominant conceptualization of benefit sharing and freedom of outer space, the position taken in this article is that it does not adequately speak to sustainability from the perspective of aspirant space states. To do so requires a significantly broader discussion and solutions aimed towards aligning space law and policy with the sustainable development paradigm, if understood as being an inclusive paradigm and not focused on the individualistic/self-interested nature of the current conception of sustainable development. A systemic, sustainable development law approach calls for a conscious engagement with the web of overlapping social, environmental, cultural, and legal frameworks, as well as cultural considerations, economic policies, expectations, players, and interests.54 Bearing in mind current U.S. space policy,55 such a broad overarching objective may not be achievable as part of the dialogue on the “Long Term Sustainability of Outer Space Activities,” but U.S. policy regarding preservation of the space environment nevertheless offers insights because international initiatives congruent with it are likely to garner the most support. Schrogl56 proposed that sustainability is rendered to threats and risks to satellite operations. This approach acknowledges the intersection of multiple issue areas: environment, security, mobility, knowledge, resources, and energy. This intersection of issue areas is more akin to the wider discourse of sustainability development of and on the Earth, and prompts a discussion of value to emerging and aspirant space actors. Otherwise, the dominant conceptualization of space sustainability removes any focus upon providing for the needs of those not among the most advanced space nations. This problem is highlighted in Peter and Rathgeber’s definition of space sustainability: Sustainable space activities can be seen as activities (in space, from space, through space and towards space) that meet the needs of the present space actors without comprising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs of performing space related operations safely.57 Peter and Rathgeber claim that the emergence of new institutional space actors, particularly from the south, is putting a greater pressure on the space environment and that the participation of the south in space sustainability efforts is unsatisfactory.58 Yet, the role of less-advanced nations in sustainability initiatives is more so on the receiving end in that advanced nations seek to engage newcomers to space during the early phase of the development of future directives and codes of conduct for sustainable space activities; that is,not really to seek their input, but to ensure compliance by the less-advanced nations.59 Their space activities are judged as either threats to or consistent with space sustainability, rather than as part of articulating the content of space sustainability.60 This indicates that, for national space programs of established space nations, a truly international focus on space sustainability is not a priority**.** It is interesting to note, at this juncture in the discussion, a fundamental provision proposed by a group of developing states during the development of the U.N. Space Benefits Declaration.61 (1) All States should pursue their activities in Outer Space with due regard to the need to preserve Outer Space, in such a way as not to hinder its continued utilization and exploration. (2) States should pay attention to all aspects related to the protection and preservation of the Outer Space environment, especially those potentially affecting the Earth’s environment. (3) States with relevant space capabilities and with programs for the utilization and exploration of outer space should share with developing countries on an equitable basis the scientific and technological knowledge necessary for the proper development of programs oriented to the more rational utilization and exploration of Outer Space.62 Paragraph 3 is fundamental and truly revealing when read in the light of the analysis of Schrogl.63 Schrogl claims that the declaration takes up the problem of space debris, which might endanger future space utilization to a significant extent. However, he also states that “the wish [of the Developing countries] to be informed about debris prevention measures voiced. . . is reasonable but actually needs no mentioning since these technological developments are discussions and documented publicly to the greatest extent.”64

#### Congestion creates rivalrous orbits.

Fabian 19 (Christopher; January 2019; B.S. from the United States Air Force Academy, thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a M.S. from the University of North Dakota, approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee and in coordination with Dr. Michael Dodge, David Kugler, and Brian Urlacher; University of North Dakota Scholarly Commons, “A Neoclassical Realist’s Analysis Of Sino-U.S. Space Policy,” <https://commons.und.edu/theses/2455/>)

b. Defect/Defect The ubiquity of space technology has also yielded the negative externality of overcrowding the space domain. Despite its seemingly unlimited size, there are a limited number of useful earth-centric orbits to optimize terrestrial coverage. It is projected that there are over 300,000 medium sized objects capable of causing catastrophic failure of a satellite upon collision currently in earth’s orbit.159 Of these objects, 20,000 are actively tracked by the comparatively robust space surveillance network (SSN) of the United States Air Force, only 1,000 are active payloads, and even fewer have maneuver capability.160 Recent trends indicate that the problem of orbital congestion will only worsen in the coming decades as the barriers to entry are reduced. Launch service cost is rapidly decreasing due to an increased number of service providers and technology revolutions such as reusable rockets. Also, the miniaturization and simplification of satellite payloads further reduces the cost and infrastructure needed to be a spacefairing nation.161 This is evidenced by the near doubling of state operated satellites from 27 in 2000 to over 50 in 2012, coupled with a near doubling in total space objects from 1997 to 2007.162 The accumulation of space debris is a vital concern to the sustainable development of the space environment due to the increased probability of conjunction between active payloads and all other objects that results from crowded orbits. This increase in collision probability occurs proportionally to the number of objects in a given orbital domain. The tripling of orbital debris projected to occur in the next century, due to routine use and accumulation alone, would cause a tenfold increase in the probability of collision. In the event of a catastrophic collision between two objects, the resulting debris cloud could cause a cascading effect. Each successive collision increases the probability of another occurrence in a given orbit until an instability threshold is reached. At this threshold, debris removal due to decay would be negligible compared to debris created by subsequent collisions. As the propagation of debris continues, the cost of launching a satellite would eventually outweigh the benefits received due to the probability of that asset being destroyed by errant debris, effectively rendering the given orbit unusable. This debris propagation model and the dangers associated with it are colloquially referred to as the Kessler Syndrome. Kessler asserts unstable regions of low earth orbit (LEO) currently exist and that, barring the addition of more debris, a major collision would occur once every 10-20 years. If debris doubles, as it has in the last decade, the collision rate would increase to 2.5 years. Although most models’ time scales are on the order of centuries, it is widely accepted that the current rate of debris accumulation will render critical orbits unusable unless immediate measures are taken to return stability.163 There is near universal acceptance of the danger space debris presents, yet little substantive action has been taken to solve the problem. Current debris accumulation and propagation models show that earth orbiting domains are finite resources. Continued unsustainable development moving forward may preclude future usage, making earth orbits rivalrous goods.164 Furthermore, orbital domains are made a non-excludable good by the OST which states, “Outer space… shall be free for exploration and use by all States without discrimination of any kind.”165 As a non-excludable public good, space succumbs to the tragedy of the commons where the privately beneficial strategy of space utilization differs significantly from the socially optimal strategy promoting orbital stability.166 Understandably, most analysis has focused on solving the problem of orbital instability by addressing the market failure responsible for debris creation. The current reasoning suggests that if actors creating space debris internalize the cost of their actions, a solution can arise. Proposed solutions run the gamut of ideologies from free market tax incentives, to command and control legislation, to restructuring orbital property rights. Scientific solutions have also been proposed, but technological feasibility and cost remain major problems. Furthermore, analogous environments susceptible to the tragedy of the commons have been examined in hopes that they may prove applicable to the problem of orbit instability.167 This analysis is ultimately useful if the problem is to be solved under nominal conditions, but there is an underlying problem that needs to be addressed before any of these proposed solutions can realistically be enacted.

#### That triggers missile radars.

Hoots 15 (Felix; Fall 2015; Distinguished Engineer in the System Analysis and Simulation Subdivision, Ph.D. in Mathematics from Auburn University, M.S. in Mathematics from Tennessee Tech University; Crosslink, “Keeping Track: Space Surveillance for Operational Support,” <https://aerospace.org/sites/default/files/2019-04/Crosslink%20Fall%202015%20V16N1%20.pdf>)

The launch of Sputnik on October 4, 1957, marked the beginning of the Space Age. It also marked the beginning of an intense space race that brought a remarkable rate of rocket launches. In a very short time, the number of objects in orbit grew dramatically. This created a host of strategic challenges, including the need for space surveillance. In particular, the Air Force needed a way to prevent false alarms as satellites came within view of missile-warning radars, while the Navy needed a way to alert deployed units of possible reconnaissance by satellites overhead. These needs led to the establishment of a military mission to maintain a catalog of all Earth-orbiting objects—active payloads, rocket bodies, and debris—along with detailed information about trajectory and point of origin. Such a catalog could be used to filter normal orbital passages from potential incoming missiles and predict the passage of suspected spy satellites. The first catalog was relatively small in comparison with today’s version, which lists more than 22,000 items (as of May 2015). Also, the current version supports much more than the original military mission—and Aerospace is helping to extend its utility even further. The Space Catalog The Space Catalog is maintained by the Joint Space Operations Center (JSpOC) at Vandenberg Air Force Base, part of U.S. Strategic Command. One of the missions of JSpOC is to detect, track, and identify all artificial objects in Earth orbit. A key component of this mission is the Space Surveillance Network, a worldwide system of ground-based radars along with ground-based and orbital telescopes. The radars are used primarily for tracking near-Earth satellites with orbital period of 225 minutes or less, as well as some eccentric orbits that come down to near-Earth altitudes as they go towards their perigee. Ground-based telescopes are used for tracking more distant satellites, with orbital period greater than 225 minutes, and space-based sensors are used to track both near and distant satellites. The JSpOC tasks these sensors to track specific satellites and to record data such as time, azimuth, elevation, and range. This data is used to create orbital element sets or state vectors that represent the observed position of the satellite. The observed position can then be compared with the predicted position. The dynamic models used for predicting satellite motion are not perfect; factors such as atmospheric density variation caused by unmodeled solar activity can cause the predicted position to gradually stray from the true position. The observations are used to correct the predicted trajectory so the network can continue to track the satellite. This process of using observations to correct and refine an orbit in an ongoing feedback loop is called catalog maintenance, and it continues as long as the satellite remains in orbit. Ideally, the process is automatic, with manual inter vention only required when satellites maneuver or get near to reentry due to atmospheric drag. Sometimes, however, more effort is required. For example, a sensor may encounter a satellite trajectory that does not correspond well to anything in the catalog. Such observations are known as partially correlated observations if they are somewhat close to a known orbit or uncorrelated observations (or uncorrelated tracks) if they are far from any known orbit. Also, if a satellite is not tracked for five days, it is placed on an attention list for manual intervention. In that case, an analyst will attempt to match the wayward satellite to one of these partially correlated or uncorrelated tracks. If that effort succeeds, then the element sets are updated, and the object is returned to automatic catalog maintenance. On the other hand, if the satellite cannot be matched to a partially correlated or uncorrelated track, the satellite information continues to age. If it reaches 30 days without a match, the satellite is placed on the lost list. Risk Prediction One of the most visible uses of the catalog is to warn about collision risks for active payloads. This function predicts potential close approaches three to five days in advance to allow time to plan avoidance maneuvers, if necessary. Unplanned maneuvers may disturb normal operations and deplete resources for future maneuvers, so one would like to have high confidence in the collision-risk predictions. The reliability of the predictions depends directly on the accuracy of the orbit calculation, which in turn depends on the quality and quantity of the tracking data, which is limited by the capability of the Space Surveillance Network. Simply put, there are not enough tracking resources in the network to achieve high-quality orbits for every object in the catalog. Furthermore, many smaller objects can only be tracked by the most sensitive radars, and this tracking is infrequent. Most objects in the catalog are considered debris, which can neither maneuver nor broadcast telemetry. On the other hand, some satellite operators depend exclusively on the satellite catalog to know where their satellites are, and users of the satellite orbital data depend on the catalog to know when the satellites will be within view. This situation creates a challenging problem in balancing Space Surveillance Network resources to support the collision-warning task (tracking as many potential hazards as possible) while also providing highly accurate support to operational satellites (tracking the spacecraft as precisely as possible). The practical solution is to perform collision risk assessment using a large screening radius to ensure no close approaches are missed despite lower-quality predictions. Once an object is identified as having a potentially close approach, then the tasking level is raised, with the expectation that more tracking data will be obtained to refine the collision risk calculations. When the danger has passed, the object reverts to a normal tracking level. Collisions and spontaneous breakups do happen. The first satellite breakup occurred on June 29, 1961, when residual fuel in an Ablestar rocket body exploded, creating 296 trackable pieces of debris. Since that time, there have been more than 200 satellite breakups, the most notable being the missile intercept of the Fengyun-1C satellite, which created more than 3300 trackable fragments. In most cases, these breakups are first detected by the phased-array radars in the Space Surveillance Network. When multiple objects are observed where only one was expected, the downstream sensors are alerted, but no tasking is issued because specific debris orbits are not yet established. Tracks are taken and tagged as uncorrelated. Analysts at JSpOC then attempt to link uncorrelated tracks from different sensors to form a candidate orbit. Subsequent tracking improves the orbit to the point that the object can be named and numbered and moved into the catalog for automatic maintenance.

#### Nuclear war.

Rogoway 15 (Tyler; November 12; Defense Journalist and Editor of Time Inc’s The War Zone; Jalopnik, “These Are The Doomsday Satellites That Detected The Explosion Of Metrojet 9268,” <https://foxtrotalpha.jalopnik.com/these-are-the-doomsday-satellites-that-detected-the-exp-1737434876>)

For over 50 years the Pentagon has had early warning satellites in orbit aimed at spotting launches of ballistic missiles, especially the big intercontinental kind that can fly around the globe in less than 30 minutes and bring about nuclear Armageddon. Recently, these satellites have made news for their “secondary capabilities,” spotting the downing of Metrojet Flight 9268 and Malaysian Airlines Flight 17. These are the shadowy satellites that are capable of such amazing feats, and an idea of how they work. In 1960, at the height of the Cold War and at the dawn of the space age, the first Missile Defense Alarm System (MiDAS) satellite was launched into low earth orbit. Six years later there was a constellation of nine of these satellites roaming the heavens, each scanning the Soviet Union for large infrared plumes, the tell-tale sign of a ballistic missile or rocket launch. These fairly crude, low-earth orbit satellites, along with the radar-based Ballistic Missile Early Warning System, would be the basis for a Cold War ballistic missile surveillance system that would become ever more complex and capable as the years went by. If ballistic missile launches were detected and deemed a threat, the decision to retaliate would mean the National Command Authority making the call to do so within half an hour, an act that could bring an the end of humanity’s reign on Earth, permanently. The first really reliable and full coverage space-based ballistic missile early warning capability came with the launch of the first Defense Support Program (DSP) satellite in 1970. These new satellites were much more capable than their MiDAS predecessors. Early DSP satellite design was relatively straight forward, with the satellites’ spinning around their center axis while in geosynchronous orbit. This allows their telescopic infrared sensor to continuously sweep an area of the planet in a relatively brief amount of time, around six times in one minute. If something were detected, the information would immediately be data-linked to controllers on the ground at the 460th Space Wing located at Buckley AFB in in Colorado. A total of 23 of these satellites have been launched over the program’s life, with constant upgrades made along the way. A DSP satellite was launched by the Space Shuttle on STS-44 in 1991, and the last one was launched by a Delta IV Heavy in 2007. Most famously, the Defense Support Program constellation of satellites were used to detect launches of SCUD missiles during Operation Desert Storm.

#### Independently causes Russia War.

Lewis 4 Jeffrey Lewis, in the Advanced Methods of Cooperative Study Program- Worked In the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Policy, Center for Defense Information, ‘4, "What if Space Were Weaponized," July 2004 pg online @ www.cdi.org/PDFs/scenarios.pdf)

Accidental Nuclear War Scenario Crisis Over Kalningrad (2010) This is the second of two scenarios that consider how U.S. space weapons might create incentives for America’s opponents to behave in dangerous ways. The previous scenario looked at the systemic risk of accidents that could arise from keeping nuclear weapons on high alert to guard against a space weapons attack. This section focuses on the risk that a single accident in space, such as a piece of space debris striking a Russian early-warning satellite, might be the catalyst for an accidental nuclear war. As we have noted in an earlier section, the United States canceled its own ASAT program in the 1980s over concerns that the deployment of these weapons might be deeply destabilizing. For all the talk about a “new relationship” between the United States and Russia, both sides retain thousands of nuclear forces on alert and conﬁgured to ﬁght a nuclear war. When briefed about the size and status of U.S. nuclear forces, President George W. Bush reportedly asked “What do we need all these weapons for?” 43 The answer, as it was during the Cold War, is that the forces remain on alert to conduct a number of possible contingencies, including a nuclear strike against Russia. This fact, of course, is not lost on the Russian leadership, which has been increasing its reliance on nuclear weapons to compensate for the country’s declining military might. In the mid-1990s, Russia dropped its pledge to refrain from the “ﬁrst use” of nuclear weapons and conducted a series of exercises in which Russian nuclear forces prepared to use nuclear weapons to repel a NATO invasion. In October 2003, Russian Defense Minister Sergei Ivanov reiterated that Moscow might use nuclear weapons “preemptively” in any number of contingencies, including a NATO attack. 44 So, it remains business as usual with U.S. and Russian nuclear forces. And business as usual includes the occasional false alarm of a nuclear attack. There have been several of these incidents over the years. In September 1983, as a relatively new Soviet early-warning satellite moved into position to monitor U.S. missile ﬁelds in North Dakota, the sun lined up in just such a way as to fool the Russian satellite into reporting that half a dozen U.S. missiles had been launched at the Soviet Union. Perhaps mindful that a brand new satellite might malfunction, the ofﬁcer in charge of the command center that monitored data from the early-warning satellites refused to pass the alert to his superiors. He reportedly explained his caution by saying: “When people start a war, they don’t start it with only ﬁve missiles. You can do little damage with just ﬁve missiles.” 45 In January 1995, Norwegian scientists launched a sounding rocket on a trajectory similar to one that a U.S. Trident missile might take if it were launched to blind Russian radars with a high 26 What if Space Were Weaponized? altitude nuclear detonation. The incident was apparently serious enough that, the next day, Russian President Boris Yeltsin stated that he had activated his “nuclear football” – a device that allows the Russian president to communicate with his military advisors and review his options for launching his arsenal. In this case, the Russian early-warning satellites could clearly see that no attack was under way and the crisis passed without incident. 46 In both cases, Russian observers were conﬁdent that what appeared to be a “small” attack was not a fragmentary picture of a much larger one. In the case of the Norwegian sounding rocket, space-based sensors played a crucial role in assuring the Russian leadership that it was not under attack. The Russian command system, however, is no longer able to provide such reliable, early warning. The dissolution of the Soviet Union cost Moscow several radar stations in newly independent states, creating “attack corridors” through which Moscow could not see an attack launched by U.S. nuclear submarines. 47 Further, Russia’s constellation of early-warning satellites has been allowed to decline – only one or two of the six satellites remain operational, leaving Russia with early warning for only six hours a day. Russia is attempting to reconstitute its constellation of early-warning satellites, with several launches planned in the next few years. But Russia will still have limited warning and will depend heavily on its space-based systems to provide warning of an American attack. 48 As the previous section explained, the Pentagon is contemplating military missions in space that will improve U.S. ability to cripple Russian nuclear forces in a crisis before they can execute an attack on the United States. Anti-satellite weapons, in this scenario, would blind Russian reconnaissance and warning satellites and knock out communications satellites. Such strikes might be the prelude to a full-scale attack, or a limited effort, as attempted in a war game at Schriever Air Force Base, to conduct “early deterrence strikes” to signal U.S. resolve and control escalation. 49 By 2010, the United States may, in fact, have an arsenal of ASATs (perhaps even on orbit 24/7) ready to conduct these kinds of missions – to coerce opponents and, if necessary, support preemptive attacks. Moscow would certainly have to worry that these ASATs could be used in conjunction with other space-enabled systems – for example, long-range strike systems that could attack targets in less than 90 minutes – to disable Russia’s nuclear deterrent before the Russian leadership understood what was going on. What would happen if a piece of space debris were to disable [hit] a Russian early-warning satellite under these conditions? Could the Russian military distinguish between an accident in space and the ﬁrst phase of a U.S. attack? Most Russian early-warning satellites are in elliptical Molniya orbits (a few are in GEO) and thus difﬁcult to attack from the ground or air. At a minimum, Moscow would probably have some tactical warning of such a suspicious launch, but given the sorry state of Russia’s warning, optical imaging and signals intelligence satellites there is reason to ask the question. Further, the advent of U.S. on-orbit ASATs, as now envisioned 50 could make both the more difﬁcult orbital plane and any warning systems moot. The unpleasant truth is that the Russians likely would have to make a judgment call. No state has the ability to deﬁnitively determine the cause of the satellite’s failure. Even the Accidental Nuclear War Scenarios 27 United States does not maintain (nor is it likely to have in place by 2010) a sophisticated space surveillance system that would allow it to distinguish between a satellite malfunction, a debris strike or a deliberate attack – and Russian space surveillance capabilities are much more limited by comparison. Even the risk assessments for collision with debris are speculative, particularly for the unique orbits in which Russian early-warning satellites operate. During peacetime, it is easy to imagine that the Russians would conclude that the loss of a satellite was either a malfunction or a debris strike. But how conﬁdent could U.S. planners be that the Russians would be so calm if the accident in space occurred in tandem with a second false alarm, or occurred during the middle of a crisis? What might happen if the debris strike occurred shortly after a false alarm showing a missile launch? False alarms are appallingly common – according to information obtained under the Freedom of Information Act, the U.S.-Canadian North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) experienced 1,172 “moderately serious” false alarms between 1977 and 1983 – an average of almost three false alarms per week. Comparable information is not available about the Russian system, but there is no reason to believe that it is any more reliable. 51 Assessing the likelihood of these sorts of coincidences is difﬁcult because Russia has never provided data about the frequency or duration of false alarms; nor indicated how seriously earlywarning data is taken by Russian leaders. Moreover, there is no reliable estimate of the debris risk for Russian satellites in highly elliptical orbits. 52 The important point, however, is that such a coincidence would only appear suspicious if the United States were in the business of disabling satellites – in other words, there is much less risk if Washington does not develop ASATs. The loss of an early-warning satellite could look rather ominous if it occurred during a period of major tension in the relationship. While NATO no longer sees Russia as much of a threat, the same cannot be said of the converse. Despite the warm talk, Russian leaders remain wary of NATO expansion, particularly the effect expansion may have on the Baltic port of Kaliningrad. Although part of Russia, Kaliningrad is separated from the rest of Russia by Lithuania and Poland. Russia has already complained about its decreasing lack of access to the port, particularly the uncooperative attitude of the Lithuanian government. 53 News reports suggest that an edgy Russia may have moved tactical nuclear weapons into the enclave. 54 If the Lithuanian government were to close access to Kaliningrad in a ﬁt of pique, this would trigger a major crisis between NATO and Russia. Under these circumstances, the loss of an early-warning satellite would be suspicious. It is any military’s nature during a crisis to interpret events in their worst-case light. For example, consider the coincidences that occurred in early September 1956, during the extraordinarily tense period in international relations marked by the Suez Crisis and Hungarian uprising. 55 On one evening the White House received messages indicating: 1. the Turkish Air Force had gone on alert in response to unidentiﬁed aircraft penetrating its airspace; 2. one hundred Soviet MiG-15s were ﬂying over Syria; 3. a British Canberra bomber had been shot down over Syria, most likely by a MiG; and 4. The Russian ﬂeet was moving through the Dardanelles. Gen. Andrew 28 What if Space Were Weaponized? Goodpaster was reported to have worried that the conﬂuence of events “might trigger off … the NATO operations plan” that called for a nuclear strike on the Soviet Union. Yet, all of these reports were false. The “jets” over Turkey were a ﬂock of swans; the Soviet MiGs over Syria were a smaller, routine escort returning the president from a state visit to Moscow; the bomber crashed due to mechanical difﬁculties; and the Soviet ﬂeet was beginning long-scheduled exercises. In an important sense, these were not “coincidences” but rather different manifestations of a common failure – human error resulting from extreme tension of an international crisis. As one author noted, “The detection and misinterpretation of these events, against the context of world tensions from Hungary and Suez, was the ﬁrst major example of how the size and complexity of worldwide electronic warning systems could, at certain critical times, create momentum of its own.” Perhaps most worrisome, the United States might be blithely unaware of the degree to which the Russians were concerned about its actions and inadvertently escalate a crisis. During the early 1980s, the Soviet Union suffered a major “war scare” during which time its leadership concluded that bilateral relations were rapidly declining. This war scare was driven in part by the rhetoric of the Reagan administration, fortiﬁed by the selective reading of intelligence. During this period, NATO conducted a major command post exercise, Able Archer, that caused some elements of the Soviet military to raise their alert status. American ofﬁcials were stunned to learn, after the fact, that the Kremlin had been acutely nervous about an American ﬁrst strike during this period. 56 All of these incidents have a common theme – that conﬁdence is often the difference between war and peace. In times of crisis, false alarms can have a momentum of their own. As in the second scenario in this monograph, the lesson is that commanders rely on the steady ﬂow of reliable information. When that information ﬂow is disrupted – whether by a deliberate attack or an accident – conﬁdence collapses and the result is panic and escalation. Introducing ASAT weapons into this mix is all the more dangerous, because such weapons target the elements of the command system that keep leaders aware, informed and in control. As a result, the mere presence of such weapons is corrosive to the conﬁdence that allows national nuclear forces to operate safely.

#### Unchecked Commercial Appropriation causes Space Conflicts.

Perez 21 Veronica Delgado-Perez. 12/14/21. Argument | The Commercialization of Space Risks Launching a Militarized Space Race. <https://www.theintlscholar.com/periodical/12/14/2020/analysis-commercialization-space-risk-international-law-military-space-race> [Veronica Delgado-Perez is a Staff Writer at The International Scholar.] // CVHS SR

Fundamentals of the Final Frontier It is a geopolitical imperative to determine what, if any, commercial activities and use of extraterrestrial resources are permitted within the confines of international law. Without clear-cut agreements on what activity is recognized by international law, the world will undoubtedly see states push the boundaries ever further in an attempt to gain the edge over geopolitical competitors — even more-so in an era of renewed great power competition. Yet to date, there exists no comprehensive treaty or legal reference to commercial activity in space. However, this should come as no surprise. It has only been since the turn of the century that technology and markets have progressed to the point where commercial space exploration and exploitation has become possible. Only recently have experts and analysts of geopolitics and international law begun to seriously examine questions surrounding the legal framework that would govern extraterrestrial resource-mining and other commercial activities. In the last decade, the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS) dealt with commercial aspects in outer space. In one of their last reports, the Committee expressed that the era of the commercial utilization of outer space’s resources is intrinsically linked to the escalation of international competition over resources, which could threaten international peace and security. By encouraging the international community to engage in outer space’s activities for the benefit of humankind as a whole, “some delegations” have expressed that states should avoid the promotion of laws and regulations related to the commercialization of outer space, arguing that it should be considered the heritage of all humanity. In that regard, states must then ensure that domestic law on the use of outer space complies with international space law, which means that states should respect the principles outlined in the Outer Space Treaty and ensure that national regulations do not contravene international provisions. Even though the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and other Celestial Bodies (which entered into force in 1967), refers to the exploration and use of outer space, it does not address questions of a commercial nature, which compromises the ability of states and international actors to address new challenges to extraterrestrial activities. In several provisions, the treaty highlights that these activities may be carried out for peaceful purposes and the benefit of all people, reaffirming that outer space is not subject to national appropriation. Were outer space not considered a global commons, that would imply that the resources and results of commercial exploration may fall within the jurisdiction of a country. It is thus incumbent upon Washington — and its commercial enterprises — to demonstrate how American commercial exploration of space benefits other countries and complies with international space law, or otherwise to adhere to the spirit of past treaties which emphasize the impartiality of outer space until such time as the law is clarified. International Law is Adrift in Space The potential benefits of commercial space exploration cannot be ignored. From an economic standpoint, the space industry would generate a significant economic boon for both states and private companies, due to the abundance and variety of resources — particularly scarce minerals that are difficult to extract on Earth. As one example of the vastness of resources held in outer space, one asteroid has the potential to contain more than the total supply of platinum extracted throughout the history of mankind. It may very well open the door to an advanced era of space navigation, building extraterrestrial infrastructure that facilitates the exploration and use of space’s resources, and extra-planetary human habitation. Inevitably, there are significant drawbacks to the commercialization of space exploration. These can vary, for instance, from the commercial dominance of space’s natural resources only by those states with the technical and financial capital to support space missions, to geopolitical competition over extraterrestrial resources that threatens world peace and security, to the potential for the monopolization of extraterrestrial resources by states and private companies. As was the case during the Cold War, the Soviet Union and the United States began a Space Race in which they struggled to achieve supremacy in space exploration and domination of science. Today, the number of space powers has increased thanks to continual advancements in flight, combustion, and fueling technologies. In the three decades since the end of the Cold War, technologically advanced countries like China, Japan, and France which previously had no space program have successfully navigated to the top tier of space-faring agencies and programs. In 2018, the U.S. allocated $41 billion to space programs, followed by China at $5.8 billion, and Russia at $3.1 billion. Collectively, the three major space powers control almost 65% of the global industry, showing space powers are monopolizing space and reinforcing the inequality gap between states that do not have sufficient economic and technological capacity to invest. With new actors on the game stage, conflicts of interest may arise. There is a risk that each actor adopts a kind of short-term Realist approach to space policy — one which is driven by self-interest in reaping the greatest benefits of extraterrestrial exploration and commercialization while controlling access to others. If unmitigated, states may choose to militarize outer space to gain a strategic edge over competitors and adversaries. This process has already begun. Under the Trump administration, the Pentagon established the U.S. Space Force as a new branch of the Armed Forces to protect the country and allied interests in space. Already, Delta 4 — one of the U.S. Space Force’s missions — conducts strategic and theater missile warnings, manages weapon systems, and provides information to missile defense forces. The measure shows that for the U.S., outer space is not only a domain of scientific exploration but has the potential to become increasingly securitized. With the impending expiration of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) between the U.S. and Russia on February 5, 2021, a number of security dilemmas could arise. If the world’s two largest nuclear powers do not edge toward extending the treaty, Washington and Moscow risk returning to the era of unrestricted expansion of launch platforms and strategically-deployed nuclear warheads — potentially with the aid of military infrastructure in space. Although President-elect Biden has expressed his interest in negotiating an extension of New START, how Moscow and Washington might proceed remains an open question. Bilateral progress towards a new arms-control regime would require establishing limits on the number and range of long- and mid-range missiles, establishing measures to limit the expansion of traditional missile deployment to space, and banning the deployment of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction in outer space. More than the risk of the securitization of space, state, and private actors could begin to claim exclusive legal rights over the resources they discover. Indeed, the U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act, which came into force in 2015, expressly recognizes the right of U.S. Citizens to possess, own, transport, use, and sell space resources. By this means, domestic law already acknowledges the legal claim to property by individuals, which is prohibited by international law. Under the Outer Space Treaty, states renounced any traditional form of acquisition of territories and agreed not to foray unilaterally into space to extend their national policies on Earth or to exercise any kind of sovereignty over celestial bodies or resources. The absence of a modern international treaty that addresses these issues should be received with grave concern, as there is significant potential for risk to become reality. Existing UN treaties lack the technological context and foresight to address legal questions regarding the potential for commercial exploration and exploitation of outer space or its resources. During the sixties and seventies, when international instruments like the Outer Space treaty were conceived, the principal aim of states was to support and expand the scale of the state’s national capacity for operation in space and the development of legal instruments to guide state’s international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space. These instruments were never designed to respond to commercial questions over mining or tourism in space, private investment in space activities, or the emergence of non-state private enterprises operating in space. As a result, private enterprises operating in the vacuum of space also float in an unstable legal vacuum which threatens to implode in geopolitical competition. Beyond Stars and States In an increasingly commercial outer space in which there are no set limits to the exploitation of resources or claim to property, states and private companies will inevitably pursue the development of new extraterrestrial industries to suit their geoeconomic interests. If unchecked, the legal protection of outer space as a domain of exploration for the benefit of all humanity would functionally fail. To protect investments and profit from national space industries, states would likely resort to military force to protect and secure private assets. Over time, space would ultimately become a fourth border domain over which states claim, exercise, and defend sovereignty — including through the use of force. The challenge is thus to prevent the circumstances that could lead to space-borne conflict before it is made possible. Notwithstanding, commercial exploration and the use of natural resources need not lead to predation among actors involved in space. The potential rewards — both technological and environmental — that could come from investment in the harvesting of resources in space are immense. International law cannot afford to wait for the security dilemma posed by commercial activity in space to manifest before addressing it but must anticipate and proactively adopt measures to address future issues that govern extraterrestrial human activity. The only remedy for the lack of legal governance over commercial activity in space is the creation of new international laws through a comprehensive international treaty on commercial operations in space. The new treaty must expressly regulate commercial activities by states and private companies, enshrine an international liability and compensation regime covering damages caused with workable sanction provisions, and reinforce norms that restrict any militarization of outer space. The international community should focus its efforts on establishing a legal regime, with mandatory provisions (rather than non-binding resolutions, observations, commentaries, and conclusions) which generate both international responsibility and provide enforceable sanctions in the event of violations. The effort should be borne out by expanding the scope and strengthening the oversight powers of the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS), rather than creating a new organ with redundant bureaucracy. Beyond the tasks of encouraging space research programs, studying space activities, and addressing legal questions, COPUOS should be granted the necessary powers to perform control and oversight monitoring functions. Experience has taught the international community that cooperative arrangements between states and international organizations can prevent competition for resources from escalating to kinetic conflict. Through cooperation, there is a chance to preserve extraterrestrial resources for future generations, secure an equitable allocation of resources and benefits with a mind to each country’s specific needs, and prevent the expansion of geopolitical conflict to the domain of space. Space powers must recognize the value in partnering with other states to advance the development of space programs more efficiently. It should be clear now that all nations could reap the benefits of collective action, exploration, and commercialization of resources from beyond Earth’s atmosphere while preventing a drawn-out international conflict to the final frontier. The will of states not to jeopardize the fundamental basis of international law must be reflected in coordination and surveillance efforts to ensure that the advantages derived from space exploration allow humanity to continue evolving.

#### Space War cause Nuclear War.

Gallagher 15 “Antisatellite warfare without nuclear risk: A mirage” <http://thebulletin.org/space-weapons-and-risk-nuclear-exchanges8346> (interim director of the Center for International and Security Studies in Maryland, previous Executive Director of the Clinton Administration’s CTBT Treaty Committee, an arms control specialist at the State Dept., and a faculty member at Wesleyan)//Elmer

In recent decades, however, as space-based reconnaissance, communication, and targeting capabilities have become integral elements of modern military operations, strategists and policy makers have explored whether carrying out antisatellite attacks could confer major military advantages without increasing the risk of nuclear war. In theory, the answer might be yes. In practice, it is almost certainly no. Hyping threats. No country has ever deliberately and destructively attacked a satellite belonging to another country (though nations have sometimes interfered with satellites' radio transmissions). But the United States, Russia, and China have all tested advanced kinetic antisatellite weapons, and the United States has demonstrated that it can modify a missile-defense interceptor for use in antisatellite mode. Any nation that can launch nuclear weapons on medium-range ballistic missiles has the latent capability to attack satellites in low Earth orbit. Because the United States depends heavily on space for its terrestrial military superiority, some US strategists have predicted that potential adversaries will try to neutralize US advantages by attacking satellites. They have also recommended that the US military do everything it can to protect its own space assets while maintaining a capability to disable or destroy satellites that adversaries use for intelligence, communication, navigation, or targeting. Analysis of this sort often exaggerates both potential adversaries’ ability to destroy US space assets and the military advantages that either side would gain from antisatellite attacks. Nonetheless, some observers are once again advancing worst-case scenarios to support arguments for offensive counterspace capabilities. In some other countries, interest in space warfare may be increasing because of these arguments. If any nation, for whatever reason, launched an attack on a second nation's satellites, nuclear retaliation against terrestrial targets would be an irrational response. But powerful countries do sometimes respond irrationally when attacked. Moreover, disproportionate retaliation following a deliberate antisatellite attack is not the only way in which antisatellite weapons could contribute to nuclear war. It is not even the likeliest way. As was clearly understood by the countries that negotiated the Outer Space Treaty, crisis management would become more difficult, and the risk of inadvertent deterrence failure would increase, if satellites used for reconnaissance and communication were disabled or destroyed. But even if the norm against attacking another country’s satellites is never broken, developing and testing antisatellite weapons still increase the risk of nuclear war. If, for instance, US military leaders became seriously concerned that China or Russia were preparing an antisatellite attack, pressure could build for a pre-emptive attack against Chinese or Russian strategic forces. Should a satellite be struck by a piece of space debris during a crisis or a low-level terrestrial conflict, leaders might mistakenly assume that a space war had begun and retaliate before they knew what had actually happened. Such scenarios may seem improbable, but they are no more implausible than the scenarios that are used to justify the development and use of antisatellite weapons.

#### Nuke war causes extinction AND outweighs other existential risks

* Checked

PND 16. internally citing Zbigniew Brzezinski, Council of Foreign Relations and former national security adviser to President Carter, Toon and Robock’s 2012 study on nuclear winter in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, Gareth Evans’ International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament Report, Congressional EMP studies, studies on nuclear winter by Seth Baum of the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute and Martin Hellman of Stanford University, and U.S. and Russian former Defense Secretaries and former heads of nuclear missile forces, brief submitted to the United Nations General Assembly, Open-Ended Working Group on nuclear risks. A/AC.286/NGO/13. 05-03-2016. <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/images/documents/Disarmament-fora/OEWG/2016/Documents/NGO13.pdf> //Re-cut by Elmer

Consequences human survival 12. Even if the 'other' side does NOT launch in response the smoke from 'their' burning cities (incinerated by 'us') will still make 'our' country (and the rest of the world) uninhabitable, potentially inducing global famine lasting up to decades. Toon and Robock note in ‘Self Assured Destruction’, in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists 68/5, 2012, that: 13. “A nuclear war between Russia and the United States, even after the arsenal reductions planned under New START, could produce a nuclear winter. Hence, an attack by either side could be suicidal, resulting in self assured destruction. Even a 'small' nuclear war between India and Pakistan, with each country detonating 50 Hiroshima-size atom bombs--only about 0.03 percent of the global nuclear arsenal's explosive power--as air bursts in urban areas, could produce so much smoke that temperatures would fall below those of the Little Ice Age of the fourteenth to nineteenth centuries, shortening the growing season around the world and threatening the global food supply. Furthermore, there would be massive ozone depletion, allowing more ultraviolet radiation to reach Earth's surface. Recent studies predict that agricultural production in parts of the United States and China would decline by about **20 percent** for four years, and by 10 percent for a decade.” 14. A conflagration involving USA/NATO forces and those of Russian federation would most likely cause the deaths of most/nearly all/all humans (and severely impact/extinguish other species) as well as destroying the delicate interwoven techno-structure on which latter-day 'civilization' has come to depend. Temperatures would drop to below those of the last ice-age for up to 30 years as a result of the lofting of up to 180 million tonnes of very black soot into the stratosphere where it would remain for decades. 15. Though human ingenuity and resilience shouldn't be underestimated, human survival itself is arguably problematic, to put it mildly, under a 2000+ warhead USA/Russian federation scenario. 16. The Joint Statement on Catastrophic Humanitarian Consequences signed October 2013 by 146 governments mentioned 'Human Survival' no less than 5 times. The most recent (December 2014) one gives it a highly prominent place. Gareth Evans’ ICNND (International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament) Report made it clear that it saw the threat posed by nuclear weapons use as one that at least threatens what we now call 'civilization' and that potentially threatens human survival with an immediacy that even climate change does not, though we can see the results of climate change here and now and of course the immediate post-nuclear results for Hiroshima and Nagasaki as well.

### 1AC – Framework (Short)

### Framing

#### The standard is maximizing expected well-being. Prefer:

#### 1] Actor specificity – a) government actors don’t have knowledge as to the effects on specific individuals which means only aggregates can be used for calculation b) intrinsicness – focusing on intrinsic factors to policy such as aggregation is better for topics that aim to make a policy action

#### Extinction comes first – 3 warrants:

#### Moral uncertainty means preventing extinction should be our highest priority.

Bostrom 13 [Nick Bostrom, Professor in the Faculty of Philosophy @ University of Oxford, “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority,” Global Policy Vol. 4 Issue 1, February 2013]  
These reflections on **moral uncertainty suggest** an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate.¶ **Our present understanding of axiology might** well **be confused. We may not** nowknow — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet **be able to imagine the best ends** of our journey. **If we are** indeedprofoundly **uncertain** about our ultimate aims,then we should recognize that **there is a great** option **value in preserving** — and ideally improving — **our ability to recognize value and** to **steer the future accordingly. Ensuring** that **there will be a future** version of **humanity** with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely **is** plausibly **the best way** available to us **to increase the probability that the future will contain** a lot of **value.** To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

#### 2] Future improvement – extinction removes possibility for future innovation or allowing development of systems or evaluation

#### 3] Bodily Security – extinction removes actors ability to act which means it’s a lexical pre-requisite as it destroys actors ability to act

## Underview

AFF theory – a) AFF gets it because otherwise the neg can engage in infinite abuse, making debate impossible, b) drop the debater – the 1AR is too short for theory and substance so ballot implications are key to check abuse, c) no RVIs – they can stick me with 6min of answers to a short arg and make the 2AR impossible, d) competing interps – 1AR interps aren’t bidirectional and the neg should have to defend their norm since they have more time. Aff theory first – it’s a much larger strategic loss because 1min is ¼ of the 1AR vs 1/7 of the 1NC which means there’s more abuse if I’m devoting a larger fraction of time