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## Space Exploration DA

#### Private sector growth in the commercial space industry is high and rising.

**Smith 18** [Matthew Smith, 6-11-2018, "Commercialized Space and You," Science in the News, https://sitn.hms.harvard.edu/flash/2018/commercialized-space-and-you/]//DDPT

Step aside, NASA. The 20th century model of space exploration is running out of fuel, and private companies are now leading the race for human expansion across the galaxy. Elon Musk, Richard Branson, and Jeff Bezos are three of the billionaires leading this extraterrestrial adventure with their respective companies, SpaceX, Virgin Galactic, and Blue Origin. Bezos, the founder of Amazon and currently the wealthiest person in the world, has a vision of sending autonomous rovers to the Moon and helping to eventually create a Moon Village. He has explained that collaborations with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and other government agencies are encouraged and appreciated, but are no longer essential to achieve his goal. [Musk](https://www.geekwire.com/2018/jeff-bezos-blue-origin-space-venture-go-moon-settlements/), who co-founded Tesla, has already launched nine rockets within the first five months of 2018, one of which was the most powerful private spacecraft [ever sent into orbit](http://sitn.hms.harvard.edu/flash/2018/spacex-launches-falcon-heavy-rocket-successfully/). Looking forward, SpaceX aims to complete its first manned mission to Mars in 2024, almost a decade earlier than NASA’s projections. Even the current US president is encouraging this shift to private companies driving [innovation in space](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-switch/wp/2018/02/11/the-trump-administration-wants-to-turn-the-international-space-station-into-a-commercially-run-venture/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.d2c1eccab4ca). With almost [$1 billion](https://www.forbes.com/sites/alexknapp/2018/04/10/nearly-1-billion-was-invested-in-space-startups-in-1q2018-new-report-says/#5fdd019b285c) invested in space-focused startups in the first quarter of 2018, the commercialized space industry shows no sign of slowing down.

#### The private sector is the key internal link to space exploration and colonization.

**Sharma 9/7** [Maanas Sharma, 9-7-2021, "The Space Review: The privatized frontier: the ethical implications and role of private companies in space exploration," The Space Review, https://www.thespacereview.com/article/4238/1]//DDPT

In recent years, private companies have taken on a larger role in the space exploration system. With lower costs and faster production times, they have displaced some functions of government space agencies. Though many have levied criticism against privatized space exploration, it also allows room for more altruistic actions by government space agencies and the benefits from increased space exploration as a whole. Thus, we should encourage this development, as the process is net ethical in the end. Especially if performed in conjunction with adequate government action on the topic, private space exploration can overcome possible shortcomings in its risky and capitalistic nature and ensure a positive contribution to the general public on Earth.

The implications of commercial space exploration have been thrust into the limelight with the successes and failures of billionaire Elon Musk’s company SpaceX. While private companies are not new to space exploration, their prominence in American space exploration efforts has increased rapidly in recent years, fueled by technological innovations, reductions in cost, and readily available funding from government and private sources.[1] In May 2020, SpaceX brought American astronauts to space from American soil for the first time in almost 10 years.[2] Recognizing the greatly reduced costs of space exploration in private companies, NASA’s budget has shifted to significantly relying on private companies.[3] However, private space companies are unique from government space agencies in the way they experience unique sets of market pressures that influence their decision-making process. Hence, the expansion of private control in the space sector turns into a multifaceted contestation of its ethicality.

The most obvious ethical concern is the loss of human life. Critics contend that companies must answer to their shareholders and justify their profits. This contributes to a larger overall psyche that prioritizes cost and speed above all else, resulting in significantly increased risks.[4] However, the possible increase in mishaps is largely overstated. Companies recognize the need for safety aboard their expeditions themselves.[5] After all, the potential backlash from a mishap could destroy the company’s reputation and significantly harm their prospects. According to Dr. Nayef Al-Rodhan, Head of the Geneva Centre for Security Policy’s Geopolitics and Global Futures Programme, “because there were no alternatives to government space programs, accidents were seen to some degree as par for the course… By comparison, private companies actually have a far more difficult set of issues to face in the case of a mishap. In a worst case scenario, a private company could make an easy scapegoat.” [6]

Another large ethical concern is the prominence capitalism may have in the future of private space exploration and the impacts thereof. The growth of private space companies in recent years has been closely intertwined with capitalism. Companies have largely focused on the most profitable projects, such as space travel and the business of space.[7] Many companies are funded by individual billionaires, such as dearMoon, SpaceX’s upcoming mission to the Moon.[8] Congress has also passed multiple acts for the purpose of reducing regulations on private space companies and securing private access to space. From this, many immediately jump to the conclusion that capitalism in space will recreate the same conditions in outer space that plague Earth today, especially with the increasing push to create a “space-for-space” economy, such as space tourism and new technologies to mine the Moon and asteroids. Critics, such as Jordan Pearson of VICE, believe that promises of “virtually unlimited resources” are only for the rich, and will perpetuate the growing wealth inequality that plagues the world today.[9]

However, others contend that just because private space exploration has some capitalist elements, it is by no means an embodiment of unrestricted capitalism. A healthy balance of restricted capitalism—for example, private space companies working through contracts with government agencies or independently under monitoring and regulation by national and international agreements—will avoid the pitfalls that capitalist colonialism faced down here on Earth. Even those who are generally against excessive government regulation should see the benefits of them in space. Lacking any consensus on definitions and rights in space will create undue competition between corporations as well as governments that will harm everyone rather than helping anyone. To create a conducive environment for new space-for-space exploration, one without confrontation but with protection for corporate astronauts, infrastructure, and other interests, governments must create key policies such as a framework for property rights on asteroids, the Moon, and Mars.[7,10]

Another key matter to note is restricted capitalism in space “could also be our salvation.”[11] Private space exploration could reap increased access to resources and other benefits that can be used to solve the very problems on Earth that critics of capitalism identify. Since governments offset some of their projects to private companies, government agencies can focus on altruistic projects that otherwise would not fit in the budget before and do not have the immediate commercial use that private companies look for. Scott Hubbard, an adjunct professor of aeronautics and astronautics at Stanford University, discusses how “this strategy allows the space agency to continue ‘exploring the fringe where there really is no business case’” but still has important impacts on people down on Earth.[12]

Indeed, this idea is a particularly powerful one when considering the ideal future of private companies in space exploration. Though there is no one set way governments will interact with companies, the consensus is that they must radically reimagine their main purpose as the role of private space exploration continues to grow. As governments utilize services from private space companies, “[i]nstead of being bogged down by the routine application of old research, NASA can prioritize their limited budget to work more on research of other unknowns and development of new long-term space travel technologies.”[13] According to the Council on Foreign Relations, such technologies have far-reaching benefits on Earth as well. Past developments obviously include communications satellites, by themselves a massive benefit to society, but also “refinements in artificial hearts; improved mammograms; and laser eye surgery… thermoelectric coolers for microchips; high-temperature lubricants; and a means for mass-producing carbon nanotubes, a material with significant engineering potential; [and h]ousehold products.”[2] Agencies like NASA are the only actors able to pursue the next game-changing missions, “where the profit motive is not as evident and where the barriers to entry are still too high for the private sector to really make a compelling business case.”[8] These technologies have revolutionized millions, if not billions, of lives, demonstrating the remarkable benefits of space exploration. It follows then that it is net ethical to prioritize these benefits.

This report concludes that the private sector, indeed, has a prominent role to play in the future of space exploration. Further, though private space exploration does bring the potential of increased danger and the colonization of space, these concerns can be effectively mitigated. Namely, strong government frameworks—particularly international ones—will minimize possible sources of ethical violations and ensure an optimal private sector role in space. This also allows government agencies to complete significantly more difficult, innovative projects which have transformative benefits for life on Earth.

#### Space exploration solves extinction and endless resource wars.

Collins 10 [Patrick Collins, professor of economics at Azabu University in Japan, and a Collaborating Researcher with the Institute for Space & Astronautical Science, as well as adviser to a number of companies, Adriano V. Autino is President of the Space Renaissance International; Manager, CEO/CTO, Systems Engineering Consultant / Trainer at Andromeda Systems Engineering LLC; and Supplier of methodological tools and consultancy at Intermarine S.p.A, Acta Astronautica, Volume 66, Issues 11–12, June–July 2010, “What the growth of a space tourism industry could contribute to employment, economic growth, environmental protection, education, culture and world peace”, Pages 1553–1562]

7. World peace and preservation of human civilisation

The major source of social friction, including international friction, has surely always been unequal access to resources. People fight to control the valuable resources on and under the land, and in and under the sea. The natural resources of Earth are limited in quantity, and economically accessible resources even more so. As the population grows, and demand grows for a higher material standard of living, industrial activity grows exponentially. The threat of resources becoming scarce has led to the concept of “Resource Wars”. Having begun long ago with wars to control the gold and diamonds of Africa and South America, and oil in the Middle East, the current phase is at centre stage of world events today [37]. A particular danger of “resource wars” is that, if the general public can be persuaded to support them, they may become impossible to stop as resources become increasingly scarce. Many commentators have noted the similarity of the language of US and UK government advocates of “war on terror” to the language of the novel “1984” which describes a dystopian future of endless, fraudulent war in which citizens are reduced to slaves.

7.1. Expansion into near-Earth space is the only alternative to endless “resource wars”

As an alternative to the “resource wars” already devastating many countries today, opening access to the unlimited resources of near-Earth space could clearly facilitate world peace and security. The US National Security Space Office, at the start of its report on the potential of space-based solar power (SSP) published in early 2007, stated: “Expanding human populations and declining natural resources are potential sources of local and strategic conflict in the 21st Century, and many see energy as the foremost threat to national security” [38]. The report ended by encouraging urgent research on the feasibility of SSP: “Considering the timescales that are involved, and the exponential growth of population and resource pressures within that same strategic period, it is imperative that this work for “drilling up” vs. drilling down for energy security begins immediately” [38].

Although the use of extra-terrestrial resources on a substantial scale may still be some decades away, it is important to recognise that simply acknowledging its feasibility using known technology is the surest way of ending the threat of resource wars. That is, if it is assumed that the resources available for human use are limited to those on Earth, then it can be argued that resource wars are inescapable [22] and [37]. If, by contrast, it is assumed that the resources of space are economically accessible, this not only eliminates the need for resource wars, it can also preserve the benefits of civilisation which are being eroded today by “resource war-mongers”, most notably the governments of the “Anglo-Saxon” countries and their “neo-con” advisers. It is also worth noting that the $1 trillion that these have already committed to wars in the Middle-East in the 21st century is orders of magnitude more than the public investment needed to aid companies sufficiently to start the commercial use of space resources.

Industrial and financial groups which profit from monopolistic control of terrestrial supplies of various natural resources, like those which profit from wars, have an economic interest in protecting their profitable situation. However, these groups’ continuing profits are justified neither by capitalism nor by democracy: they could be preserved only by maintaining the pretence that use of space resources is not feasible, and by preventing the development of low-cost space travel. Once the feasibility of low-cost space travel is understood, “resource wars” are clearly foolish as well as tragic. A visiting extra-terrestrial would be pityingly amused at the foolish antics of homo sapiens using long-range rockets to fight each other over dwindling terrestrial resources—rather than using the same rockets to travel in space and have the use of all the resources they need!

7.2. High return in safety from extra-terrestrial settlement

Investment in low-cost orbital access and other space infrastructure will facilitate the establishment of settlements on the Moon, Mars, asteroids and in man[/woman]-made space structures. In the first phase, development of new regulatory infrastructure in various Earth orbits, including property/usufruct rights, real estate, mortgage financing and insurance, traffic management, pilotage, policing and other services will enable the population living in Earth orbits to grow very large. Such activities aimed at making near-Earth space habitable are the logical extension of humans’ historical spread over the surface of the Earth. As trade spreads through near-Earth space, settlements are likely to follow, of which the inhabitants will add to the wealth of different cultures which humans have created in the many different environments in which they live.

Success of such extra-terrestrial settlements will have the additional benefit of reducing the danger of human extinction due to planet-wide or cosmic accidents [27]. These horrors include both man-made disasters such as nuclear war, plagues or growing pollution, and natural disasters such as super-volcanoes or asteroid impact. It is hard to think of any objective that is more important than preserving peace. Weapons developed in recent decades are so destructive, and have such horrific, long-term side-effects that their use should be discouraged as strongly as possible by the international community. Hence, reducing the incentive to use these weapons by rapidly developing the ability to use space-based resources on a large scale is surely equally important [11] and [16]. The achievement of this depends on low space travel costs which, at the present time, appear to be achievable only through the development of a vigorous space tourism industry.

## Mining CP

#### CP: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust except for the mining of asteroids.

#### 2 reasons why that’s good:

#### 1] Warming -- Asteroid mining is an unqualified good – it’s essential to fight climate change

Duran 21 -- Paloma Duran (Journalist and Industry Analyst), 11/03/2021, Is Space Mining the Best Option to Face Climate Change?, https://mexicobusiness.news/mining/news/space-mining-best-option-face-climate-change WJ

Going to net zero means that more mining is needed. Experts have said that the current supply cannot support the necessary metals demand for the green transition. As a result, new mining alternatives have gained greater relevance, among them is space mining. Several countries, including Mexico, have shown their interest in this alternative, creating a new space race.

“The solar system can support a billion times greater industry than we have on Earth. When you go to vastly larger scales of civilization, beyond the scale that a planet can support, then the types of things that civilization can do are incomprehensible to us … We would be able to promote healthy societies all over the world at the same time that we would be reducing the environmental burden on the Earth,” said Dr. Phil Metzger, Planetary Scientist at the University of Central Florida.

Currently, there are several attempts to address global warming and transition to a net zero carbon economy. There has been an increasing interest in renewable energy and infrastructure, which has increased demand for various minerals, especially lithium, cobalt, nickel, copper and rare earth elements. However, according to experts, the world is close to entering a metals supercycle, where demand will exceed available supply, causing prices to skyrocket.

Consequently, the mining industry has sought alternatives to achieve the required supply. Options include recycling and improved mine waste management, sea mining and space mining. The latter is considered one of the alternatives with the greatest potential. However, a regulatory framework is still lacking and there is almost no experience in this regard.

Despite the lack of knowledge regarding space mining, it has become a very attractive option since the planet is running out of resources. While some people believe that land-based mining is cheaper than space mining, experts believe this may change in the long term. Furthermore, within the solar system there are countless bodies rich in minerals, ores and elements that will accelerate the fight against climate change.

“There will come a point when there is nothing left to mine on the surface, prompting mines to reach even further below. But even those resources are destined to run out and so we will aim toward ocean mining, which already has specific technologies that are being developed. Nevertheless, even those mines are limited as well. The mine of the future, which today may seem unlikely, will no longer be on our planet. There will be a time when space mining will be as common as an open leach mine,” Eder Lugo, Minerals Head at Siemens, told MBN.

More than 150 million asteroids measuring approximately 100m are believed to be in the inner solar system alone. In addition, astronomers have also identified abundant minerals near the Earth’s space and the Main Asteroid Belt. There are three main groups into which asteroids are divided: C- type, S- type, and M- type. The last two groups are the most abundant in minerals such as gold, platinum, cobalt, zinc, tin, lead, indium, silver, copper and rare earth metals.

"Energy is limited here. Within just a few hundred years, you will have to cover all of the landmass of Earth in solar cells. So, what are you going to do? Well, what I think you are going to do is you are going to move out in space … all of our heavy industry will be moved off-planet and Earth will be zoned residential and light-industrial,” said Jeff Bezos, Founder of Amazon and the Space Launch Provider Blue Origin.

#### Warming causes extinction

Yangyang Xu 17, Assistant Professor of Atmospheric Sciences at Texas A&M University; and Veerabhadran Ramanathan, Distinguished Professor of Atmospheric and Climate Sciences at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, 9/26/17, “Well below 2 °C: Mitigation strategies for avoiding dangerous to catastrophic climate changes,” Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, Vol. 114, No. 39, p. 10315-10323

We are proposing the following extension to the DAI risk categorization: warming greater than 1.5 °C as “dangerous”; warming greater than 3 °C as “catastrophic?”; and warming in excess of 5 °C as “unknown??,” with the understanding that changes of this magnitude, not experienced in the last 20+ million years, pose existential threats to a majority of the population. The question mark denotes the subjective nature of our deduction and the fact that catastrophe can strike at even lower warming levels. The justifications for the proposed extension to risk categorization are given below.

From the IPCC burning embers diagram and from the language of the Paris Agreement, we infer that the DAI begins at warming greater than 1.5 °C. Our criteria for extending the risk category beyond DAI include the potential risks of climate change to the physical climate system, the ecosystem, human health, and species extinction. Let us first consider the category of catastrophic (3 to 5 °C warming). The first major concern is the issue of tipping points. Several studies (48, 49) have concluded that 3 to 5 °C global warming is likely to be the threshold for tipping points such as the collapse of the western Antarctic ice sheet, shutdown of deep water circulation in the North Atlantic, dieback of Amazon rainforests as well as boreal forests, and collapse of the West African monsoon, among others. While natural scientists refer to these as abrupt and irreversible climate changes, economists refer to them as catastrophic events (49).

Warming of such magnitudes also has catastrophic human health effects. Many recent studies (50, 51) have focused on the direct influence of extreme events such as heat waves on public health by evaluating exposure to heat stress and hyperthermia. It has been estimated that the likelihood of extreme events (defined as 3-sigma events), including heat waves, has increased 10-fold in the recent decades (52). Human beings are extremely sensitive to heat stress. For example, the 2013 European heat wave led to about 70,000 premature mortalities (53). The major finding of a recent study (51) is that, currently, about 13.6% of land area with a population of 30.6% is exposed to deadly heat. The authors of that study defined deadly heat as exceeding a threshold of temperature as well as humidity. The thresholds were determined from numerous heat wave events and data for mortalities attributed to heat waves. According to this study, a 2 °C warming would double the land area subject to deadly heat and expose 48% of the population. A 4 °C warming by 2100 would subject 47% of the land area and almost 74% of the world population to deadly heat, which could pose existential risks to humans and mammals alike unless massive adaptation measures are implemented, such as providing air conditioning to the entire population or a massive relocation of most of the population to safer climates.

Climate risks can vary markedly depending on the socioeconomic status and culture of the population, and so we must take up the question of “dangerous to whom?” (54). Our discussion in this study is focused more on people and not on the ecosystem, and even with this limited scope, there are multitudes of categories of people. We will focus on the poorest 3 billion people living mostly in tropical rural areas, who are still relying on 18th-century technologies for meeting basic needs such as cooking and heating. Their contribution to CO2 pollution is roughly 5% compared with the 50% contribution by the wealthiest 1 billion (55). This bottom 3 billion population comprises mostly subsistent farmers, whose livelihood will be severely impacted, if not destroyed, with a one- to five-year megadrought, heat waves, or heavy floods; for those among the bottom 3 billion of the world’s population who are living in coastal areas, a 1- to 2-m rise in sea level (likely with a warming in excess of 3 °C) poses existential threat if they do not relocate or migrate. It has been estimated that several hundred million people would be subject to famine with warming in excess of 4 °C (54). However, there has essentially been no discussion on warming beyond 5 °C.

Climate change-induced species extinction is one major concern with warming of such large magnitudes (>5 °C). The current rate of loss of species is ∼1,000-fold the historical rate, due largely to habitat destruction. At this rate, about 25% of species are in danger of extinction in the coming decades (56). Global warming of 6 °C or more (accompanied by increase in ocean acidity due to increased CO2) can act as a major force multiplier and expose as much as 90% of species to the dangers of extinction (57).

The bodily harms combined with climate change-forced species destruction, biodiversity loss, and threats to water and food security, as summarized recently (58), motivated us to categorize warming beyond 5 °C as unknown??, implying the possibility of existential threats. Fig. 2 displays these three risk categorizations (vertical dashed lines).

#### 2] Collisions -- Asteroid collisions are inevitable and the Earth is woefully unprepared to address the risk – lack of funding and effort for planetary defense undermines testing efforts

Léa Surugue ’17, Science journalist reporting on health and science, “Massive asteroid collision with Earth is inevitable - and we have never tested the technology to prevent it”, 6/21/17, International Business Times, https://www.ibtimes.co.uk/massive-asteroid-collision-earth-inevitable-we-have-never-tested-technology-prevent-it-1627266

A leading astrophysicist has warned that it is just a matter of time before an asteroid collides with Earth. Alan Fitzsimmons from Queen's University Belfast has said it was not a matter of if but when such a collision would happen. "Asteroids have hit the Earth throughout its history and will continue to do so in the future. The rate at which they hit the planet depends on their size. Asteroids the size of the object that helped kill the dinosaurs are really rare and happen only about every 100 million years," Fitzsimmons told IBTimes UK. "However, asteroids like the one that hit Tunguska in Siberia in 1908 are more common, happening every 200 to 300 years. They are smaller, but they can still cause significant damage." A similar asteroid strike now could potentially destroy an entire city. Although astronomers have made great progress in detecting near-Earth asteroids and understanding the threat posed by them, a number of challenges still remain. How serious is the risk of Earth being struck by an asteroid? Astronomers who research asteroids have a range of sources at their disposal to estimate the impact frequency of asteroids of different sizes. These include studying craters on the Earth and on the moon, historical records as well as satellite data. Here on Earth, we are bombarded by space rocks every day, though most of them don't make it to the ground and burn up when they pass through the atmosphere. For an asteroid to cause damage on the ground, it has to be quite big, at least 20 metres across. The risk of being hit by an object that size or greater is low, because these objects are extremely rare, and would probably not make it in one piece to the surface. "I think it is common to think of an impacting asteroid as a very large object, but impacts by large asteroids are very rare because large asteroids themselves are relatively rare. It is many times more likely that the Earth is hit by an asteroid that is relatively small than by an asteroid that is relatively large because small asteroids are many times more numerous. Indeed, the Earth is hit by very small objects every day", Hugh Lewis, Senior Lecturer in Aerospace Engineering at the University of Southampton, told IBTimes UK. "Impacts on the Earth by objects that are about 10 kg in mass occur about once every day, but impacts by objects that are 1,000 kg occur probably 10 times a year. It is very unlikely that objects of this size would reach the Earth's surface and we'd see them as a bright shooting star or fireball, technically known as bolides." The larger objects that do make it through to the surface occasionally can be quite damaging. Perhaps the most recent example of this is the 2013 Chelyabinsk bolide, approximately 20-metre near-Earth asteroid that entered Earth's atmosphere over Russia on 15 February 2013. "Even if they don't make it to the surface in one piece, these are the kind of objects that can cause damage. About 1,500 people were injured, mostly by the shockwaves of the object entering the atmosphere," Fitzsimmons said. A research paper published by Lewis and colleagues backed up this idea that an asteroid does not have touch the surface to be damaging to humans. In a research paper, the scientists showed that the consequences of an airburst (where the asteroid explodes in the atmosphere) are significant. How are near-Earth asteroids monitored? Telescopes are used around the world to survey the sky every night to look for Near-Earth asteroids. Once one is identified, it is monitored for a few days until astronomers can calculate its orbit around the Sun - and thus assess whether it will come close to Earth in the future. "Essentially, we are watching it move along a small arc of its orbit, so we can extrapolate from this arc to the full orbit – it won't be a perfect prediction of the orbit, however. Once we have an estimate of the orbit we can propagate it forwards in time to see if the orbit crosses the Earth's orbit. Again, there will be uncertainty in how the asteroid orbit will evolve over time. Because of the uncertainty in our knowledge of the orbit, scientists can only provide a probability of an impact," Lewis explained. The problem is that while scientists know a lot about the Earth-threatening large asteroid population (those larger than 1 km across), their knowledge is much more limited when it comes to smaller asteroids - in particular those asteroids that are smaller than 100m across. "As a result, we can only make impact predictions for asteroids that we have observed, but the most likely scenario is that the Earth is hit by an asteroid that we haven't observed, because it is small, and because small asteroids are much more numerous than large asteroids," Lewis added. "The most worrying event for me was the Chelyabinsk bolide in February 2013 because it was an example of the most likely asteroid-impact scenario: an asteroid we had not detected in advance. In addition, the estimates of the size of the asteroid (17-20 m across) put it into a category that we would arguably have said would cause no damage on the ground. Nevertheless, there were damage and injuries as a result." Space agencies like NASA regularly update the list of known asteroids that may be likely to hit the Earth. What can be done against threatening asteroids? "When we study an asteroid and find there is a significant chance it going to hit Earth in the next 100 years or so, the idea will be to try to change its orbit. Scientists have developed technologies to do so, but to know whether they work or not they will have to be tested," Fitzsimmons said. One of the methods modelled by scientists is known as the 'Kinetic impactor', which would involve sending a large high-speed spacecraft in the path of an approaching asteroid in an attempt to change its path. The other possible method is known as 'gravity tractor' would involve diverting the asteroid using the gravity of a large spacecraft. Although a lot of space agencies have worked on this subject, these methods have never been tested due to a lack of funding.

#### Empirics prove that efforts to mitigate deaths from asteroid collisions is effective – efforts to defend the planet significantly reduce death-by-collision risk

Clemens M. Rumpf ’19, University of Southampton, “Chapter 12 Asteroid Impact Risk Assessment: Rationalizing the Threat”, 2019, Planetary Defense, Space and Society, <https://dl1.cuni.cz/pluginfile.php/634091/mod_resource/content/1/Planetary%20Defence.pdf> \*tables inserted at the end of the card

A major advantage of expressing the asteroid impact hazard in terms of the average annual casualty rates is that the asteroid hazard becomes comparable to other hazards. However, it should be noted early on that the nature of the asteroid hazard differs significantly from the other hazards listed below, insofar as it is generally a very low frequency, yet large consequence event. The statistics about annual asteroid casualties are driven by rare events that might be separated by thousands of years but that may produce significantly higher casualty numbers than the other more common hazards. It is important to keep the low frequency, large consequence nature of the asteroid impact hazard in mind when drawing conclusions from risk comparisons. Before the Spaceguard Survey took effect, the chance of dying from select causes in the USA, including the asteroid impact hazard, was quantified in (Chapman and Morrison 1994) with data from 1994; these numbers are reproduced in Table 12.1. Based on these results, an individual from the United States population has an equal chance of dying from a passenger aircraft accident or from an asteroid impact, based on estimates over long periods of time (meaning that no impact might occur in any given lifespan). Tables 12.1 and 12.2 clearly illustrate the benefit provided by increased asteroid discovery rates. The effect of Spaceguard becomes apparent when data from Table 12.1 is compared with risk estimates after Spaceguard took effect, based on data available in 2008. The chance of dying from an asteroid impact was significantly reduced from 1 in 20,000 before Spaceguard to 1 in 720,000 after Spaceguard, as one could exclude the possibility of most of the larger objects impacting the Earth in the predictable future. In other words, while previously, the fatal asteroid impact risk would have been ranked as comparable to an airplane crash, it was reduced to a similar level as that of a fireworks accident. It should also be mentioned that the differences in risk numbers are not exclusively due to the effect of the Spaceguard Survey but are also due to updated impact consequence estimates and a general change in the external situation (e.g. population size).

TABLE 12.1

## Economy DA

#### The private sector in space is growing and investors have poured hundreds of millions into the industry based on projected growth – the aff reverses that and crashes investment

Davenport 21 – covers NASA and the space industry for The Washington Post's Financial desk. He joined The Post in 2000 and has a bachelors degree from Colby College. [Christian, “Investors are placing big bets on a growing space economy. But can they reach orbit?”, Washington Post, 9/05/21, [https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/09/05/space-finance-bubble-investors/]//AV](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/09/05/space-finance-bubble-investors/%5d//AV)

Space is hot. The billionaire “space barons” — Elon Musk, Jeff Bezos and Richard Branson — [have given the industry a cachet](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2020/11/11/nasa-spacex-crew1-launch-space-station/?itid=lk_inline_manual_3) not seen since the Apollo era of the 1960s and ’70s, with Branson and Bezos flying to the edge of space on their own spacecraft and Musk’s SpaceX becoming the dominant supplier of people and cargo to the International Space Station. Investors are fearful of missing out. That’s turned out to be great news for the space companies hoping to get a piece of the satellite-launch business. But it’s also caused analysts to warn that space is still a nascent and risky business, one rocket explosion away from disaster. Hundreds of millions of dollars are now flowing to an industry long viewed as too risky for serious investment. New start-ups are blossoming in an explosion reminiscent of the early days of tech, when money poured into Silicon Valley start-ups at the beginning of the Internet age. Gen. John “Jay” Raymond, the chief of space operations for the U.S. Space Force, even predicted during a recent speech that investment in the commercial space sector would drive “a second Golden Age of space.” Over the past decade, investors pumped $200 billion into 1,500 space companies around the world, according to an analysis done by [Space Capital, a space investment firm](https://www.spacecapital.com/). Investment in start-up space companies reached $7.6 billion last year, a 16 percent increase from 2019, [according to Bryce Space and Technology](https://brycetech.com/download.php?f=Bryce_Start_Up_Space_2021.pdf), a consulting firm. “This level of investment is consistent with the 6-year trend beginning in 2015 of unprecedented levels of venture capital driven investment flowing into the space industry,” the company said. That has helped drive a $447 billion global space economy that grew 4.4 percent last year, [according to the Space Foundation](https://spacefoundation.org/), an advocacy group. Over the past 10 years, the space economy has grown 55 percent, according to the Foundation, which said the commercial space products and services market is valued at $219 billion. In addition to those investments, several space ventures have gone public over the past year through special purpose acquisition companies, or SPACs. Branson’s Virgin Galactic space tourism company [was one of the first high-profile space ventures](https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2019/07/09/virgin-galactic-announces-plans-become-first-publicly-listed-space-company/?itid=lk_inline_manual_16) to go public through a SPAC when it merged with a New York hedge fund in 2019. Since then, SPACs have “exploded in popularity,” [according to a report by analysts at Avascent and Jefferies](https://www.avascent.com/news-insights/avascent-apogee/space-spacs-valuation-in-zero-g/), a financial advisory firm specializing in aerospace, which found that the mergers across all industries raised $83 billion in 2020 compared to $14 billion the year before. But the stocks can be volatile. In the last couple of weeks, for example, the stocks of two space companies took hits when they suffered problems. Shares of Virgin Galactic dipped after the Federal Aviation Administration said it was investigating the company after its flight, with Branson on board, went off course. The probe was first reported by the [New Yorker](https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/the-red-warning-light-on-richard-bransons-space-flight). Astra, a start-up rocket company based outside of San Francisco, saw its stock drop after a launch attempt failed to reach orbit last month. Still, more than a dozen companies have gone public, or announced they would in recent months. They include Planet, which has built a constellation of satellites to take images of the Earth, and Astra. [Rocket Lab, which has launched dozens of small satellites](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/innovations/wp/2017/11/09/ready-to-book-your-satellite-launch-online-the-rocket-industry-looks-to-run-more-like-an-airline/?itid=lk_inline_manual_21) on its Electron rocket, started trading on the Nasdaq last month. And Virgin Orbit, [which “air launches” a rocket](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/01/17/richard-branson-virgin-orbit-launch-success/?itid=lk_inline_manual_21) designed to fly satellites by dropping it from the wing of a 747 airplane, announced that it would go public through a SPAC and that it had raised $100 million in another funding round backed by Boeing and AE Industrial Partners. International companies also are driving growth, analysts said. “Going forward, I would expect to see it becoming increasingly international,” said Nickolas Boensch, a program manager at Bryce. “China, Japan, the U.K. have been huge players here, and there is something attractive to having a domestic capability.”

#### The future of the economy is based on the private-sector driven success of space exploration

Clark 20 – President of U.S. Chamber of Commerce with an MBA from Georgetown University. [Suzanne, “Space is our new economic frontier. The US can’t afford to lose out”, CNN Business, 3/02/20, [https://www.cnn.com/2020/03/02/perspectives/space-economic-frontier/index.html]//AV](https://www.cnn.com/2020/03/02/perspectives/space-economic-frontier/index.html%5d//AV)

President Trump's budget, which was released last month, outlines several moonshots that are unlikely to pass a divided Congress. But there's one in particular that both Republicans and Democrats should support wholeheartedly: the $25.2 billion request to fund NASA, a 12% boost [over the prior year](https://www.cnn.com/2020/02/10/tech/nasa-budget-moon-landing-artemis-scn/index.html). The future of our economy depends on the vigorous pursuit of space exploration. And with NASA leading the way, the potential for growth — like space itself — has no limits. Since NASA's launch, American space exploration has always been a bipartisan venture. It was President Kennedy who announced our goal of going to the moon, but it was President Nixon who brought that goal to fruition. Reaching the next milestone in interplanetary travel requires a commitment from our leaders that spans political parties and administrations. And with a new space race getting underway — one that could prove even more consequential than the last — NASA needs bipartisan support from Congress today more than ever. Space is the most promising industry to arise since the birth of the tech sector, with growth projected to skyrocket in the coming years led by companies such as Boeing and Northrop Grumman, and new entrants, such as Virgin Galactic, SpaceX and Blue Origin. [According to US Chamber of Commerce economists](https://www.uschamber.com/series/above-the-fold/the-space-economy-industry-takes), the industry will be worth at least $1.5 trillion by 2040. While no one can fully grasp what our economy will look like 20 years from now, one thing is certain: the private sector space industry will transform how societies across the globe live, communicate and do business. In fact, it already has. Nearly every company depends on space-enabled technologies for day-to-day operations — whether they use satellite communications, remote sensing or location-based services. Businesses across multiple sectors are leveraging these and other technologies to stake their claim in this new economic frontier. Pharmaceutical companies such as Merck and Sanofi, for example, are conducting experiments in low-Earth orbit [aboard the International Space Station](https://www.issnationallab.org/research-on-the-iss/areas-of-research/life-sciences/) to evaluate the potential advantages of microgravity in developing new drug treatments that will help people live longer, healthier lives. Companies, such as Bigelow, are committed to making [off-Earth habitation](https://www.cnn.com/2016/05/05/tech/way-up-there-where-will-we-live-space/index.html) a reality. Even retailers are getting in on the action, with companies like Target [funding research](https://www.iss-casis.org/cottonsustainabilitychallenge/) on the International Space Station to produce more sustainable forms of cotton. Lunar colonies, asteroid mining and interplanetary travel — once the stuff of science fiction — could become a reality. But for any of that to happen, we need sustained and meaningful action from members of Congress. They can start by meeting the president's request for NASA funding. Included in the White House budget is [$12.4 billion](https://www.cnn.com/2020/02/10/tech/nasa-budget-moon-landing-artemis-scn/index.html) specifically for lunar exploration that would include landing systems, continued development of the Space Launch System (SLS) and the Orion crew module. These spacecraft will allow us to shuttle people and equipment to the moon and back. They will take us not only beyond Earth's orbit but also into the next phase of commercial space development. Most importantly, they will ensure that the United States continues to outpace competitors like China and Russia in the space race. Our country must be the vanguard in exploring these new economic frontiers. Planting the American flag in the private sector space industry will help create the jobs of the future and allow the United States to lead the formation of best practices that will govern the industry for decades to come. Some might ask if returning to the moon is worth the expense. The answer is undeniably yes. Providing NASA with the resources it needs to succeed is a small investment that will yield tremendous dividends over time. To start, it would help secure American commercial dominance in a fast-growing industry. It also would be a catalyst for innovation and scientific discovery, with salutary effects that would benefit the entire economy.

#### Specifically, The space industry and its private sector are key to the economy

Ovadia 21 – contributing writer for The Jerusalem Post and CTech, and has also written for Israel Hayom. From Colorado, she holds a bachelor's degree in biology and political science and a master's degree in international relations and strategic studies from Bar-Ilan University. [Yafit, “Space will be the dominant economy in the next 20 or 30 years”, CTech, 1/29/21, [https://www.calcalistech.com/ctech/articles/0,7340,L-3890291,00.html]//AV](https://www.calcalistech.com/ctech/articles/0,7340,L-3890291,00.html%5d//AV)

Israel should look to the booming U.S. aerospace industry as a model. Shelli Brunswick, COO of the Space Foundation, an educational and business institution based out of Colorado Springs, also discussed her thoughts of how Israel can look to the booming U.S. aerospace industry, which combines both commercial and government aspects working together in harmony as a model to emulate. “We’re seeing the pendulum swing from government to partially-government controlled to commercial, such as the decision to send Eytan Stibbe to the ISS, which will be the first entirely commercial spaceflight by Axiom Space.” “Many people don’t realize that the technologies we’ve used for space are also currently used for healthcare and pharmaceutical developments as well as telemedicine, telecommunications, precision agriculture, broadband, animal tracking, and weather predictions,” she added. “Spacetech is creating economic development and opportunities for workforce development as well as jobs that people will fill. When you think about startup incubators and accelerators, they help unlock that technology and help bring entry-level technology into the market.” Brunswick was a space programming engineer and worked on a wide variety of launch ranges, including aboard vehicles, satellites, and payloads. She was stationed at the Space and Missiles System Center as part of the U.S. Air Force in LA and afterward served as a professor in the military, and later served as a liaison to the U.S. Congress articulating Air Force budget needs. “There are a lot of opportunities in Colorado to nurture that growing economy in space tech and cybersecurity, which unlocks jobs and draws more startups here.” She noted large corporations such as Northmann Grumman which builds space assets and has satellite service capabilities, giants like Lockheed Martin, Ball Aerospace, Raytheon Technologies, and Sierra Nevada Corp. as well as smaller companies such as Blue Canyon, Astroscale U.S., and York Space Systems. Strong local engineering schools such as the University of Colorado Boulder and the presence of the U.S. Space Force in Colorado have also encouraged growth as well as supply chains to develop aerospace parts that are located in more remote areas and work in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Commerce. “Space will be the dominant economy in the next 20 or 30 years, it will grow from $424 billion to $1-$3 trillion according to predictions by Bank of America,” she said. “Having the Space Force is a good model for other countries to look at since it provides a foundation for how the military and commercial branches can partner.” While the U.S. has the base to preserve national security interests, she noted why that protection is crucial and serves as the first line of defense against cyberattacks on local infrastructure such as power grids, food banks, and financial systems. Investors are interested in space tech for the sake of research. Graham Lau, an astrobiologist and Director of Communications and Marketing at the Blue Marble Space Institute of Science, a nonprofit based in Seattle, Washington and dedicated to conducting research that can preserve the human species, and help the next generation of scientists break into the sector provided logical reasons why people should consider investing in space tech. “The most popular gripe I hear is why should people choose to invest in space but not on Earth. It’s really ironic since the ways that space exploration benefits us are myriad. If we can figure out how humans can grow food on Mars, perhaps we can put an end to world hunger on Earth,” he said, from one of the branches in Longmont, Colorado. “Astrobiology is essentially the quest to understand life. It gets us asking questions such as what is life? Why are we here? Are we alone out there? And these are some of the most long-standing questions that have been around since the earliest records of civilizations.” “I think that the number of government space agencies around the world is growing but what's growing even faster is the number of tech companies getting involved in space, bringing us back to Eytan’s mission. Space is open for business,” he said. “There’s a lot of return on investments in space. It’s not just customers who want products, there’s a growing number of companies, such as Axiom, who are getting invested in human space missions. Maybe in the future instead of seeing government organizations sending missions to Mars, we might see private companies doing so. There are investors who are willing to put time and money into their questions whether there is life on other planetary bodies without any promise of any returns besides for knowledge.” A reciprocal relationship Lastly, in a panel held by the Ministry of Science and Technology, Stibbe discussed how the reciprocal relationship between the public and private sector can create a positive impact on the spacetech ecosystem. “It’s a natural evolution of a sector, similar to water, energy, or civilian aviation and telecommunications - they all started from governments heavily-investing in those areas. Gradually the private sector got involved, first as subcontractors, then as suppliers, and then actually took over, made the investment, and supplied their products directly to the public. Innovation is about trial and error. I think the private sector has a larger capacity to absorb loss and failure, which is very similar to venture capitalists. They have a portfolio, and they take some lower-risk investments as well as some higher-risked ones. They know that they will not necessarily succeed in all their endeavors, which is more of a commercial mindset than the public sector.”

#### Econ decline results in nuclear war.

Tønnesson 15 [Tønnesson is a research professor at the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) in Norway and the leader of the East Asia Peace program at Uppsala University in Sweden.] “Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace.” International Area Studies Review, volume 18, number 3, pgs. 297-311. 2015.

Several recent works on China and Sino–US relations have made substantial contributions to the current understanding of how and under what circumstances a combination of nuclear deterrence and economic interdependence may reduce the risk of war between major powers. At least four conclusions can be drawn from the review above: first, those who say that interdependence may both inhibit and drive conflict are right. Interdependence raises the cost of conflict for all sides but asymmetrical or unbalanced dependencies and negative trade expectations may generate tensions leading to trade wars among inter-dependent states that in turn increase the risk of military conflict (Copeland, 2015: 1, 14, 437; Roach, 2014). The risk may increase if one of the interdependent countries is governed by an inward-looking socio-economic coalition (Solingen, 2015); second, the risk of war between China and the US should not just be analysed bilaterally but include their allies and partners. Third party countries could drag China or the US into confrontation; third, in this context it is of some comfort that the three main economic powers in Northeast Asia (China, Japan and South Korea) are all deeply integrated economically through production networks within a global system of trade and finance (Ravenhill, 2014; Yoshimatsu, 2014: 576); and fourth, decisions for war and peace are taken by very few people, who act on the basis of their future expectations. International relations theory must be supplemented by foreign policy analysis in order to assess the value attributed by national decision-makers to economic development and their assessments of risks and opportunities. If leaders on either side of the Atlantic begin to seriously fear or anticipate their own nation’s decline then they may blame this on external dependence, appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, contemplate the use of force to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately refuse to be deterred by either nuclear arms or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. Such a dangerous shift could happen abruptly, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party. Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. The greatest risk is not that a territorial dispute leads to war under present circumstances but that changes in the world economy alter those circumstances in ways that render inter-state peace more precarious. If China and the US fail to rebalance their financial and trading relations (Roach, 2014) then a trade war could result, interrupting transnational production networks, provoking social distress, and exacerbating nationalist emotions. This could have unforeseen consequences in the field of security, with nuclear deterrence remaining the only factor to protect the world from Armageddon, and unreliably so. Deterrence could lose its credibility: one of the two great powers might gamble that the other yield in a cyber-war or conventional limited war, or third party countries might engage in conflict with each other, with a view to obliging Washington or Beijing to intervene.

## Innovation DA

#### Cross-apply the smith ev we read on the exploration da – it proves innovation is happening in the private sector

#### A Strong private space industry catalyzes tech innovation – progress at the margins and spinoff tech change global information networks.

**Hampson 17** [Joshua Hampson, 1-27-2017, "The Future of Space Commercialization," Niskanen Center, <https://www.niskanencenter.org/wp-content/uploads/old_uploads/2017/01/TheFutureofSpaceCommercializationFinal.pdf>]//DDPT

Innovation is generally hard to predict; some new technologies seem to come out of nowhere and others only take off when paired with a new application. It is difficult to predict the future, but it is reasonable to expect that a growing space economy would open opportunities for technological and organizational innovation.

In terms of technology, the difficult environment of outer space helps incentivize progress along the margins. Because each object launched into orbit costs a significant amount of money—at the moment between $27,000 and $43,000 per pound, though that will likely drop in the future —each 19 reduction in payload size saves money or means more can be launched. At the same time, the ability to fit more capability into a smaller satellite opens outer space to actors that previously were priced out of the market. This is one of the reasons why small, affordable satellites are increasingly pursued by companies or organizations that cannot afford to launch larger traditional satellites. These small 20 satellites also provide non-traditional launchers, such as engineering students or prototypers, the opportunity to learn about satellite production and test new technologies before working on a full-sized satellite. That expansion of developers, experimenters, and testers cannot but help increase innovation opportunities.

Technological developments from outer space have been applied to terrestrial life since the earliest days of space exploration. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) maintains a website that lists technologies that have spun off from such research projects. Lightweight 21 nanotubes, useful in protecting astronauts during space exploration, are now being tested for applications in emergency response gear and electrical insulation. The need for certainty about the resiliency of materials used in space led to the development of an analytics tool useful across a range of industries. Temper foam, the material used in memory-foam pillows, was developed for NASA for seat covers. As more companies pursue their own space goals, more innovations will likely come from the commercial sector.

Outer space is not just a catalyst for technological development. Satellite constellations and their unique line-of-sight vantage point can provide new perspectives to old industries. Deploying satellites into low-Earth orbit, as Facebook wants to do, can connect large, previously-unreached swathes of 22 humanity to the Internet. Remote sensing technology could change how whole industries operate, such as crop monitoring, herd management, crisis response, and land evaluation, among others. 23 While satellites cannot provide all essential information for some of these industries, they can fill in some useful gaps and work as part of a wider system of tools. Space infrastructure, in helping to change how people connect and perceive Earth, could help spark innovations on the ground as well. These innovations, changes to global networks, and new opportunities could lead to wider economic growth.

#### Tech innovation solves every existential threat – cumulative extinction events outweigh the aff

**Matthews 18** [Dylan Matthews, 10-26-2018, "How to help people millions of years from now," Vox, <https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/26/18023366/far-future-effective-altruism-existential-risk-doing-good>]

If you care about improving human lives, you should overwhelmingly care about those quadrillions of lives rather than the comparatively small number of people alive today. The 7.6 billion people now living, after all, amount to less than 0.003 percent of the population that will live in the future. It’s reasonable to suggest that those quadrillions of future people have, accordingly, hundreds of thousands of times more moral weight than those of us living here today do.

That’s the basic argument behind Nick Beckstead’s 2013 Rutgers philosophy dissertation, “[On the overwhelming importance of shaping the far future](https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=sites&srcid=ZGVmYXVsdGRvbWFpbnxuYmVja3N0ZWFkfGd4OjExNDBjZTcwNjMxMzRmZGE).” It’s a glorious mindfuck of a thesis, not least because Beckstead shows very convincingly that this is a conclusion any plausible moral view would reach. It’s not just something that [weird utilitarians](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/consequentialism/) have to deal with.

And Beckstead, to his considerable credit, walks the walk on this. He works at the Open Philanthropy Project on grants relating to the far future and runs a [charitable fund](https://app.effectivealtruism.org/funds/far-future) for donors who want to prioritize the far future. And arguments from him and others have turned “long-termism” into a very vibrant, important strand of the effective altruism community.

But what does prioritizing the far future even mean?

The most literal thing it could mean is preventing human extinction, to ensure that the species persists as long as possible. For the long-term-focused effective altruists I know, that typically means identifying concrete threats to humanity’s continued existence — like unfriendly artificial intelligence, or a [pandemic](https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/15/17948062/pandemic-flu-ebola-h1n1-outbreak-infectious-disease), or global warming/out of control geoengineering — and engaging in activities to prevent that specific eventuality.

But in a [set of slides](https://intelligence.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Beckstead-Evaluating-Options-Using-Far-Future-Standards.pdf) he made in 2013, Beckstead makes a compelling case that while that’s certainly part of what caring about the far future entails, approaches that address specific threats to humanity (which he calls “targeted” approaches to the far future) have to complement “broad” approaches, where instead of trying to predict what’s going to kill us all, you just generally try to keep civilization running as best it can, so that it is, as a whole, well-equipped to deal with potential extinction events in the future, not just in 2030 or 2040 but in 3500 or 95000 or even 37 million.

In other words, caring about the far future doesn’t mean just paying attention to low-probability risks of total annihilation; it also means acting on pressing needs now.

For example: We’re going to be better prepared to prevent extinction from AI or a supervirus or global warming if society as a whole makes a lot of scientific progress. And a significant bottleneck there is that the vast majority of humanity doesn’t get high-enough-quality education to engage in scientific research, if they want to, which reduces the odds that we have enough trained scientists to come up with the breakthroughs we need as a civilization to survive and thrive.

So maybe one of the best things we can do for the far future is to improve school systems — here and now — to harness the group economist Raj Chetty calls [“lost Einsteins”](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/03/opinion/lost-einsteins-innovation-inequality.html) (potential innovators who are thwarted by poverty and inequality in rich countries) and, more importantly, the hundreds of millions of kids in developing countries dealing with even worse education systems than those in depressed communities in the rich world.

What if living ethically for the far future means living ethically now?

Beckstead mentions some other broad, or very broad, ideas (these are all his descriptions):

Help make computers faster so that people everywhere can work more efficiently

Change intellectual property law so that technological innovation can happen more quickly

Advocate for open borders so that people from poorly governed countries can move to better-governed countries and be more productive

Meta-research: improve incentives and norms in academic work to better advance human knowledge

Improve education

Advocate for political party X to make future people have values more like political party X

”If you look at these areas (economic growth and technological progress, access to information, individual capability, social coordination, motives) a lot of everyday good works contribute,” Beckstead writes. “An implication of this is that a lot of everyday good works are good from a broad perspective, even though hardly anyone thinks explicitly in terms of far future standards.”

Look at those examples again: It’s just a list of what normal altruistically motivated people, not effective altruism folks, generally do. Charities in the US love talking about the lost opportunities for innovation that poverty creates. Lots of smart people who want to make a difference become scientists, or try to work as teachers or on improving education policy, and lord knows there are plenty of people who become political party operatives out of a conviction that the moral consequences of the party’s platform are good.

All of which is to say: Maybe effective altruists aren’t that special, or at least maybe we don’t have access to that many specific and weird conclusions about how best to help the world. If the far future is what matters, and generally trying to make the world work better is among the best ways to help the far future, then effective altruism just becomes plain ol’ do-goodery.\*