## **fwks**

#### ***[Value] The value is morality.***

#### ***[Standard] The criteria is maximizing expected wellbeing. Prefer:***

#### ***1] Util is intrinsic to us we can’t avoid that maximizing well being is the most moral action.***

**Nagel 86:** Thomas Nagel, The View From Nowhere, HUP, 1986: 156-168.

I shall defend the unsurprising claim that sensory pleasure is good and pain bad, no matter whose they are. The point of the exercise is to see how the pressures of objectification operate in a simple case. Physical pleasure and pain do not usually depend on activities or desires which themselves raise questions of justification and value. They are just sensory experiences in relation to which we are fairly passive, but toward which we feel involuntary desire or aversion. Almost [E]veryone takes the avoidance of his {their} own pain and the promotion of his own pleasure as subjective reasons for action in a fairly simple way; they are not back[ed] up by any further reasons.

#### ***2] Reducing existential risks is the top priority in any coherent moral theory***

**Pummer 15**

(Theron, Philosophy @St. Andrews <http://blog.practicalethics.ox.ac.uk/2015/05/moral-agreement-on-saving-the-world/>)

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, **whatever** general **moral view we adopt**: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous **catastrophe**, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try **to save the world.** According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only.  **But that is a huge mistake**. Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; **it is not the view that the latter don’t matter**. Even John **Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account** in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” **Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view**. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risks, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that **most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations** of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. **We should also take into account moral uncertainty.** What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) **who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken,** and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), **they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk**. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, **reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world**. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

## **contention 1: asteroid mining**

#### *Private entities are key to asteroid mining and fulfilling demand for rare earth elements*

**Britt 21** (Hugo Britt, August 19, 2021, Companies Are Preparing for Space Mining, <https://www.thomasnet.com/insights/companies-are-preparing-for-space-mining/>) SJ

Rare Earth Materials Are Abundant. There are around two million near-earth asteroids brimming with rare earth minerals, precious metals, iron, and nickel. The Moon contains helium-3, yttrium, samarium, and lanthanum, while Mars contains an abundance of magnesium, aluminum, titanium, iron, chromium, and trace amounts of lithium, cobalt, tungsten, and other metals. Importantly, many planetary bodies contain water, which through hydrolysis can be used as rocket fuel. It Helps with Sustainability Earth’s resources are finite. [Non-renewable metal resources are inherently unsustainable](https://www.nature.com/articles/s43247-020-0011-0), and mining causes environmental degradation all over the world. The answer is to source our minerals off-world. Off-world minerals are exhaustible as well, but the argument is that mining lifeless rocks such as the Moon or asteroids is infinitely preferable to continuing to damage Earth’s fragile biosphere. Discoveries May Be Made Opening space to commercial mining does not mean that science takes a back seat. Space-mining interests could drive scientific advancement by discovering extremely rare or unknown minerals on other planetary bodies. Robotics Would Do the Work While countless lives have been lost on Earth over the centuries due to mining accidents and disasters, it is likely that humans will not have to risk their lives by traveling in-person to off-world mining sites. [Regolith-sampling probes](https://www.thomasnet.com/insights/nasa-uses-pogo-stick-probe-to-retrieve-sample-from-asteroid-that-may-one-day-hit-earth/) are already in use and provide an early glimpse of what a scaled-up robotic mining craft may one day look like. Off-Earth Mining and Space Law The [1967 Outer Space Treaty](https://www.thomasnet.com/insights/is-the-outer-space-treaty-outdated/) is unclear in terms of whether any country — or private company — can claim mineral rights in space. It states that “exploration and use of outer space shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries and shall be the province of all mankind.” The [1979 Moon Treaty](https://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/spacelaw/treaties/moon-agreement.html) was an attempt to declare the Moon and its natural resources to be CHM (Common Heritage of Mankind). Significantly, it called for “an equitable sharing [by all countries] in the benefits derived from these resources.” Most nations, including the U.S., did not ratify this treaty. Recently, the U.S. has accelerated its efforts to create a legal framework for the exploitation of resources in space. The Obama administration signed the [U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act of 2015](https://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/ast/media/US-Commercial-Space-Launch-Competitiveness-Act-2015.pdf), allowing U.S. citizens to “engage in the commercial exploration and exploitation of space resources.” In April 2020, the Trump administration issued an [executive order](https://www.space.com/trump-moon-mining-space-resources-executive-order.html) supporting U.S. mining on the Moon and asteroids. In May 2020, NASA unveiled the [Artemis Accords](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2020/05/15/moon-rules-nasa-artemis/), which included the development of safety zones around lunar mining sites. Former NASA administrator Jim Bridenstine said: “It’s time to establish the regulatory certainty to extract and trade space resources,” and clarified in a separate statement that: “We do believe we can extract and utilize the resources of the moon, just as we can extract and utilize tuna from the ocean.” NASA planned an [Asteroid Redirect Mission](https://www.nasa.gov/content/what-is-nasa-s-asteroid-redirect-mission) which involved collecting a multi-ton boulder from an asteroid and redirecting it into a stable orbit around the moon, but the mission was canceled in 2017. What Companies Are Preparing for a Future of Space Mining? One thing that is becoming clear is that off-earth mining is unlikely to be a state-run activity. Instead, several private companies are jockeying to be first in line to access minerals in space. [iSpace](https://ispace-inc.com/) (Japan) has a mission to “help companies access new business opportunities on the moon,” including the extraction of water and mineral resources to spearhead a space-based economy. Planetary Resources (defunct) was founded in 2009 with the goal of developing a robotic asteroid mining industry. Despite having high-profile founding investors including Alphabet’s Larry Page, Eric Schmidt, and Virgin Group founder Richard Branson, Planetary ran into financial trouble in 2018 and was gone by 2020. Deep Space Industries (defunct) was another early mover that intended to explore, examine, sample, and harvest minerals from asteroids. DSI was acquired by Bradford Space in 2019. [Offworld](https://www.offworld.ai/) is an AI company building “universal industrial robots to do the heavy lifting [including mining] on Earth, the Moon, asteroids, and Mars.” [The Asteroid Mining Corporation](https://asteroidminingcorporation.co.uk/) (UK) is a venture currently crowdfunding for a 2023 satellite mission called “El Dorado,” which will conduct a spectral survey of 5,000 asteroids to identify the most valuable for mining. Alongside the U.S., the tiny European nation of Luxembourg has also developed a space mining framework and has subsequently [emerged as a European hub](https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20201118005699/en/) for the fledgling industry.

#### *Space mining releases less emissions than Earth-based mining by a LOT*

**Emerging Technology 18**, 10-19-2018, "Asteroid mining might actually be better for the environment," MIT Technology Review, <https://www.technologyreview.com/2018/10/19/139664/asteroid-mining-might-actually-be-better-for-the-environment/>]//pranav

But profit margins are only part of the picture. A potentially more significant aspect of these missions is the impact they will have on Earth’s environment. But nobody has assessed this environmental impact in detail. Today, that changes thanks to the work of Andreas Hein and colleagues at the University of Paris-Saclay in France. These guys have calculated the greenhouse-gas emissions from asteroid-mining operations and compared them with the emissions from similar Earth-based activities. Their results provide some eyebrow-raising insights into the benefits that asteroid mining might provide. The calculations are relatively straightforward. Rocket launches release significant amounts of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. The fuel on board the first stage of a rocket burns in Earth’s atmosphere to form carbon dioxide. For kerosene-burning rockets, one kilogram of fuel creates three kilograms of CO2. (The second and third stages operate outside the Earth’s atmosphere and so can be ignored.) Reentries are just as damaging. That’s because a significant mass of a re-entering vehicle ablates in the upper atmosphere, producing NOx such as nitrous oxide (N2O), a greenhouse gas that is about 300 times more potent than CO2. By one estimate, the space shuttle released about 20% of its mass in the form of N2O every time it returned to Earth. Hein and co use these numbers to calculate that a kilogram of platinum mined from an asteroid would release some 150 kilograms of CO2 into Earth’s atmosphere. However, economies of scale from large asteroid-mining operations could lower this to about 60 kilograms of CO2 per kilogram of platinum. That needs to be compared with the emission from Earth-based mining. Here, platinum mining generates significant greenhouse gases, mostly from the energy it takes to remove this stuff from the ground. Indeed, the numbers are huge. The mining industry estimates that producing one kilogram of platinum on Earth releases around 40,000 kilograms of carbon dioxide. “The global warming effect of Earth-based mining is several orders of magnitude larger,” say Hein and co. The figures for water are also encouraging. In this case, the authors calculate the greenhouse-gas emissions from an asteroid-mining operation that returns water to anywhere within the moon’s orbit, a so-called cis-lunar orbit. They compare this to the emissions from sending the same volume of water from Earth into orbit. The big difference is that a water-carrying vehicle from Earth can haul only a small percentage of its mass as water. But an asteroid-mining spacecraft can transport a significant multiple of its mass as water to cis-lunar orbit. “Substantial savings in greenhouse gas emissions can be achieved,” say Hein and co. This interesting work should help to focus minds on the environmental impacts of mining, which are rapidly increasing in profile. But it is only a first step. There is significant uncertainty in the numbers here, so these will need to be better understood.

#### *Commercial mining solves adaptation better*

**Pelton 17**—(Director Emeritus of the Space and Advanced Communications Research Institute at George Washington University, PHD in IR from Georgetown). Pelton, Joseph N. 2017. The New Gold Rush: The Riches of Space Beckon! Springer. Accessed 8/30/19.

Are We Humans Doomed to **Extinction**? What will we do when Earth’s resources are used up by humanity? The world is now hugely **over populated**, with billions and billions crammed into our over**crowded** cities. By 2050, we may be 9 billion strong, and by 2100 well over 11 billion people on Planet Earth. Some at the United Nations say we might even be an amazing 12 billion crawling around this small globe. And over 80 % of us will be living in congested cities. These cities will be ever more vulnerable to **terror**ist attack, **natural disaster**, and other plights that come with overcrowding and a dearth of jobs that will be fueled by rapid automation and the rise of artifi cial intelligence across the global economy. We are already rapidly **running out of water** and **minerals**. **Climate change** is threatening our very **existence**. Political leaders and even the Pope have cautioned us against inaction. Perhaps the naysayers are right. **All humanity is at tremendous risk.** Is there no hope for the future? This book is about hope. We think that there is literally heavenly hope for humanity. But we are not talking here about divine intervention. We are envisioning a new space economy that recognizes that there is more water in the skies that all our oceans. Th ere is a new wealth of natural resources and clean energy in the reaches of outer space—more than most of us could ever dream possible. There are those that say why waste money on outer space when we have severe problems here at home? Going into space is not a waste of money. It is our future. It is our hope for new jobs and resources. The great challenge of our times is to reverse public thinking to see space not as a resource drain but as the doorway to opportunity. The new space frontier can literally open up a “gold rush in the skies.” In brief, we think there is new hope for humanity. We see a new a pathway to the future via new ventures in space. For too long, space programs have been seen as a money pit. In the process, we have overlooked the great abundance available to us in the skies above. It is important to recognize there is already the beginning of a new gold rush in space—a pathway to astral abundance. “New Space” is a term increasingly used to describe radical new commercial space initiatives—many of which have come from Silicon Valley and often with backing from the group of entrepreneurs known popularly as the “space billionaires.” New space is revolutionizing the space industry with lower cost space transportation and space systems that represent significant cost savings and new technological breakthroughs. “New Commercial Space” and the “New Space Economy” represent more than a new way of looking at outer space. These new pathways to the stars could prove vital to **human survival**. If one does not believe in spending money to probe the mysteries of the universe then perhaps we can try what might be called “calibrated greed” on for size. One only needs to go to a cubesat workshop, or to Silicon Valley or one of many conferences like the “Disrupt Space” event in Bremen, Germany, held in April 2016 to recognize that entrepreneurial New Space initiatives are changing everything [ 1 ]. In fact, the very nature and dimensions of what outer space activities are today have changed forever. It is no longer your grandfather’s concept of outer space that was once dominated by the big national space agencies. The entrepreneurs are taking over. The hopeful statements in this book and the hard economic and technical data that backs them up are more than a minority opinion. It is a topic of growing interest at the World Economic Forum, where business and political heavyweights meet in Davos, Switzerland, to discuss how to stimulate new patterns of global economic growth. It is even the growing view of a group that call themselves “space ethicists.” Here is how Christopher J. Newman, at the University of Sunderland in the United Kingdom has put it: Space ethicists have offered the view that space exploration is not only desirable; it is a duty that we, as a species, must undertake in order to secure the survival of humanity over the longer term. Expanding both the resource base and, eventually, the habitats available for humanity means that any expenditure on space exploration, far from being viewed as frivolous, can legitimately be rationalized as an ethical investment choice. (Newman) On the other hand there are space ethicists and space exobiologists who argue that humans have created ecological ruin on the planet—and now space debris is starting to pollute space. Th ese countervailing thoughts by the “no growth” camp of space ethicists say we have no right to colonize other planets or to mine the Moon and asteroids—or at least no right to do so until we can prove we can sustain life here on Earth for the longer term. However, for most who are planning for the new space economy the opinion of space philosophers doesn’t really fl oat their boat. Legislators, bankers, and aspiring space entrepreneurs are far more interested in the views of the super-rich capitalists called the space billionaires. A number of these billionaires and space executives have already put some very serious money into enterprises intent on creating a new pathway to the stars. No less than five billionaires with established space ventures—Elon Musk, Paul Allen, Jeff Bezos, Sir Richard Branson, and Robert Bigelow—have invested millions if not billions of dollars into commercializing space. They are developing **new tech**nologies and establishing space enterprises that can bring the wealth of outer space down to Earth. This is not a pipe dream, but will increasingly be the **economic reality** of the 2020s. These wealthy space entrepreneurs see major new economic opportunities. To them space represents the last great frontier for enterprising pioneers. Th us they see an ever-expanding space frontier that offers opportunities in low-cost space transportation, satellite solar power satellites to produce clean energy 24h a day, space mining, space manufacturing and production, and eventually space habitats and colonies as a trajectory to a better human future. Some even more visionary thinkers envision the possibility of terraforming Mars, or creating new structures in space to protect our planet from cosmic hazards and even raising Earth’s orbit to escape the rising heat levels of the Sun in millennia to come. **Some**, of course, will say this is **sci-fi hogwash**. It can’t be done. We say that this is what people would have said in 1900 about air**planes**, rocket ships, cell phones and nuclear devices. The skeptics **laughed** at **Columbus** and his plan to sail across the oceans to discover new worlds. When Thomas Jefferson bought the Louisiana Purchase from France or Seward bought Alaska, there were plenty of naysayers that said such investment in the unknown was an extravagant waste of money. A healthy skepticism is useful and can play a role in economic and business success. Before one dismisses the idea of an impending major new space economy and a new gold rush, it might useful to see what has already transpired in space development in just the past five decades. The world’s first geosynchronous communications satellite had a throughput capability of about 500 kb / s. In contrast, today’s state of the art Viasat 2 —a half century later— has an impressive throughput of some 140 Gb/s. Th is means that the relative throughput is nearly 300,000 greater, while its lifetime is some ten times longer (Figs. 1.1 and 1.2 ). Each new generation of communications satellite has had more power, better antenna systems, improved pointing and stabilization, and an extended lifetime. And the capabilities represented by remote sensing satellites , meteorological satellites , and navigation and timing satellites have also expanded their capabilities and performance in an impressive manner. When satellite applications first started, the market was measured in millions of dollars. Today commercial satellite services exceed a quarter of a billion dollars. Vital services such as the Internet, aircraft traffi c control and management, international banking, search and rescue and much, much more depend on application satellites. Th ose that would doubt the importance of satellites to the global economy might wish to view on You Tube the video “If Th ere Were a Day Without Satellites?” [ 2 ]. Let’s check in on what some of those very rich and smart guys think about the new space economy and its potential. (We are sorry to say that so far there are no female space billionaires, but surely this, too, will come someday soon.) Of course this twenty-fi rst century breakthrough that we call the New Space economy will not come just from new space commerce. It will also come from the amazing new technologies here on Earth. Vital new terrestrial technologies will accompany this cosmic journey into tomorrow. Information technology, robotics, **a**rtificial **i**ntelligence and commercial space travel systems have now set us on a course to allow us humans to harvest the amazing riches in the skies—new natural resources, new energy, and even totally new ways of looking at the **purpose of human existence**. If we pursue this course steadfastly, it can be the beginning of a New Space renaissance. But if we don’t seek to realize our **ultimate destiny** in space, Homo sapiens can end up in the **dustbin of history**—just like literally **millions of already failed species**. In each and every one of the five mass extinction events that have occurred over the last 1.5 billion years on Earth, some 50–80 % of all species have gone the way of the **T. Rex**, the **woolly mammoth**, and the **Dodo bird** along with extinct **ferns**, **grasses** and **cacti**. On the other hand, the best days of the human race could be just beginning. If we are smart about how we go about discovering and using these riches in the skies and applying the best of our new technologies, it could be the start of a new beginning for humanity. Konstantin Tsiokovsky, the Russian astronautics pioneer, who fi rst conceived of practical designs for spaceships, famously said: “A planet is the cradle of mankind, but one cannot live in a cradle forever.” Well before Tsiokovsky another genius, Leonardo da Vinci, said, quite poetically: “Once you have tasted flight, you will forever walk the earth with your eyes turned skyward, for there you have been, and there you will always long to return.” The founder of the X-Prize and of Planetary Resources, Inc., Dr. Peter Diamandis, has much more brashly said much the same thing in quite diff erent words when he said: “The meek shall inherit the Earth. The rest of us will go to Mars.” The New Space Billionaires Peter Diamandis is not alone in his thinking. From the list of “visionaries” quoted earlier, Elon Musk, the founder of SpaceX; Sir Richard Branson, the founder of Virgin Galactic; and Paul Allen, the co-founder of Microsoft and the man who financed SpaceShipOne, the world’s first successful spaceplane have all said the future will include a vibrant new space economy. Th ey, and others, have said that we can, we should and we soon shall go into space and realize the bounty that it can offer to us. Th e New Space enterprise is today indeed being led by those so-called space billionaires , who have an exciting vision of the future. They and others in the commercial space economy believe that the exploitation of outer space may open up a new golden age of astral abundance. They see outer space as a new frontier that can be a great source of new materials, energy and various forms of new wealth that might even save us from excesses of the past. Th is gold rush in the skies represents a new beginning. We are not talking about expensive new space ventures funded by NASA or other space agencies in Europe, Japan, China or India. No, these eff orts which we and others call New Space are today being forged by imaginative and resourceful commercial entrepreneurs. Th ese twenty-fi rst century visionaries have the fortitude and zeal to look to the abundance above. New breakthroughs in technology and New Space enterprises may be able to create an “astral life raft” for humanity. Just as Columbus and the Vikings had the imaginative drive that led them to discover the riches of a new world, we now have a cadre of space billionaires that are now leading us into this New Space era of tomorrow. These **bold leaders**, such as **Paul Allen** and Sir **Richard Branson**, plus other space entrepreneurs including **Jeff Bezos of Amazon** and **Blue Origin**, and **Robert Bigelow**, Chairman of Budget Suites and Bigelow Aerospace, not only dream of their future in the space industry but also have **billions** of dollars in assets. These are the **bright stars of an entirely new industry** that are leading us into the age of New Space commerce. These space billionaires, each in their own way, are proponents of a new age of astral abundance. Each of them is launching new commercial space industries. They are literally transforming our vision of tomorrow. These new types of entrepreneurial aerospace companies—the New Space enterprises—give new hope and new promise of transforming our world as we know it today. The New Space Frontier What happens in space in the next few decades, plus corresponding new information technologies and advanced robotics, will change our world forever. These changes will redefi ne wealth, change our views of work and employment and upend almost everything we think we know about economics, wealth, jobs, and politics. Th ese changes are about truly disruptive technologies of the most fundamental kinds. If you thought the Internet, smart phones, and spandex were disruptive technologies, just hang on. You have not seen anything yet. In short, if you want to understand a transition more fundamental than the changes brought to the twentieth century world by computers, communications and the Internet, then read this book. There are truly riches in the skies. Near-Earth asteroids largely composed of platinum and **rare earth metals** have an incredible value. Helium-3 isotopes accessible in outer space could provide **clean and abundant energy**. There is far more water in outer space than is in our oceans. In the pages that follow we will explain the potential for a cosmic shift in our global economy, our ecology, and our commercial and legal systems. These can take place by the end of this century. And if these changes do not take place we will be in trouble. Our conventional petro-chemical energy systems will fail us economically and eventually blanket us with a hydrocarbon haze of smog that will threaten our health and our very survival. Our rare precious metals that we need for modern electronic appliances will skyrocket in price, and the struggle between “haves” and “have nots” will grow increasingly **ugly**. A lack of affordable and readily available **water**, natural **resources**, **food**, **health care** and medical supplies, plus systematic threats to **urban security** and **systemic war**fare are the alternatives to astral abundance. The choices between astral abundance and a downward spiral in global standards of living are stark. Within the **next few decades** these problems will be increasingly real. By then the world may almost be **begging** for new, out of- the-box thinking. International peace and security will be an indispensable prerequisite for exploitation of astral abundance, as will good government for all. No one nation can be rich and secure when everyone else is poor and insecure. In short, global space security and strategic space defense, mediated by global space agreements, are part of this new pathway to the future.

## **contention 2: solar power satellites**

#### *[Horowitz] There is an energy crisis and its only going to get worse in the next couple months*

**Horowitz 21** (Julia Horowitz, a senior writer. She leads CNN Business international coverage of global markets and business , October 7th, 2021, A global energy crisis is coming. There's no quick fix, CNN Business, <https://www.cnn.com/2021/10/07/business/global-energy-crisis/index.html>) SJ

A global energy crunch caused by weather and a resurgence in demand is getting worse, stirring alarm ahead of the winter, when more energy is needed to light and heat homes. Governments around the world are trying to limit the impact on consumers, but acknowledge they may not be able to prevent bills spiking. Further complicating the picture is mounting pressure on governments to accelerate the transition to cleaner energy as world leaders prepare for a critical climate summit in November. In China, [rolling blackouts](https://edition.cnn.com/2021/09/28/economy/china-power-shortage-gdp-supply-chain-intl-hnk/index.html) for residents have already begun, while in India power stations are scrambling for coal. [Consumer advocates in Europe](https://twitter.com/beuc/status/1445702126336761865?s=20) are calling for a ban on disconnections if customers can't promptly settle what they owe. "This price shock is an unexpected crisis at a critical juncture," EU energy chief Kadri Simson said Wednesday, confirming the bloc will outline its longer-term policy response next week. "The immediate priority should be to mitigate social impacts and protect vulnerable households." In Europe, natural gas is now trading at the equivalent of $230 per barrel, in oil terms — up more than 130% since the beginning of September and more than eight times higher than the same point last year, according to data from Independent Commodity Intelligence Services. In East Asia, the cost of natural gas is up 85% since the start of September, hitting roughly $204 per barrel in oil terms. Prices remain much lower in the United States, a net exporter of natural gas, but still have shot up to their highest levels in 13 years. "A lot of it is feeding off of fear about what the winter's going to look like," said Nikos Tsafos, an energy and geopolitics expert at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a Washington-based think tank. He thinks that anxiety has caused the market to break away from the fundamentals of supply and demand. The frenzy to secure natural gas is also pushing up the price of coal and oil, which can be used as substitutes in some cases, but are even worse for the climate. India, which remains extremely dependent on coal, said this week that as many as 63 of its 135 coal-fired power plants have [two days or less](https://edition.cnn.com/2021/10/06/energy/india-energy-crisis-coal-hnk-intl/index.html) of supplies. The circumstances are causing central banks and investors to worry. Rising energy prices are contributing to inflation, which already was a major concern as the global economy tries to shake off the lingering effects of Covid-19. Dynamics over the winter could make matters worse.

#### *[Stossel] Government space programs are ineffective at innovating*

**Stossel 20** (John Stossel, July 29, 2020, The Private Space Race, <https://www.capitalismmagazine.com/2020/07/the-private-space-race/>) SJ

An Obama administration committee had concluded that launching such a vehicle would take 12 years and cost $36 billion. But this rocket was finished in half that time — for less than $1 billion (1/36th the predicted cost). That’s because it was built by Elon Musk’s private company, Space X. He does things faster and cheaper because he spends his own money. “This is the potential of free enterprise!” explains aerospace engineer Robert Zubrin in my newest video. Of course, years ago, NASA did manage to send astronauts to the moon. That succeeded, says Zubrin, “because it was purpose-driven. (America) wanted to astonish the world what free people could do.” But in the 50 years since then, as transportation improved and computers got smaller and cheaper, NASA made little progress. Fortunately, President Obama gave private companies permission to compete in space, saying, “We can’t keep doing the same old things as before.” Competition then cut the cost of space travel to a fraction of what it was. Why couldn’t NASA have done that? Because after the moon landing, it became a typical government agency — overbudget and behind schedule. Zubrin says NASA’s purpose seemed to be to “supply money to various suppliers.” Suppliers were happy to go along. Zubrin once worked at Lockheed Martin, where he once discovered a way for a rocket to carry twice as much weight. “We went to management, the engineers, and said, ‘Look, we could double the payload capability for 10% extra cost.’ They said, ‘Look, if the Air Force wants us to improve the Titan, they’ll pay us to do it!'” NASA was paying contractor’s development costs and then adding 10% profit. The more things cost, the bigger the contractor’s profit. So contractors had little incentive to innovate. Even NASA now admits this is a problem. During its 2020 budget request, Administrator Jim Bridenstine confessed, “We have not been good at maintaining schedule and … at maintaining costs.” Nor is NASA good at innovating. Their technology was so out of date, says Zubrin, that “astronauts brought their laptops with them into space — because shuttle computers were obsolete.” I asked, “When (NASA) saw that the astronauts brought their own computers, why didn’t they upgrade?” “Because they had an entire philosophy that various components had to be space rated,” he explains. “Space rating was very bureaucratic and costly.” NASA was OK with high costs as long as spaceships were assembled in many congressmen’s districts. “NASA is a very large job program,” says Aerospace lawyer James Dunstan. “By spreading its centers across the country, NASA gets more support from more different congressmen.” Congressmen even laugh about it. Randy Weber, R-Texas, joked, “We’ll welcome (NASA) back to Texas to spend lots of money any time.” Private companies do more with less money. One of Musk’s cost-saving innovations is reusable rocket boosters. For years, NASA dropped its boosters into the ocean. “Why would they throw it away?” I ask Dunstan. “Because that’s the way it’s always been done!” he replies. Twenty years ago, at Lockheed Martin, Zubrin had proposed reusable boosters. His bosses told him: “Cute idea. But if we sell one of these, we’re out of business.” Zubrin explains, “They wanted to keep the cost of space launch high.” Thankfully, now that self-interested entrepreneurs compete, space travel will get cheaper. Musk can’t waste a dollar. Space X must compete with Jeff Bezos’ Blue Origin, Richard Branson’s Virgin Galactic, Boeing, Lockheed Martin and others.The private sector always comes up with ways to do things that politicians cannot imagine. Government didn’t invent affordable cars, airplanes, iPhones, etc. It took competing entrepreneurs, pursuing profit, to nurture them into the good things we have now. Get rid of government monopolies.

#### *[Snowden] Solar power satellites solves the energy crisis*

**Snowden 19** (Scott Snowden, Mar 12, 2019, has written about science and technology for 20 years for publications around the world, Solar Power Stations In Space Could Supply The World With Limitless Energy, Forbes, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/scottsnowden/2019/03/12/solar-power-stations-in-space-could-supply-the-world-with-limitless-energy/?sh=23471fec4386> ) SJ

While on the surface of the Earth, society still struggles to adopt solar energy solutions, many scientists maintain that giant, space-based solar farms could provide an environmentally-friendly answer to the world's energy crisis. Only last week, we reported that China [was planning to](https://www.forbes.com/sites/scottsnowden/2019/03/05/china-plans-to-build-the-worlds-first-solar-power-station-in-space/#51f7f9c35c94) build the world's first solar power station to be positioned in Earth's orbit. Because the sun always shines in space, an orbital solar power station is seen as an inexhaustible source of clean energy. "Above the Earth, there's no day and night cycle and no clouds or weather or anything else that might obstruct the sun's ray, so a constant power source is available," said Ali Hajimiri, professor of electrical engineering at the California Institute of Technology and co-director of the university’s [Space Solar Power Project](https://www.spacesolar.caltech.edu/). Collecting solar power in space and wirelessly transmitting was first described by Isaac Asimov in 1941 in his short story Reason. In 1968, American aerospace engineer Peter Glaser published the first technical article on the concept – Power From The Sun: Its Future in the journal [Science](http://www.sciencemag.org/). Space-based solar power attracted considerable attention in the 1970s as the necessary individual technical components – in essence, photovoltaic cells, satellite technology and wireless power transmission – were developed. Despite the concept being technically feasible, it was considered economically unrealistic at the time and research ultimately stalled. “The idea seems to be going through a resurgence and it’s probably because the technology exists to make it happen,” said John Mankins, a former NASA scientist who was at the forefront of this field in the 1990s, before it was abandoned. Global energy demands are only going to grow, says Hajimiri. The global population is expected to reach a staggering 9.6 billion by 2050, according to a [United Nations report](http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/news/population/un-report-world-population-projected-to-reach-9-6-billion-by-2050.html), so methods of generating large quantities of clean energy must be found. A space-based solar power system could provide energy to everyone, even in places that don't receive sunlight all year round, like northern Europe and Russia. In April of 2015, a research agreement between Northrop Grumman and Caltech provided up to $17.5m for the development of innovations necessary to enable a space solar power system. Three Caltech professors head up the project: joining Hajimiri were Harry Atwater and Sergio Pellegrino. Caltech is just one institution working on developing this technology. We know that scientists at the Chongqing Collaborative Innovation Research Institute for Civil-Military Integration in China are constructing a facility to test the theoretical viability of the concept and plans to develop an orbital photovoltaic array [were announced](https://phys.org/news/2009-11-japan-eyes-solar-station-space.html) in Japan some time ago. One of the biggest issues to overcome is that of getting an array of solar panels large enough to make the project viable into orbit. Early concept designs in the 1970s featured giant arrays that would've proved very difficult to actually get into orbit. "The systems of the 70s for solar power satellites, the cost estimates suggested, at that time, that it might be as much as a trillion dollars to get to the first kilowatt hour because of the way the designs worked. Essentially a single satellite, a platform, an integrated, monolithic platform about the size of Manhattan," said Mankins.However, with SpaceX and Blue Origin slowly driving the cost of orbital delivery down, suddenly the concept seems a little closer to reality. "Going to modular systems to allow mass production, I believe was the answer to how to get solar power satellite costs down to something more reasonable," said Mankins.

#### *[Klare] Energy crisis results in war*

**Klare 14** (Micheal T Klare, July 15, 2014, Twenty-first century energy wars: how oil and gas are fuelling global conflicts, a Five Colleges professor of Peace and World Security Studies, <https://energypost.eu/twenty-first-century-energy-wars-oil-gas-fuelling-global-conflicts/>) SJ

As these conflicts and others like them suggest, fighting for control over key energy assets or the distribution of oil revenues is a [critical factor](http://www.tomdispatch.com/blog/175540/) in most contemporary warfare. While ethnic and religious divisions may provide the political and ideological fuel for these battles, it is the potential for mammoth oil profits that keeps the struggles alive. Without the promise of such resources, many of these conflicts would eventually die out for lack of funds to buy arms and pay troops. So long as the oil keeps flowing, however, the belligerents have both the means and incentive to keep fighting. In a fossil-fuel world, control over oil and gas reserves is an essential component of national power. “Oil fuels more than automobiles and airplanes,” Robert Ebel of the Center for Strategic and International Studies [told](http://2001-2009.state.gov/s/p/of/proc/tr/10187.htm) a State Department audience in 2002. “Oil fuels military power, national treasuries, and international politics.” Far more than an ordinary trade commodity, “it is a determinant of well being, of national security, and international power for those who possess this vital resource, and the converse for those who do not.” If anything, that’s even truer today, and as energy wars expand, the truth of this will only become more evident. Someday, perhaps, the development of renewable sources of energy may invalidate this dictum. But in our present world, if you see a conflict developing, look for the energy. It’ll be there somewhere on this fossil-fueled planet of ours.

#### *[Dvorsky 12] Conventional War Causes Extinction*

**Dvorsky 12** (George Dvorsky, [George P. Dvorsky is a Canadian bioethicist, transhumanist and futurist. He is a contributing editor at io9[1] and producer of the Sentient Developments blog and podcast. He was Chair of the Board for the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies (IEET)[2][3] and is the founder and chair of the IEET's Rights of Non-Human Persons Program,[4] a group that is working to

Secure human-equivalent rights and protections for highly sapient animals. He also serves on the Advisory Council of METI (Messaging Extraterrestrial Intelligence], 12-12-2012, io9, "9 Ways Humanity Could Bring About Its Own Destruction", <https://io9.gizmodo.com/9-ways-humanity-could-bring-about-its-own-destruction-5967660>)

Given the incredible degree to which technology has advanced in the nearly seven decades since this war, it's reasonable to assume that the next global ‘conventional war' — i.e. one fought without

nuclear weapons — would be near apocalyptic in scope. The degree of human suffering that could be unleashed would easily surpass anything that came before it, with combatants using many of the technologies already described in this list, including autonomous killing machines and weaponized nanotechnology. And in various acts of desperation (or sheer malevolence),some belligerent nations could choose to unleash chemical and biological agents that would result in countless deaths. And like WWII, food could be used as a weapon; agricultural yields could be brought to a grinding halt.

## **Contention 3: collaboration cp**

#### *CP text: we advocate for public-private partnerships in space in line with the ISS model or a sponsored program model*

**ISS National Lab** [International Space Station National Laboratory – Center for the Advancement of Science in Space, “Research on the ISS, No Date, <https://www.issnationallab.org/research-on-the-iss/public-private-partnerships-in-space/>] //neth

Public-private partnerships are a key component to driving innovation and national leadership. With the potential to address a wide array of modern challenges from technology development to infrastructure modernization, and from education to the economic development of space, public-private partnerships unlock new possibilities unavailable when we rely solely on public or private investment. The International Space Station (ISS) National laboratory is a great example of a public-private partnership model that is working in space. The ISS National Lab opens up the incredible possibilities of the space station research environment to a diverse range of researchers, entrepreneurs, and innovators that could create entirely new markets in space. The ISS National Laboratory – Accelerating Utilization of the ISS The ISS offers a unique research and development platform, unlike any on Earth, enabling research that benefits both exploration and life on Earth. In an effort to expand the research opportunities this unparalleled platform provides to the nation, the ISS United States Orbital Segment, through bipartisan legislation, was designated as a U.S. National Laboratory in 2005, enabling research and development access to a broad range of commercial, academic, and government users. After final assembly of the ISS in 2011, the Center for the Advancement of Science in Space, a (501)(c)(3) organization, was selected by NASA to manage the ISS U.S. National Laboratory. The ISS National Lab fulfills its mission to accelerate space-based research by engaging a variety of nontraditional space users, operating in the fields of life science, physical science, technology development, and remote sensing. The ISS National Lab engages primarily with organizations that pay toward the value obtained on the ISS, as well as with other organizations addressing national science and research priorities. This research serves commercial and entrepreneurial needs and other important goals such as the pursuit of new knowledge and education. Since 2011, the ISS National Lab has stewarded more than 200 ISS research projects, ranging from developing new drug therapies, to monitoring tropical cyclones, to improving equipment for first-responders, to producing unique fiber-optics materials in space. Working together with NASA, the ISS National Lab aims to advance the nation’s leadership in commercial space, pursue groundbreaking science not possible on Earth, and leverage the space station to inspire the next generation. Prior to the ISS National Lab model, NASA traditionally funded all aspects of ISS research, whether it was research needed to further exploration, or discovery-based space research that expanded upon its scientific agenda. As the ISS evolved into a National Laboratory, the ISS National Lab has increased the diversity of users by accelerating utilization of the ISS as an innovation platform for a wide variety of partners. These include Fortune 500 organizations, small businesses, educational institutions, philanthropic and research foundations, federal and state government agencies, and other thought leaders in pursuit of groundbreaking technology and innovation who are interested in leveraging microgravity to solve complex research problems on Earth. The ISS National Lab plays a role in not only attracting a diverse set of users, including private companies, to utilize the ISS, but also in engaging the private sector through various research and cost-sharing arrangements. Sponsored Programs – Accelerating Third-Party Funding for Space Research. The ISS National Lab has developed a successful Sponsored Program model that attracts third-party funding from private industry and other government agencies to solve big problems or address target challenges. These programs translate into projects on the ISS National Lab. The Sponsored Program model enables an organization to ask new questions and explore key variables, using the ISS National Lab environment as a tool in their innovation portfolio. In return, the organization creates opportunities for targeted research and development projects and STEM education projects or fosters novel ideas of startup companies. Fortune 500 companies, government agencies, and regional incubators have successfully used the ISS National Lab Sponsored Program model. This unique research and development model is flexible to meet the needs and budget of a partnering organization. Successful Sponsored Programs include Boeing Mass Challenge, Massachusetts Life Sciences Center, National Science Foundation (NSF) fluid dynamics and combustion Sponsored Program, and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS) organ-on-chip technologies Sponsored Program, totaling more than $20 million in third-party funding over the last two years. Additional Sponsored Programs totaling close to $5 million in 2017 with Fortune 500 organizations are imminent and will target major challenges to humankind as well as STEM education initiatives.

#### *Private organizations already have debris tracking technology – partnership would be the safest and most efficient*

**Moore & van Burken 2021** [Adrian Moore, Vice President of Policy, and Rebecca van Burken, Policy Analyst, “As Commercial Space Travel Becomes Reality, Debris and Space Traffic Management Becomes More Important,” Reason Foundation, August 5, 2021, <https://reason.org/commentary/as-commerical-space-travel-becomes-reality-debris-and-space-traffic-management-becomes-more-important/>] //neth

With Richard Branson and Jeff Bezos soaring into suborbital space, three U.S. flights to the International Space Station (ISS) in July, and SpaceX delivering 88 satellites to orbit in the last six weeks, space traffic is surging. And this is just the beginning of increased commercial and governmental activity in space. August will see several more trips to the ISS and more launches of satellites. Additionally, the Biden administration signed an agreement with the European Space Agency to use more satellites to address climate change through earth science research. This increased space traffic serves a wide array of purposes and represents vast investments by the private space industry and government. But these investments are going to increasingly be jeopardized by the massive amount of space junk already circling Earth. There’s plenty of room to fly up there, but, believe it or not, NASA estimates there are already 23,000 pieces of debris larger than 10 centimeters and over 500,000 pieces of smaller junk in orbit. This space junk, or orbital debris, travels at high speeds and even a small piece can cause serious damage or destruction if it hits a spacecraft or satellite. The space debris includes thousands of dead and retired satellites, parts of spacecraft from decades of missions, items exploded in warfare testing, and more. Dodging space junk is a regular requirement for spacecraft in orbit. The International Space Station had to maneuver 25 times between 1999 and 2018 to avoid collisions, and it had to dodge debris three times in 2020. Monitoring this debris is going to be a major issue as private space travel and the space economy grow. In 2019, the global space economy amounted to about $366 billion. Of this, $271 billion was in the satellite industry and $123 billion was directly in satellite services. As the world increasingly becoming reliant on satellites U.S. and global satellite businesses bear the brunt of the failure to track and remove orbital debris. As Sen. John Hickenlooper (D-Colo.), chair of the Senate Commerce Committee’s Subcommittee on Science and Space, said recently, we need to be proactive on space debris “rather than learning by a terrible accident … but we don’t quite have the sense of urgency we need.” Urgency means committing to better space traffic management, and tracking and removing orbital debris. Orbital debris management is not well organized within the government. Right now, the Department of Defense (DOD) does most tracking of space debris for the U.S. out of the need to protect military satellites and national security interests. NASA has its own less advanced systems for tracking debris. However, orbital debris management is not just about tracking debris anymore. It is also about forming collision warning systems and safely managing traffic in space. To do this efficiently, we need a civil repository for all orbital debris components, something that many commercial space companies have already created on their own to stay aware of orbital debris and help protect their satellites in space. Tracking debris may be a national security priority, but providing space traffic control is not really in the Defense Department’s mission. We should be utilizing the private sector’s expertise and advancements in this area. For example, Astroscale has contracts with both the Japanese and European space agencies to develop orbital debris removal capability. And responsibility for developing collision warnings and space traffic management would be best suited for the Office of Space Commerce, an office with existing connections to the commercial space industry, NASA and DOD. Partnering with the debris tracking and removal systems private companies are developing while freeing up DOD to focus on military awareness and NASA to focus on research and development would be the most efficient way forward. If the government works with private industry through strategic public-private partnerships, the U.S. can best address the threats posed by orbital debris and create sustainable policies for safe space exploration.

## **Case**

On framing—

**Case – framing analytics**

#### **1 – their fw is arbitrary – everyone has a different conception of environmental justice – means we can never use it to measure impacts**

#### **2 – enviro justice impacts aren’t quantifiable – our fw quantifies by pleasure and pain, specifically lives saved. You can’t count how many environmental justices you create – reason to prefer our fw**

#### **3 – our fw is a prior question – you need to be alive to help the environment**

#### **4 – we control the internal link to environmental justice – private entities have the best chance of solving – that means you negate even if you buy their fw**

**5--The environmental movement is white-dominated – it’s a reason to be skeptical of the benefits of “environmental justice” approaches**

**Ortiz 2021** (Erik Ortiz, “'The numbers don't lie': The green movement remains overwhelmingly white, report finds,” January 13, 2021, NBC News, <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/numbers-don-t-lie-green-movement-remains-overwhelmingly-white-report-n1253972>) //neth

But while Shepard, a co-founder of the group WE ACT for Environmental Justice, has collaborated with large national environmental organizations and been invited to sit on their boards, she still stands out among many of her peers in the green movement. "These organizations are generally predominantly white. Their boards are generally older white men," said Shepard, who is Black. "They're realizing that not only do those boards have to get younger, they have to get more diverse." A report released Wednesday by Green 2.0, an independent advocacy campaign that tracks racial and gender diversity within the environmental movement, found that while strides have been made in recent years, it has been at an incremental pace that begs for "improvement at all levels," said Andrés Jimenez, the campaign's executive director. New data from about 40 of the largest nonprofit environmental organizations in the country and the top 40 foundations and grant providers show that, on average, these groups added six people of color and eight women to their full-time staff from 2017 to 2020, added two people of color and two women to their senior staff in that time, and one person of color and one woman to their boards since 2017. Diversity advocates acknowledge that such large legacy groups, which have staffing numbers in the hundreds and budgets worth millions of dollars, may be in the best position to bring attention to issues such as protecting national parks and endangered species. But those groups have not historically been in tune with problems facing inner cities and communities of color, places that are disproportionately burdened by pollution, according to the federal government's research. The latest numbers demonstrate a noticeable shift, but still highlight that the organizations and foundations remain overwhelmingly white — even as many of those groups released statements last year calling for racial justice and recognizing how despite their progressive ideals, they failed to react to systemic disparities that people of color have been subjected to in the United States. Some organizations reported having no people of color in senior levels, including Oceana, an ocean conservation nonprofit, and the BlueGreen Alliance, which works with labor unions to promote clean jobs and infrastructure. Oceana's international board does include people of color, but the group said it did not report the board's specific racial makeup to the Green 2.0 report because not all of the members are American. An Oceana spokesperson said the organization is "committed to diversity among our staff and board, making all feel welcome in our workplace, and improving equity for disenfranchised groups through our conservation campaigns," adding that it was pleased to have participated in the Green 2.0 report and encouraged by the expanding racial and gender diversity numbers at environmental organizations. The BlueGreen Alliance did not immediately respond to a request for comment. "The numbers don't lie. Organizations can't escape the actual numbers that we put into this report," Jimenez said.

On tourism--

#### *No guarantee space tourism ever becomes affordable enough for average people, until then it will be reserved for the rich and famous making the effects limited.*

**Roulette 21** (Roulette, Joey. “The Space Tourism Industry Is Stuck In Its Billionaire Phase.” The Verge. July 17, 2021. Web. December 13, 2021. <https://www.theverge.com/2021/7/17/22573791/space-tourism-industry-bezos-branson-musk-billionaire-phase>.) SJ

“There’s going to be a fairly large learning curve as companies go from the process of developing a capability and testing it, to operating it routinely,” Christensen said. It’s possible that space tourism will follow the same path as computers or airplanes, but there’s no guarantee that it will succeed. In part, that’s because there’s no single solution to driving down the cost of launching people to space. Virgin Galactic earlier this year unveiled a new version of SpaceShipTwo that’s tailored for quick production rates, signaling it’s gearing up to accommodate its hefty customer backlog and reopen ticket sales, which have been closed since a fatal 2014 accident during a test flight. (Branson’s presence on Sunday’s flight also served as a visual reassurance to customers that the ship is safe.) Musk is focusing on better rocket fuel efficiency with SpaceX’s Starship, a fully reusable launch system being developed to slash the cost of sending humans to space. But again, what exactly those next-generation prices will be remain a mystery. Musk hasn’t said how much it’ll cost prospective passengers to fly on Starship. And Virgin Galactic hasn’t said how much it plans to charge for tickets for its newer spaceplane, SpaceShipThree, just like Blue Origin, which hasn’t revealed its New Shepard prices. Currently, you either have to be talented (hand-picked by a billionaire) or lucky to book a ride on one of these rockets without paying the steep price tag. Raffling off tickets, like Virgin Galactic plans to do, and donating seats to space enthusiasts who can’t afford them keeps the public dream of normalized, low-cost space travel alive while the industry races to find the right recipe for bringing prices down. “I think that in any competitive market you’re going to see products improve and/or prices drop,” Christensen added.

2—ca the mining disad—even if rocket launches do release emissions using rocket launches for asteorid mining results in significantly lower, nearly 300 times lower emissions than terrestrial mining’s

On debris--

#### *Too much debris exists in space now – that destroys satellites—means cp sovles better than aff*

**Wall 21** [Mike Wall, Michael Wall is a Senior Space Writer with [Space.com](http://space.com/) and joined the team in 2010. He primarily covers exoplanets, spaceflight and military space. He has a Ph.D. in evolutionary biology from the University of Sydney, Australia, a bachelor's degree from the University of Arizona, and a graduate certificate in science writing from the University of California, Santa Cruz. 11/15/21, "Kessler Syndrome and the space debris problem," Space, [https://www.space.com/kessler-syndrome-space-debris accessed 12/10/21](https://www.space.com/kessler-syndrome-space-debris%20accessed%2012/10/21)] Adam

Earth orbit is getting more and more crowded as the years go by. Humanity has launched about 12,170 satellites since the dawn of the space age in 1957, [according to the European Space Agency](https://www.esa.int/Safety_Security/Space_Debris/Space_debris_by_the_numbers) (ESA), and 7,630 of them remain in orbit today — but only about 4,700 are still operational. That means there are nearly 3,000 defunct spacecraft zooming around Earth at tremendous speeds, along with other big, dangerous pieces of debris like upper-stage rocket bodies. For example, orbital velocity at 250 miles (400 kilometers) up, the altitude at which the ISS flies, is about 17,100 mph (27,500 kph). At such speeds, even a tiny shard of debris can do serious damage to a spacecraft — and there are huge numbers of such fragmentary bullets zipping around our planet. ESA estimates that Earth orbit harbors at least 36,500 debris objects that are more than 4 inches (10 centimeters) wide, 1 million between 0.4 inches and 4 inches (1 to 10 cm) across, and a staggering 330 million that are smaller than 0.4 inches (1 cm) but bigger than 0.04 inches (1 millimeter). These objects pose more than just a hypothetical threat. From 1999 to May 2021, for example, the ISS conducted 29 debris-avoiding maneuvers, including three in 2020 alone, [according to NASA officials](https://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/station/news/orbital_debris.html). And that number continues to grow; the station performed [another such move in November 2021](https://www.space.com/space-station-dodging-chinese-space-junk-spacex-crew-3), for example. Many of the smaller pieces of space junk were spawned by the explosion of spent rocket bodies in orbit, but others were more actively emplaced. In January 2007, for instance, China intentionally destroyed one of its defunct weather satellites in a much-criticized test of anti-satellite technology that generated [more than 3,000 tracked debris objects](https://swfound.org/media/9550/chinese_asat_fact_sheet_updated_2012.pdf) and perhaps 32,000 others too small to be detected. The vast majority of that junk remains in orbit today, experts say. Spacecraft have also collided with each other on orbit. The most famous such incident occurred in February 2009, when Russia's defunct Kosmos 2251 satellite slammed into the operational communications craft Iridium 33, producing [nearly 2,000 pieces of debris](https://swfound.org/media/6575/swf_iridium_cosmos_collision_fact_sheet_updated_2012.pdf) bigger than a softball. That 2009 smashup might be evidence that the Kessler Syndrome is already upon us, though a cataclysm of "Gravity" proportions is still a long way off. "The cascade process can be more accurately thought of as continuous and as already started, where each collision or explosion in orbit slowly results in an increase in the frequency of future collisions," [Kessler told Space Safety Magazine in 2012](http://www.spacesafetymagazine.com/space-debris/kessler-syndrome/don-kessler-envisat-kessler-syndrome/)

#### *Only profit motive solves debris.*

**Nelson & Block 18** [Peter Lothian Nelson and Walter E. Block, \*\* Harold E. Wirth Endowed Chair and Professor of Economics, College of Business, Loyola University New Orleans, “Space Capitalism: How Humans will Colonize Planets, Moons, and Asteroids,” 2018, Springer, pp. 108, EA]

Space debris is a major challenge to space exploration (Goldsmith 2015). The higher the speed (see Chap. 1 on the need for hyper speeds), the worse will be the issue of impact avoidance or damage in the event of impact. It is through the **unregulated free market** that solutions to intractable problems are found. Explorers will be well **motivated** to **develop** **methods for detection of** both minuscule and massive invisible **objects** and **quick reaction mechanisms** for avoidance of things large and small.

#### *No Kessler syndrome.*

**Mosher ’19** [Dave; September 3rd; Journalist with more than a decade of experience reporting and writing stories about space, science, and technology; Business Insider, “Satellite collisions may trigger a space-junk disaster that could end human access to orbit. Here’s How,” <https://www.usafa.edu/app/uploads/Space_and_Defense_2_3.pdf>; GR]

The **Kessler syndrome** plays center-stage in the movie "Gravity," in which an accidental **space collision** endangers a crew aboard a large space station. But Gossner said that type of a runaway **space-junk catastrophe** is **unlikely**. "Right now I don't think we're **close to that**," he said. "I'm not saying we couldn't get there, and I'm not saying we don't need to be smart and manage the problem. But I don't see it **ever** becoming, anytime soon, an unmanageable problem." There is no current system to remove old satellites or sweep up bits of debris in order to prevent a Kessler event. Instead, space debris is monitored from Earth, and new rules require satellites in low-Earth orbit be deorbited after 25 years so they don't wind up adding more space junk. "Our current plan is to manage the problem and not let it get that far," Gossner said. "I don't think that we're even close to needing to **actively remove** stuff. There's lots of research being done on that, and maybe some day that will happen, but I think that — at this point, and in my humble opinion — an unnecessary expense." A major part of the effort to prevent a Kessler event is the **S**pace **S**urveillance **N**etwork (SSN). The project, led by the **US military**, uses **30** different systems around the **world** to **identify**, **track**, and share **info**rmation about **objects** in space. Many objects are tracked **day and night** via a networkof radar observatories around the globe. Optical telescopes on the ground also keep an eye out, but they aren't always run by the government. "The commercial sector is actually putting up lots and lots of telescopes," Gossner said. The government pays for their debris-tracking services. Gossner said one major debris-tracking company is called **Exoanalytic**. It uses about 150 small telescopes set up around the globe to **detect**, **track**, and **report** space debris to the SSN. Telescopes in space track debris, too. Far less is known about them because they're likely top-secret military satellites. Objects detected by the government and companies get added to a **catalog** of space debris and **checked** against the orbits of other known bits of **space junk**. New orbits are calculated with **supercomputers** to see if there's a **chance** of **any collisions**. Diana McKissock, a flight lead with the US Air Force's 18th Space Control Squadron, helps track space debris for the SSN. She said the surveillance network issues warnings to NASA, satellite companies, and other groups with spacecraft, based on two levels of emergency: basic and advanced. The SSN issues a basic emergency report to the **public three days ahead** of a 1-in-10,000 chance of a **collision**. It then provides **multiple updates** per day until the risk of a collision **passes**. To qualify for such reporting, a rogue object must come within a certain distance of another object. In low-Earth orbit, that distance must be less than 1 kilometer (0.62 mile); farther out in deep space, where the precision of orbits is less reliable, the distance is less than 5 kilometers (3.1 miles). Advanced emergency reports help satellite providers see possible collisions much more than **three days ahead**. "In **2017**, we provided **data** for **308,984 events**, of which only **655** were **emergency**-reportable," McKissock told Business Insider in an email. Of those, 579 events were in low-Earth orbit (where it's relatively crowded with satellites).

#### *Their models are old and don’t assume appropriate solar activity decay – debris is stable*

**Wang and Liu 19** – Advances in Astronomy(Xiao-wei and Jing, PhDs, National Astronomical Observatories, Chinese Academy of Sciences, “An Introduction to a New Space Debris Evolution Model: SOLEM”, <https://www.hindawi.com/journals/aa/2019/2738276/>)

1. Introduction During the past decades, the number of space objects has been growing rapidly. Until now, the cataloged in-orbit space objects number has reached about 24,000, about 19000 of which are publicly listed at Space Track [1]. Uncataloged objects number with smaller size has approximately reached hundreds of millions. These space objects, mostly space debris, pose great threats to operational safety of in-orbit spacecraft. Adopting space debris mitigation measures is an important way to relieve the threats from space debris and prevent the number of resident space objects from growing. However, some studies indicated that the space debris environment would be stable for only 50 years under current mitigation measures, even without new launches in future [2]. This statement has aroused widespread concern over the world. In order to check and quantify the effectiveness of mitigation measures on controlling the growth of space debris in future, many space debris evolution models are established and compared to study the long-term stability of the future space environment. At present, the well-known space debris evolution models mainly include the LEGEND model from National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) [3], DAMAGE model from United Kingdom Space Agency (UKSA) [4], MEDEE model from Centre National d’Etudes Spatiales (CNES) [5], DELTA model from European Space Agency (ESA) [6], LUCA model from Technische Universität Braunschweig [7], and NEODEEM model from Kyushu University and the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency (JAXA)[8]. Some of these models have been used to study the stability of the future space environment in the joint research organized by Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee (IADC) [9, 10]. Besides, further work on the uncertainties affecting the long-term evolution of space debris is encouraged in international community to better assess the uncertainty induced by the modelling assumptions [11]. Therefore, more space debris evolution models are welcomed to participate in such research activities, which may provide the technical support for making new space debris mitigation guidelines as well as other related policies for space traffic management to guarantee the long-term sustainability of outer space activities. SOLEM (Space Objects Long-term Evolution Model) is a Low Earth Orbit (LEO) space debris long-term evolution model established by China. It has participated in the joint researches of IADC as a representative of China National Space Administration (CNSA). SOLEM is capable of predicting the **number evolution trends of space debris**, estimating the **rate of collision** events of space objects during the evolution in future, and analyzing the effects of different **mitigation and remediation measures** or other potential **uncertainties on the long-term evolution** of space debris. The reliability of SOLEM has been **validated** during the joint research of IADC. This paper introduces the components, algorithms, and workflow of SOLEM. After that, the effects of different mitigation measures based on SOLEM model are analyzed. 2. The SOLEM Model The space debris evolution model is expected to predict the evolution of space debris population and possible collision rates for a long period in future, usually for decades and even centuries. It can be used to study the evolution processes with various assumptions. The future evolution of space debris is affected by natural factors such as various perturbations, atmosphere evolutions, periodic solar activities, accidental explosions, and even the surface degradations. In fact, it could also be affected by human space activities such as launches, collision avoidance manoeuvres, mitigation and remediation measures. In space debris evolution model, usually the most important source and sink mechanisms are considered. Generally, a space debris evolution model is composed of orbital propagation model, collision probability estimation model, fragment generation model, future launch model, postmission disposal model, and active debris removal model (if the active debris removal measures are considered). These components will significantly affect the model evolution results if some key parameters are changed. The composition of space debris evolution model is illustrated in Figure 1. Figure 1: The general components of space debris evolution models. The left components are the main source mechanisms, and the right components are the main sink mechanisms. 3. Orbital Propagation Orbital propagation is to project the current orbits of space objects to the future. It is the core component of space debris evolution model. Through orbital propagation, the space debris evolution model is able to obtain the space objects orbital distribution at any moment in future. There are three basic orbital prediction algorithms: numerical method, analytical method, and semianalytical method. Numerical method has the highest precision but takes the most time in orbit propagation. Due to the long evolution time of space debris, usually from decades to hundreds of years, moreover, the high-precision position has no practical significance in long-term evolution; it is more appropriate to use analytical method or semianalytical method. SOLEM model adopts a simplified semianalytical orbital propagator, in which the integration is done on the perturbation functions with the short-periodic terms removed. Essentially, it is performed on the averaged orbital dynamic system. At present, SOLEM covers only LEO region, including objects residing in LEO with near-circular orbits and those crossing LEO with high eccentricity orbits. For near-circular orbits, the main perturbations considered include the Earth’s nonspherical gravity perturbation J2, J3, J4, J2,2, and atmospheric drag. For high eccentricity orbits, besides the Earth’s nonspherical gravity and atmospheric drag, the perturbations due to solar radiation pressure and gravity of the Sun and Moon are also considered. The atmosphere density model used for drag calculation is the NRLMSIS00 model. The values of solar radiation flux at 10.7 cm and the geomagnetic index can be read from a configuration file which can be replaced according to assumptions. In order to verify this orbital propagator of SOLEM, we conducted an experiment on the evolution of a small population. It is to compare the SOLEM propagation results with historical data for the number evolution of a small population in a statistical view. We used all the 1021 cataloged LEO-crossing objects on 1980.01.01 to do the experiment. It includes 38 objects with high eccentricity orbits () and 983 objects with near-circular orbits (). The area-to-mass ratio of these objects is calculated according to the UNW type of perturbed motion equation together with the method of least squares, using the orbital data for months previously. For SOLEM propagation, we used historical solar activities recorded in CelesTrak website [12] considering no collision avoidance and station keeping manoeuvres. The real decay information of the 1021 objects is drawn from SSR on the Space Track website [13]. The propagation result of SOLEM orbital propagator and the real data of historical evolution of the 1021 objects are compared in Figure 2, which shows a high consistency with a relative error of about 2%. Figure 2: The statistical results comparison of SOLEM propagation (denoted as test) and historical evolution (denoted as real). The semianalytical method has a limit precision in orbit propagation. However, comparing with the evolution of a single orbit, the space debris long-term evolution model cares more about the number evolution of the whole population in statistics. Considering the experiment above, we think the SOLEM orbital propagator is applicable to space debris long-term evolution model. 4. Fragment Generation Model In-orbit breakup is one important source of space debris growth. Therefore, the accuracy of fragment generation model simulating the breakup events has an important impact on the simulation results of space debris evolution model. The fragment generation model is to simulate the space debris collisions or explosions and give the instantaneous information of generated fragments which is necessary for the subsequent evolution prediction. The information includes the fragments number and each fragment’s mass, size, velocity, etc. In SOLEM, we adopt NASA’s standard breakup model to simulate the generation of fragments produced by in-orbit breakups. NASA’s standard breakup model is the most popular fragment generation model at present. The implementation is following the process presented in paper [14, 15]. 5. Collision Probability Estimation When considering the fragmentation due to in-orbit collisions, there is a key component in the space debris evolution model, that is, the collision probability estimation algorithm. In SOLEM, we adopt an Improved-CUBE (I-CUBE) model to do the calculation of collision probabilities. It is based on the CUBE method proposed by NASA [16, 17]. In CUBE model, the evolution system is uniformly sampled in time. At each sampling moment, the space around the Earth is discretized in small cubes in geocentric Cartesian coordinates. By obtaining updated orbital elements, the location of each space objects is calculated. CUBE model assumes that the collision probability only exists between objects residing in the same cube. And the collision probability is calculated by where and are the spatial densities of objects and in the cube, is the collision cross-section, is collision speed, is the volume of the cube, and is the time interval between two sampling moments. Actually, calculated by (1) is the mean number of collisions between objects and in the volume during the propagation time interval . The time interval is given as 5 days, i.e., seconds. As it does not approach 0, for some objects with collision cross-section large enough, will reach a value greater than 1. That is not reasonable. To avoid this, in I-CUBE model, we used (2) to express the collision probability with the consideration that the collision process follows a Poisson distribution. where represents the collision probability and is the mean number of collisions between objects and in the volume during the propagation time interval . According to Heiner Klinkrad [18], the approximation yields results with less than 10% error for . That means, for , the approximation will bring error bigger than 10%. For most space objects, the approximation is well suited. But for those with collision cross-sections large enough (dozens or even hundreds of square meters), the collision probability may be greatly overestimated if still using the approximation. Besides, CUBE model assumes that only the objects residing in the same cube are considered for collisions. For space debris evolution, the divided cube size is given as 10 km. However, it has been queried by CNES for the effects on evolution results from the divided cube size [19, 20]. In I-CUBE model, we assume that collision probability exists in all close approaches with a distance from the target satisfying the threshold. The distance threshold is the diagonal of the divided cube. Thus, the value of in (1) is no longer the volume of cube, but the volume of a sphere with radius equal to the distance threshold; i.e., where is the divided cube size. As relates to the spatial densities, and are now the spatial densities of objects and in the volume of the sphere. The two-dimensional representation is illustrated in Figure 3. Figure 3: Two-dimensional representation for considering possible collisions between debris residing in neighbouring cubes. In this approach, the divided cube size will never influence the evolution result of space debris evolution models. The comparison results using CUBE and I-CUBE model running by SOLEM are presented in Figure 4. The divided cube size varies from 5 km to 50 km. Except for the divided cube size, all the other configurations are the same. Every curve is the average result of 50 Monte Carlo runs. Figure 4: Comparison of simulation results with different cube size. (a) Using CUBE model. (b) Using I-CUBE model. 6. Future Launch Activities The launch of spacecraft in future is another important source of space debris increase. However, it is highly related to technical development and space policies which cannot be predicted. Therefore, the future launch model usually takes the current launch level as a reference. The data of a launch model includes all the characteristics of launched objects, such as the launched number, each object’s type, mass, area, or/and size, target orbit, and launch time. In SOLEM model, we adopt the launch traffic during the last 8 years, from September 1, 2009, to August 31, 2017, as future launch model. It will be repeated during the overall simulation time. The traffic data is collected mainly from websites of Space Launch Report [21], Space Track [22], and Union of Concerned Scientists [23]. It is prepared previously as a configuration file containing the information of launched numbers, types (including satellites, rocket bodies, and mission-related objects), each object’s mass, area (or/and size), target orbit, launch date, etc. 7. Postmission Disposal Postmission Disposal (PMD) is an important mitigation measure to stop space debris population from growing. In SOLEM model, PMD measures are implemented on nonfunctional satellites and rockets launched during the evolution time. For newly launched satellites, the mission life is uniformly set as 8 years by default. It can also be set as other values by user. For rockets, the mission life will end at once when the carried satellites are sent into the target orbits. When the mission life of a satellite or rocket ends, the natural orbital lifetime will be estimated. If the natural orbital lifetime exceeds 25 years, the satellite or upper stage of the rocket will be deorbited to a disposed orbit that will naturally decay within 25 years, complying with the 25-year rule. The PMD success rate in SOLEM can be set freely by users. Currently this value is estimated to be lower than 20% for region above 600 km. The procedure of PMD is shown in Figure 5. Figure 5: The procedure of PMD. For mission ended satellites or rockets (R/Bs), if the evaluated natural orbital lifetime exceeds 25 years, it will be disposed to a new orbit complying with the 25-year rule. 8. Active Debris Removal To better limit the growth of LEO space debris populations, measures of active debris removal (ADR) are suggested. Although the ADR has not become practical due to the technical difficulties and high costs, its effects on space debris evolution have been proved through computer simulations. Considering the developing technology, ADR will be another important measure in stopping the growth of the space debris population in future. As suggested, ADR measure is to remove existing large and massive objects from regions where high collision activities are expected [24]. The selection criterion that should be used in choosing which objects to remove has also been researched, and the criterion based on the mass and collision probability of each object has been proposed [25–27]. By annually removing several targets, the space environment can be stabilized according to computer simulations. In SOLEM model, the selection criterion is implemented as follows: where is the mass of object and is the cumulated collision probabilities between object and object , where during the last year. Their product is the selection index for ADR. The larger the value of , the more dangerous the object . At the beginning of each projection year, all objects in orbit are sorted in descending order by the value of . A predefined number of space debris objects with the largest s will be immediately removed from orbits. Only the operating satellites and objects with high eccentricity orbits are excluded. The beginning year of implementing ADR measures is set by users. In SOLEM, it is set as 2030 by default. 9. The Initial Population Space objects initial population is the baseline of space debris evolution model. It is the description of current space environment. For SOLEM, the population data on 2017.09.01 is used as initial population. Just like the future launch model, the information of space objects is obtained from Space Track, Space Launch Report, and Union of Concerned Scientists. The orbital distribution and the area-to-mass ratio (A/M) versus size distribution are shown in Figures 6 and 7. Figure 6: The semimajor axis versus eccentricity distribution of population data of 2017.09.01. Figure 7: The A/M versus size distribution of population data of 2017.09.01. 10. The Workflow of SOLEM Model The workflow of SOLEM model is simply represented by Figure 8. As presented, before projection, initialization will be done first by setting key parameters which are based on simulated assumptions, taking prepared initial population data as input. All space objects contained in the initial population are propagated after initialization. As time evolves, the newly launched objects from future launch model will also be propagated. If the newly launched active satellite or rocket ends its mission, the PMD measure will be done. All space objects with size over 10 cm are included for collision consideration. Once a collision happens, the breakup model will be used to generate new fragments. And the population for next propagation step will be updated. Figure 8: The workflow of SOLEM model. 11. Model Application As key parameters of each module are flexible to users, SOLEM model is able to simulate the evolution of space debris under various assumptions with **high flexibility**. Since 2015, SOLEM, as a representative of CNSA, has participated in a joint research of IADC. With uniform input data and assumptions, SOLEM has achieved results consistent with other space debris evolution models (IADC internal reports). In this paper, the effects of different mitigation measures on space debris evolution are analyzed with the SOLEM model. 11.1. Input Data The initial input data and relevant assumptions are shown in Table 1. Three scenarios are performed with PMD rate set as 30%, 60%, and 90%, and the other input data and assumptions are all the same. For each scenario, 50 Monte Carlo simulation runs are performed to obtain the averages. Table 1: Assumptions of scenarios simulated by SOLEM model. The solar activity used in SOLEM for future evolution is shown in Figure 9. It is generated according to the monthly fit formula offered by CelesTrak website [12]. The geomagnetic index is set as a constant median value of Ap=9. Figure 9: The solar activity recorded in history (green line, denoted as real) and the solar activity model adopted in SOLEM (purple line). 11.2. Simulation Results In the evolution results, space objects are classified into three types: intact objects include all satellites, R/Bs, and mission-related objects; old fragments are all the DEB already existing in the initial population; new fragments are all the DEB generated during the evolution time. Separating new fragments from old fragments can help us have a clear view of the increasing process of space debris population. The space debris evolution results of the scenario setting PMD rate as 30% is presented in Figure 10. It is the average result of 50 Mont-Carlo runs by SOLEM. As Figure 10 shows, the total number of objects in LEO shows a decrease in the first two decades, then turns into increase throughout the evolution time, and finally reaches more than 115% of the initial population. This scenario predicts 34 catastrophic collisions and 25 noncatastrophic collisions in average in future 200 years. Figure 10: The evolution results of scenario 1, with PMD rate of 30%. (a) The population evolution. The line of total is plotted with the error bar of 1 σ standard deviation. (b) The cumulative number of collisions. Figure 11 shows the evolution results of the scenario setting PMD rate as 60%. The reinforcement of such mitigation measure makes the final effective number of LEO objects in future 200 years decrease greatly comparing with the baseline scenario. The final total effective number of LEO objects is only 23% more than the initial population. And the cumulative number of collisions also decreases greatly in both collision types. Figure 11: The evolution results of scenario 2, with PMD rate of 60%. (a) The population evolution. The line of total is plotted with the error bar of 1 σ standard deviation. (b) The cumulative number of collisions. In Figure 12, the evolution result shows, with PMD rate of 90%, there is a clear decrease by approximately 30% in the total effective number of space objects crossing LEO orbits for the next 50 years, and then the population remains at a **long-term stable level**. The decrease in the first 50 years is mainly due to the **natural decay of old fragments**. The number of new fragments generated by breakup events increases in nearly the whole evolution time with a low rate and finally seems to stop increasing at the end of evolution. The cumulative number of catastrophic collisions is decreased down to 15, and for noncatastrophic collisions the number is only 7. Generally, this scenario predicts a space debris environment **becoming better** with PMD rate as high as 90%. Figure 12: The evolution results of scenario 3, with PMD rate of 90%. (a) The population evolution. The line of total is plotted with the error bar of 1 σ standard deviation. (b) The cumulative number of collisions. Simulation results of the three scenarios are quantified in Table 2. It can be seen that, with PMD rate increasing, the space debris population after 200 years will greatly decrease, as well as the average catastrophic collision rates. High PMD rates will make the current space environment better and safer. Table 2: Quantification of evolution results of the three scenarios simulated by SOLEM model. Taking the IADC comparison study about “Stability of the Future LEO Environment” [9, 10] as a reference, the evolution results shown above look rather optimistic. The IADC comparison study predicted about +30% changes in population after 200 years and one catastrophic collision every 5 to 9 years with PMD rate of 90%. And we predict -30% change in population and one catastrophic collision every 13 years with the same PMD compliance level. That might be mainly due to the differences in **solar activity model** and the input initial population used for simulation. The solar activity used in this paper (Figure 9) is in a higher level than those used in [9, 10], which is shown in Figure 13. This will make **more objects decay during the evolution.** Besides, the initial population we used in this paper is obtained from the public data on 2017.09.01, which is about 13000 space objects. While the initial population used in [9, 10] is the reference population of MASTER2009 on 2009.05.01, which is about 17000 space objects, the difference in initial population is as high as about 24%. Additionally, the area-to-mass ratio distribution of the initial population in this paper (Figure 7) is also different from [9, 10], which is shown in Figure 14. From the area-to-mass ratio distribution of the initial population, it can be seen that the initial population we used does not exclude those objects with high area-to-mass ratio. Figure 13: Solar flux projections used in IADC comparison study. Figure 14: Area-to-mass ratio distributions of the initial population used in IADC comparison study. The differences in solar activity projection and initial population including both the number and area-to-mass ratio finally lead to a very different evolution result. 12. Summary and Future Work This paper mainly introduced the composition, submodel algorithm, and workflow of SOLEM, the space debris long-term evolution model of China. The reliability of SOLEM has been validated during the joint research of IADC. After that, the application work of SOLEM model on analyzing the effects of different mitigation measures on the evolution of space environment is presented. The result shows, with higher PMD rate, the current space environment will become **better and safer.** SOLEM is a LEO space debris evolution model with high flexibility. It is capable of simulating the space environment evolution with various assumptions. Therefore, it can be used to simulate and analyze the uncertainties affecting the space debris evolution, such as the future launches, solar activities, manual collision avoidance measures, and mitigation and remediation measures. Through simulation and analysis, SOLEM can help us to deeply understand the evolution process of space environment and provides technical support for making space policies and laws to guarantee the sustainability of space activities in future. At present, the orbital range covered by SOLEM is limited to LEO region from 200 km to 2000 km. In the next step, the orbital range covered by SOLEM will be expanded from LEO region to GEO (Geostationary Earth Orbit) region. Besides, the postmission disposal model will be optimized, including the disposed orbit selection process and the computation time.

#### *Alt causes swamp the AFF:*

#### *Mega-constellations of satellites produce unmanageable debris.*

**Boley & Byers 21** [Aaron C., Department of Physics and Astronomy @ The University of British Columbia\*, and Michael, Department of Political Science @ The University of British Columbia; Published: 20 May 2021; Scientific Reports; “Satellite mega-constellations create risks in Low Earth Orbit, the atmosphere and on Earth,” <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-021-89909-7>] brett

Companies are placing satellites into orbit at an unprecedented frequency to build **‘mega-constellations’** of communications satellites in Low Earth Orbit (**LEO**). **In two years**, the number of active and defunct satellites in **LEO** has increased by over 50%, to about **5000** (**as of** 30 March **2021**). **SpaceX** **alone** is on track to add 11,000 more as it builds its Starlink mega-constellation and has already filed for permission for another 30,000 satellites with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC)1. Others have similar plans, including **OneWeb, Amazon, Telesat,** and GW, which is a Chinese state-owned company2. The current governance system for LEO, while slowly changing, is ill-equipped to handle **large satellite systems**. Here, we outline how applying the consumer electronic model to satellites could lead to **multiple tragedies of the commons**. Some of these are well known, such as impediments to **astronomy** and an increased risk of **space debris**, while others have received insufficient attention, including changes to the **chemistry** of Earth’s **upper atmosphere** and **increased dangers** on Earth’s surface from **re-entered debris**. The heavy use of certain orbital regions might also result in a de facto exclusion of other actors from them, violating the 1967 **O**uter **S**pace **T**reaty. All of these challenges could be addressed in a coordinated manner through multilateral law-making, whether in the United Nations, the Inter-Agency Debris Committee (IADC), or an ad hoc process, rather than in an uncoordinated manner through different national laws. Regardless of the law-making forum, **mega-constellations** require a shift in perspectives and policies: from looking at single satellites, to evaluating systems of thousands of satellites, and doing so within an understanding of the limitations of Earth’s environment, including its orbits.

Thousands of **satellites** and 1500 rocket bodies provide **considerable mass** in LEO, which can break into debris upon **collisions**, explosions, or **degradation** in the **harsh space environment**. **Fragmentations** increase the **cross-section of orbiting material**, and with it, the **collision probability** per time. Eventually, collisions could dominate on-orbit evolution, a situation called the **Kessler Syndrome**3. There are already over 12,000 trackable debris pieces in LEO, with these being typically 10 cm in diameter or larger. Including sizes down to 1 cm, there are about a million inferred debris pieces, all of which threaten satellites, spacecraft and astronauts due to their orbits crisscrossing at high relative speeds. Simulations of the **long-term evolution** of debris suggest that LEO is already in the protracted **initial stages of the Kessler Syndrome**, but that this could be managed through **a**ctive **d**ebris **r**emoval4. The addition of satellite **mega-constellations** and the general proliferation of low-cost satellites in LEO **stresses the environment further**5,6,7,8.

Results

The overall setting

The rapid development of the space environment through mega-constellations, predominately by the ongoing construction of Starlink, is shown by the cumulative payload distribution function (Fig. 1). From an environmental perspective, the slope change in the distribution function defines NewSpace, an era of dominance by commercial actors. Before 2015, changes in the total on-orbit objects came principally from fragmentations, with effects of the 2007 Chinese anti-satellite test and the 2009 Kosmos-2251/Iridium-33 collisions being evident on the graph.
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Cumulative on-orbit distribution functions (all orbits). Deorbited objects are not included. The 2007 and 2009 spikes are a Chinese anti-satellite test and the Iridium 33-Kosmos 2251 collision, respectively. The recent, rapid rise of the orange curve represents NewSpace (see "Methods").
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Although the volume of space is large, individual satellites and satellite systems have specific functions, with associated altitudes and inclinations (Fig. 2). This increases congestion and requires active management for station keeping and collision avoidance9, with automatic collision-avoidance technology still under development. Improved space situational awareness is required, with data from operators as well as ground- and space-based sensors being widely and freely shared10. Improved communications between satellite operators are also necessary: in 2019, the European Space Agency moved an Earth observation satellite to avoid colliding with a Starlink satellite, after failing to reach SpaceX by e-mail. Internationally adopted ‘right of way’ rules are needed10 to prevent games of ‘chicken’, as companies seek to preserve thruster fuel and avoid service interruptions. SpaceX and NASA recently announced11 a cooperative agreement to help reduce the risk of collisions, but this is only one operator and one agency.
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Orbital distribution and density information for objects in Low Earth Orbit (LEO). (Left) Distribution of payloads (active and defunct satellites), binned to the nearest 1 km in altitude and 1° in orbital inclination. The centre of each circle represents the position on the diagram, and the size of the circle is proportional to the number of satellites within the given parameter space. (Right) Number density of different space resident objects (SROs) based on 1 km radial bins, averaged over the entire sky. Because SRO objects are on elliptical orbits, the contribution of a given object to an orbital shell is weighted by the time that object spends in the shell. Despite significant parameter space, satellites are clustered in their orbits due to mission requirements. The emerging Starlink cluster at 550 km and 55° inclination is already evident in both plots (Left and Right).
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When completed, **Starlink** will include about as many satellites as there are trackable debris pieces today, while its **total mass will equal all the mass currently in LEO**—over 3000 tonnes. The satellites will be placed in narrow orbital shells, creating **unprecedented congestion**, with 1258 already in orbit (as of 30 March 2021). **OneWeb** has already placed an initial 146 satellites, and **Amazon,** **Telesat,** **GW** and **other companies,** operating under different national regulatory regimes, are soon likely to follow.

**Enhanced collision risk**

Mega-constellations are composed of **mass-produced satellites** with **few backup systems**. This consumer electronic model allows for short upgrade cycles and rapid expansions of capabilities, but also **considerable discarded equipment**. SpaceX will actively de-orbit its satellites at the end of their 5–6-year operational lives. However, this process takes 6 months, so roughly 10% will be de-orbiting at any time. If other companies do likewise, thousands of **de-orbiting satellites** will be slowly passing through the same congested space, posing collision risks. Failures will increase these numbers, although the long-term failure rate is difficult to project. Figure 3 is similar to the righthand portion of Fig. 2 but includes the Starlink and OneWeb mega-constellations as filed (and amended) with the FCC (see “Methods”). The large density spikes show that some shells will have satellite number densities in excess of n=10−6 km−3.

Figure 3
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Satellite density distribution in LEO with the Starlink and OneWeb mega-constellations as filed (and amended) with the FCC. Provided that the orbits are nearly circular, the number densities in those shells will exceed 10–6 km−3. Because the collisional cross-section in those shells is also high, they represent regions that have a high collision risk whenever debris is too small to be tracked or collision avoidance manoeuvres are impossible for other reasons.
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Deorbiting satellites will be tracked and operational satellites can manoeuvre to avoid close conjunctions. However, this depends on ongoing communication and cooperation between operators, which at present is ad hoc and voluntary. A recent letter12 to the FCC from SpaceX suggests that some **companies might be less-than-fully transparent** about events13 in LEO.

Despite the congestion and traffic management challenges, FCC filings by **SpaceX** suggest that collision avoidance manoeuvres can in fact maintain collision-free operations in orbital shells and that the probability of a collision between a non-responsive satellite and tracked debris is negligible. However, the **filings do not account for untracked debris**6, including untracked debris decaying through the shells used by Starlink. Using simple estimates (see “Methods”), the probability that a single piece of untracked debris will hit any satellite in the Starlink 550 km shell is about 0.003 after one year. Thus, if at any time there are 230 pieces of **untracked debris** decaying through the 550 km orbital shell, there is a **50% chance** that there will be one or more collisions between satellites in the shell and the debris. As discussed further in “Methods”, such a situation is plausible. Depending on the balance between the de-orbit and the collision rates, if **subsequent fragmentation** events lead to **similar amounts of debris within that orbital shell**, **a runaway cascade of collisions could occur**.

Fragmentation events are not confined to their local orbits, either. The India 2019 ASAT test was conducted at an altitude below 300 km in an effort to minimize long-lived debris. Nevertheless, debris was placed on orbits with apogees in excess of 1000 km. As of 30 March 2021, three tracked debris pieces remain in orbit14. Such long-lived debris has high eccentricities, and thus can cross multiple orbital shells twice per orbit. **A major fragmentation event from a single satellite could affect all operators in LEO**.

Even if debris collisions were avoidable, meteoroids are always a threat. The cumulative meteoroid flux15 for masses m > 10–2 g is about 1.2 × 10–4 meteoroids m−2 year−1 (see “Methods”). Such masses could cause non-negligible damage to satellites16. Assuming a Starlink constellation of 12,000 satellites (i.e. the initial phase), there is about a 50% chance of 15 or more meteoroid impacts per year at m > 10–2 g. Satellites will have shielding, but events that might be rare to a single satellite could become common across the constellation.

One partial response to these congestion and collision concerns is for operators to construct mega-constellations out of a smaller number of satellites. But this does not, individually or collectively, eliminate the need for an all-of-LEO approach to evaluating the effects of the construction and maintenance of any one constellation.

#### *Kessler syndrome is a process not an event---timeframe is decades and intervening actors check.*

**Burns Interviewing Kessler ’13** Corrinne Burns, interviewing Donald Kessler, who made up the concept. [Space junk apocalypse: just like Gravity? 11-15-2013, <https://www.theguardian.com/science/blog/2013/nov/15/space-junk-apocalypse-gravity]//BPS>

Now? Are we in trouble? Not yet. Kessler syndrome isn't **an acute phenomenon**, as depicted in the movie – it's **a slow, decades-long process**. "It'll happen throughout **the next 100 years** – we have time to deal with it," Kessler says. "The time between collisions will become shorter – it's around 10 years at the moment. In 20 years' time, the time between collisions could be reduced to five years." Fortunately, communications satellites are, in the main, situated high up in geosynchronous orbit (GEO), whereas the risk of collisions lies mainly in the much lower, and more crowded, low Earth orbit (LEO). But that doesn't mean we can relax. "We've got to get a handle on it – we need to prevent the cascade process from speeding up." And the only way to do that is, he says, to begin actively removing junk from space. Charlotte Bewick agrees. She's a mission concepts engineer with the German space technology company OHB System, with special expertise in space junk – specifically, how we can capture it and bring it back to Earth. While agreeing with Kessler that the movie scenario is exaggerated, she remains concerned. "Fragments of junk can naturally re-enter the atmosphere [and so be removed from orbit]. But we're at the stage where the rate of creation of new debris fragments is higher than the rate of natural removal. The orbits most at risk harbour important space assets – satellites for weather forecasting, oil spill and bush fire detection, and polar ice monitoring." Bewick highlights the case of Envisat, a defunct 8,000kg spacecraft circling Earth in an orbit that is very popular with space agencies and, hence, pretty crowded. "If Envisat collides with a piece of debris or a micrometeorite, the fragments could render the whole orbital region unusable." So can we get the junk down, I asked Massimiliano Vasile, part of the Mechanical & Aerospace Department at the University of Strathclyde and co-ordinator of the Stardust network. He told me defunct satellites in the high GEO region have, for some time, been shifted to higher "graveyard orbits" to keep them out of the way. But that's not an option for items in low Earth orbit. For this, he tells me, researchers are looking seriously into active debris removal – in-orbit capture techniques like harpooning, netting and tethering, the use of contactless systems like ion-beams or lasers, and even onboard robotics to position the junk away from high-risk orbital regions. As for middle Earth orbit – well, ideas are welcome, he says. We're in no **immediate danger** from Kessler syndrome – but it's not a problem that's going away. Despite Gravity's artistic license, Donald Kessler is pleased to see the phenomenon represented on the big screen. "It is **very improbable** that events would play out as they did in the film," he says. "But if it raises awareness, then that's great."