## 1AC

### 1AC – Cosmic Colonialism

#### Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

#### The Advantage is Cosmic Colonialism.

#### Private appropriation of outer space expands corporate colonialism.

Shammas and Holen 19 [(Victor L, a sociologist working at the Department of Sociology and Human Geography, University of Oslo; Tomas B., independent scholar in Oslo, Norway) “One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space,” 1-29-2019, pg. 3-5] TDI

The 2010s may very well be remembered as the ‘Age of NewSpace', the decade when outer space was turned into a capitalist space, when private corporations pushed the price of launches, satellites, and space infrastructure downwards, exerting what industry insiders call the ‘SpaceX effect' (Henry, 2018), centered on the technological achievement of ‘reusability', recovering used rocket boosters for additional launches, promising to drastically reduce the price of going to space (Morring, 2016). As one report observes, ‘Not only has the number of private companies engaged in space exploration grown remarkably in recent years, these companies are quickly besting their government-sponsored competitors' (Houser, 2017). What the rockets, shuttles, ships, and landing pods will carry beneath their payload fairing or in their cargo hold, however, along with supplies and satellites, is the capitalist worldview, a particular ideology—just as Robinson Crusoe, in Marx’s ironic retelling in Capital, ‘having saved a watch, ledger, ink and pen from the shipwreck… soon begins, like a good Englishman, to keep a set of books' (Marx, 1976, p. 170), brings with him English political economy—'Freedom, Equality, Property and Bentham', as Marx (1976, p. 280) says elsewhere— to his desert island.

In early 2018, astronomers across the world learned that a New Zealand start-up, Rocket Lab, which aimed to launch thousands of miniature satellites into orbit around Earth (so-called ‘smallsats'), had planned to launch a giant, shining ‘disco ball'—the ‘Humanity Star'—into orbit around Earth. It was an elaborate marketing stunt masked by humanistic idealism. ‘No matter where you are in the world, or what is happening in your life', said Rocket Lab CEO Peter Beck, ‘everyone will be able to see the Humanity Star in the night sky' (Amos, 2018). Many astronomers expressed outrage at these plans, fearing that the light from the Human Star would threaten their ability to carry out scientific observations. But while these astronomers were incensed by the idea of a bright geodesic object disrupting their ability to carry out observations, concerns with the effects of the arrival of capitalistkind on their ability to collect data were non-existent. The astronomical community was angered by the idea of a material, concrete, visible object polluting “pure” scientific data, but it paid less attention to the (invisible and abstract) recuperation of the night sky as it was brought into the fold of capitalism.

In an interview, Beck was quizzed about the Humanity Star and asked by a reporter about the difficulties of generating profits in space (Tucker, 2018). To this Beck replied, ‘It has always been a government domain, but we’re witnessing the democratization of it…[I]t [is] turning into a commercially dominated domain'. Beck established an equivalence established between the dissolution of space as the rightful domain of states and the advent of profitmaking ventures as signs of ‘democratization'. In space, according to Beck’s logic, democratization involves the disappearance of the state and the rise of capital. The argument, of course, is impeccably post-statist: on this account, states are monolithic, conservative Leviathans beyond the reach of popular control; corporations, on the other hand, are in principle representatives of the everyman: in the age of the start-up, any humble citizen could in theory become an agent of disruption, a force for change, an explorer of space, and a potential member of the cadre of capitalistkind. Following this logic, the question for the entrepreneurs of NewSpace is how to monetize outer space, which means turning space into a space for capital; their question is how they can deplanetarize capital and universalize it, literally speaking, that is, turn the Universe into a universe for capital. In this light, Peter Beck’s distortion of democratic ideals appears eminently sensible, equating democratization with monetization, that is, capital liberated from its earthly tethers.

Emblematic of this capitalist turn in space was the founding of Moon Express in 2011, composed of a ‘team of prominent Silicon Valley entrepreneurs…shooting for the moon with a new private venture aimed at scouring the lunar surface for precious metals and rare metallic elements' (Hennigan, 2011). Following Google’s Lunar XPRIZE—an intertwining of Silicon Valley and NewSpace’s capitalistkind—which promised a $20 million prize for the first private company to land a spacecraft on the Moon, travel 500 meters, and transmit high-definition images back to Earth, all by March 2018,9 Moon Express claimed that it would be capable of landing on the lunar surface and earn the cash prize. Their stated goal was twofold: first, to mine rare resource like Helium-3 (a steadily dwindling scarce resources on Earth), gold, platinum group metals, and water, and, second, to carry out scientific work that would ‘help researchers develop human space colonies for future generations' (Ioannou, 2017). The ordering is telling: first profits, then humanity. These were the hollow, insubstantial promises of a venture-capitalized NewSpace enterprise: in early 2018, Google announced that none of the five teams competing for the Lunar XPRIZE, including Moon Express, would reach their stated objectives by the 31 March deadline and they were taking their money back (Grush, 2018). In this sense, it was typical for NewSpace in its formative years: a corporate field populated by (overly exuberant) private enterprises who promised more than they could deliver. But the belief in NewSpace is real enough. In a tome bursting with the optimism of NewSpace, Wohlforth and Hendrix claim that ‘the commercial spaceflight industry is transforming our sense of possibility. Using Silicon Valley’s money and innovative confidence, it will soon bring mass space products to the market' (2016, p. 7).

The trope of humanity plays a key role in the rhetoric of the adherents of NewSpace. To fulfill the objectives of NewSpace, including profit maximization and the exploitation of celestial bodies, the symbolic figure of a shared humanity serves a useful purpose, camouflaging the conquest of space by capitalism with a dream of humanity boldly venturing forth into the dark unknown, thereby also providing the legitimacy and enthusiasm needed to support bolster the legitimacy of NewSpace. So long as the stargazers and SpaceX watchers are permitted their fill of ‘collective effervescence', to use Durkheim’s (1995, p. 228) concept, capitalist entrepreneurs will be able to pursue their business interests more or less as they please. The spectacle of outer space is crucial in this regard.

Crucially, however, and despite this spectacle, SpaceX’s technology might not necessarily be more sophisticated than its competitors or predecessors. Some industry insiders have rebuffed some of the more the spectacular claims of NewSpace’s proponents, arguing that launch vehicle reusability requires a (perhaps prohibitively) expensive refurbishing of the rocket engines involved in launches: ‘The economics will depend on how many times a booster can be flown, and how much the individual expense will be to refurbish the booster…each time' (Chang, 2017). Reusability may be a technological dead-end because of the inherently stressful effects of a rocket launch on the launch vehicle’s components, with extreme limitations on reusability beyond second-use as well as added risks of malfunctions that customers and insurers are likely to wish to avoid. Furthermore, the Falcon Heavy still has not matched the power and payload capacity of NASA’s Saturn V, a product of 1960s military-industrial engineering and Fordist state spending programs. What SpaceX and other NewSpace corporations do with great ingenuity, however, is to manage the spectacle of outer space, producing outpourings of public fervor, aided by a widespread adherence to the ‘Californian Ideology' (Barbrook and Cameron, 1996), or post-statist techno-utopianism, in many postindustrialized societies.

The very centrality of these maneuvers has initiated a new phase in the history of capitalist relations, that of ‘charismatic accumulation'—certainly not in the sense of any ‘objective' or inherent charismatic authority, but with a form of illusio, to speak with Bourdieu, vested in the members of capitalistkind by their uncanny ability to spin mythologizing self-narratives. This has always been part of the capitalist game, from Henry Ford and onwards, but the charismatic mission gains a special potency in the grandiose designs of NewSpace’s entrepreneurs. Every SpaceX launch is a quasi-religious spectacle, observed by millions capable of producing a real sense of wonder in a condition of (legitimizing) collective effervescence.

Outer space necessarily reduces inter-human difference to a common denominator or a shared species-being. An important leitmotiv in many Hollywood science fiction movies, including Arrival (2016), is that a first encounter with an alien species of intelligent beings tends to flatten all human difference (including ethnoracial and national categories), thereby restoring humankind to its proper universality (see also Novoa, 2016). Ambassadors of Earth as a whole, not representatives of particular nations, step forth to meet alien emissaries. But even in the absence of such an encounter, the search for habitable domains (or rather, profitable locales) beyond Earth will necessarily forge a shared conception of the human condition, initiated with the Pale Blue Dot photograph in 1990. Typical of this sentiment are the words of the astronomer Carl Sagan, who famously observed of this photograph: ‘On it everyone you love, everyone you know, everyone you ever heard of, every human being who ever was, lived out their lives'.

This naïvely humanistic vision has been one of the dominant tropes in the discourse on space since the 1950s, and it remains strong today, as with the claims of the United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs (UNOOSA) that their task is to ‘uphold the vision of a more equitable future for all humankind through shared achievements in space'. This representational tendency mobilizes humanism to generate enthusiasm about space-related activities. But such representations are increasingly being recuperated by capitalist enterprise, so that it is not humankind but its modulation by space capitalists that will launch into the dark unknown. It is not humankind but capitalistkind that ventures forth. In early 2018, NASA was set to request $150 million in its 2019 budget to ‘enable the development and maturation of commercial entities and capabilities which will ensure that commercial successors to the ISS…are operational when they are needed', only one of many signs that space is becoming a space for capitalism. According to one estimate, the value of just one single asteroid would be more than $20 trillion in rare earth and platinum-group metals (Lewis, 1996), a precious prize indeed for profit-hungry corporations.10 Even the UNOOSA spoke vociferously in favor of the commercialization of space, appealing variously to the ‘industry and private sector' and elevating the ‘space economy' to a central pillar in its Space2030 Agenda (including the ‘use of resources that create and provide value and benefits to the world population in the course of exploring, understanding and utilizing space'), even as the UN agency falls back on a humanistic, almost social-democratic vision of the equitable distribution of benefits (and profits) from space mining, exploration, and colonization (UNOOSA, 2018).

We find evidence of this strategic humanism in all manner of pronouncements from NewSpace entrepreneurs. To take but one example: Naveen Jain, the chairman and co-founder of MoonEx, a lunar commercialization firm, has claimed that ‘from an entrepreneur’s perspective, the moon has never truly been explored'. The moon, Jain has claimed, ‘could hold resources that benefit Earth and all humanity' (Hennigan, 2011). We should note the recourse to the trope of all of humanity by this NewSpace entrepreneur, mimicked in the 1979 Moon Agreement, a UN treaty, which also held that the Moon’s resources are ‘the common heritage of mankind' (Tronchetti, 2013, p. 13).11 In a purely factual sense, of course, Jain is wrong: Google Moon offers high-resolution images of the lunar surface,12 and the moon has already been explored, in the sense of being mapped, albeit rudimentarily and with room for further data collection. Crucially, however, these cartographic techniques have not been put to capitalist uses: mapping minerals, for instance, or producing detailed schemata that might one day turn the Moon into a ‘gas station' for commercial space ventures, as Wilbur Ross, Trump’s Secretary of Commerce, has proposed (Bryan, 2018). What is lacking, in short, are capitalist maps of the Moon, i.e., a cartography for capital. But as Klinger (2017: 199) notes, even though no one is ‘actively mining the Moon' at present, at least ‘six national space programs, fifty private firms, and one graduate engineering program, are intent on figuring out how to do so'; furthermore, Klinger draws attention to mapping efforts that have revealed high an abundance of rare earth metals, thorium, and iron in the Moon’s ‘Mare Procellarum KREEP' region (Klinger, 2017, p. 203).

We have already noted that it is not humanity, conceived as species-being, a Gattungswesen, that makes its way into space. The term Gattungswesen, of course, has a long intellectual pedigree, harking back to Hegel, Feuerbach, Marx, and others. The term can ‘be naturally applied both to the individual human being and to the common nature or essence which resides in every individual man and woman', Allan Wood (2004, p. 17) writes, as well as ‘to the entire human race, referring to humanity as a single collective entity or else to the essential property which characterizes this entity and makes it a single distinctive thing in its own right'. Significantly, the adherents of NewSpace often resort to the idea of humanity in its broad universality (e.g., Musk, 2017), but this denies and distorts the modulation of humanity by its imbrication with the project of global (and post-global, i.e., space-bound) capitalism. It is precisely the sort of false universality implied in the humanism of the supporters of NewSpace that Marx subjected to a scathing critique in the sixth of his Theses on Feuerbach. Here Marx noted that the human essence is not made up of some ‘abstraction inherent in each single individual' (1998, p. 570). Instead, humans are defined by the ‘ensemble of social relations' in which they are enmeshed. Under NewSpace, it is not humanity, plain and simple, that ventures forth, but a specific set of capitalist entrepreneurs, carrying a particular ideological payload, alongside their satellites, instruments, and supplies, a point noted by other sociologists of outer space, or ‘astrosociologists' (Dickens and Ormrod, 2007a, 2007b).

#### The insistence on outer space as corporate capital’s spatial fix accelerates environmental degradation.

Shammas and Holen 19 [(Victor L, a sociologist working at the Department of Sociology and Human Geography, University of Oslo; Tomas B., independent scholar in Oslo, Norway) “One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space,” 1-29-2019, pg. 6-8] julian

As Earth’s empty spaces are filled, as our planet comes to be shorn of blank places, capitalistkind emerges to rescue capitalism from its terrestrial limitations, launching space rockets, placing satellites into orbit, appropriating extraterrestrial resources, and, perhaps one day, building colonies on distant planets like Mars. But why limit ourselves to Mars? As of mid-2017, NASA’s Kepler observatory had discovered more than 5000 exoplanets—planets that seem like promising alternatives to Earth, located at an appropriate distance from their respective suns in the famed ‘Goldilocks zone'. These ‘planetary candidates', as they are known —that is, candidates for the replacement of Earth, capable of supporting human life with only minimal technological augmentation or cybernetic re-engineering—are above all viable candidates for selection by specific capitalists seeking to discover new profitable ventures beyond the limits of an Earth-bound capitalism. Space reveals the impotence of the neoliberal, postFordist state, its incapacity and unwillingness to embark on gigantic infrastructural projects, to project itself outwards, and to fire the imagination of (actual) humankind. Capitalistkind steps in to fill the vacuum left behind by a state that lacks what Mann (2012, p. 170) calls ‘infrastructural power'. The old question, the question of Old Space, was quite simply: is this planet a viable site for humankind, a suitable homeland for the reproduction of human life away from Earth? But the new question, the question for NewSpace, will be: can this celestial body support capitalistkind? Will it support the interests of capitalist entrepreneurs, answering to the capitalist desire for continued accumulation?

While some elements of the astrosociological community, such as the Astrosociology Research Institute (ARI),14 insist on elucidating the “human dimension” in outer space, Dickens and Ormrod recognize that this humanization-through-capitalism really involves the ‘commodification of the universe' (2007b, p. 2). While Dickens and Ormrod develop similar arguments to those sketched here—from their concept of an ‘outer spatial fix' to their argument about outer space becoming woven into circuits of capital accumulation—they were writing at a time when their remarks necessarily remained speculative: the commercialization of space was still in its infancy. In an inversion of Hegel’s owl of Minerva, reality has since largely confirmed their ideas and caught up with theory. Above all, when considering the various ventures ongoing in space today, it is not so much the universalizing human dimension as the specifically capitalist dimension that is striking. With the advent of NewSpace, outer space is becoming not the domain of a common humanity but of private capital.

The arguments laid out above mirror an ongoing turn in critical scholarship away from the notion of the Anthropocene towards a more rigorously political-economic concept of Capitalocene, premised on the ‘claim that capitalism is the pivot of today’s biospheric crisis' (Moore, 2016, p. xi). Just as the exponents of the concept of Capitalocene emphasize that it is capitalism, and not humanity as such, that is the driving force behind environmental transformation, so too does the notion of capitalistkind emphasize that it is not humankind tout court but rather a set of specific capitalist entrepreneurs who are acting as the central transformative agents of and in outer space, with the ‘ever-increasing infiltration of capital' into what was formerly the domain of the state (Dickens and Ormrod, 2007a, p. 6). We can also think about these issues in terms of what Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos (2015) terms ‘spatial justice'. This concept captures the fact that struggles over justice are often struggles to occupy space, as the term is more conventionally understood, as with urban battles over the ‘right to the city' (Harvey, 2008), to provide just one example. But the same also holds true for outer space: there is an ongoing struggle over the right to take up space in outer space. So far, the capitalist side appears to be winning. As the proto-communism of the Cold War-era Outer Space Treaty is abandoned—in tandem with the increased technological feasibility of exploiting resources and accumulating profits in outer space—spatial justice in outer space increasingly comes to mean the ‘justice' of capital, capitalistkind taking the place of humankind. It is comparatively easy to declare that outer space is a commons, as the Outer Space Treaty did in the late 1960s, when that domain is, for all practical purposes, inaccessible to capital; with the heightened accessibility of outer space, however, it is unsurprising that central political agents, such as President Trump’s administration, should seek to dismantle this regulatory framework and ensure the smooth functioning of capital accumulation beyond the terrains of Earth.

What kind of capitalism is being projected into space? The complexity of state-market relations is sufficient to force us to hedge against a simplified reading of space commercialization: it is not a matter of states against markets, as if the two were mutually exclusive. Instead, as Bratton (2015) suggests, we are witnessing the emergence of a ‘stack', a complex intertwining of commercial, geopolitical, and technological concerns, which challenges previous notions of state sovereignty. This can be seen as a hybridized state-market form, with technology playing a central role in reciprocal processes of political and economic transformation. On the one hand, outer space was in some sense always already the domain of marketization, albeit to a limited extent, even during the Cold War, from the first commercial satellite launch in the early 1960s to President Ronald Reagan’s implementation of the Commercial Space Launch Act of 1984, which aimed to encourage private enterprise to take an interest in an emerging launch market. As Hermann Bondi, the head of the European Space Organization, wrote in the early 1970s, ‘It is clear…that there must be three partners in space, universities and research institutions on the one hand, the government on the second and industry on the third' (Bondi, 1971, p. 9).

On the other hand, outer space still remains firmly within the domain of the state and is likely to do so for the foreseeable future, with the likely continued importance of military uses of satellite technology and the weaponization of Earth’s orbit— crucially, the Outer Space Treaty only prohibits nuclear arms and other ‘weapons of mass destruction' in space, not conventional weapons, such as ballistic missiles. One novel element in this phase of capitalism-in-space is the interrelationship between Silicon Valley, NewSpace, and the state (see, e.g., Vance, 2015). Silicon Valley’s capitalist class, including Amazon’s Jeff Bezos, play an outsize role in NewSpace. Behind and around these figures, however, remains the state—through its weighty fiscal, regulatory, military, and symbolic investments.15 To take but one example: In June 2018, SpaceX won a $130 million contract with the U.S. Air Force to launch an ‘Air Force Space Command' satellite onboard a Falcon Heavy rocket (Erwin, 2018).

Fredric Jameson’s (2003, p. 76) oft-quoted observation that it is easier to imagine the end of humankind than the end of capitalism, is realized in the ideals and operations of capitalistkind. Elon Musk has observed that the goal of SpaceX is to establish humankind as a ‘multiplanetary species with a self-sustaining civilization on another planet' whose purpose is to counteract the possibility of a ‘worst-case scenario happening and extinguishing human consciousness' (Vance, 2015, p. 5). But couldn’t we view this idealistic assertion on behalf of humanity in another way? It is not human consciousness, over and against what the writer Kim Stanley Robinson (2017, p. 2) calls ‘mineral unconsciousness' (i.e., the mute, geological reality of the natural universe), so much as a specifically capitalist consciousness that is at stake. While the actions of capitalistkind may primarily be aimed at ensuring the future survival of the human species, an additional result is to ensure that the very idea of capitalism itself will outlive a (distantly) possible extinction event. Capitalism is a self-replicating system, pushing to expand ever outwards, using a territorializing strategy of survival. As David Harvey notes, ‘a steady rate of growth is essential for the health of a capitalist economic system, since it is only through growth that profits can be assured and the accumulation of capital be sustained' (1990, p. 180). In this respect, outer space is ideal: it is boundless and infinite. As Earth comes to be blanketed by capital, it is only to be expected that capital should set its sights on the stars above. The actions of capitalistkind serve to bolster the capitalist mode of production and accumulation: it is not only life but capital itself that must outlive Earth—even into the darkness of space.

#### Environmental degradation causes extinction.

Dr. Peter Kareiva 18, Ph.D. in Ecology and Applied Mathematics from Cornell University, Director of the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at UCLA, Pritzker Distinguished Professor in Environment & Sustainability at UCLA, et al., September 2018, “Existential Risk Due To Ecosystem Collapse: Nature Strikes Back”, Futures, Volume 102, p. 39-50

In summary, six of the nine proposed planetary boundaries (phosphorous, nitrogen, biodiversity, land use, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution) are unlikely to be associated with existential risks. They all correspond to a degraded environment, but in our assessment do not represent existential risks. However, the three remaining boundaries (climate change, global freshwater cycle, and ocean acidification) do pose existential risks. This is because of intrinsic positive feedback loops, substantial lag times between system change and experiencing the consequences of that change, and the fact these different boundaries interact with one another in ways that yield surprises. In addition, climate, freshwater, and ocean acidification are all directly connected to the provision of food and water, and shortages of food and water can create conflict and social unrest.

Climate change has a long history of disrupting civilizations and sometimes precipitating the collapse of cultures or mass emigrations (McMichael, 2017). For example, the 12th century drought in the North American Southwest is held responsible for the collapse of the Anasazi pueblo culture. More recently, the infamous potato famine of 1846–1849 and the large migration of Irish to the U.S. can be traced to a combination of factors, one of which was climate. Specifically, 1846 was an unusually warm and moist year in Ireland, providing the climatic conditions favorable to the fungus that caused the potato blight. As is so often the case, poor government had a role as well—as the British government forbade the import of grains from outside Britain (imports that could have helped to redress the ravaged potato yields).

Climate change intersects with freshwater resources because it is expected to exacerbate drought and water scarcity, as well as flooding. Climate change can even impair water quality because it is associated with heavy rains that overwhelm sewage treatment facilities, or because it results in higher concentrations of pollutants in groundwater as a result of enhanced evaporation and reduced groundwater recharge. Ample clean water is not a luxury—it is essential for human survival. Consequently, cities, regions and nations that lack clean freshwater are vulnerable to social disruption and disease.

Finally, ocean acidification is linked to climate change because it is driven by CO2 emissions just as global warming is. With close to 20% of the world’s protein coming from oceans (FAO, 2016), the potential for severe impacts due to acidification is obvious. Less obvious, but perhaps more insidious, is the interaction between climate change and the loss of oyster and coral reefs due to acidification. Acidification is known to interfere with oyster reef building and coral reefs. Climate change also increases storm frequency and severity. Coral reefs and oyster reefs provide protection from storm surge because they reduce wave energy (Spalding et al., 2014). If these reefs are lost due to acidification at the same time as storms become more severe and sea level rises, coastal communities will be exposed to unprecedented storm surge—and may be ravaged by recurrent storms.

A key feature of the risk associated with climate change is that mean annual temperature and mean annual rainfall are not the variables of interest. Rather it is extreme episodic events that place nations and entire regions of the world at risk. These extreme events are by definition “rare” (once every hundred years), and changes in their likelihood are challenging to detect because of their rarity, but are exactly the manifestations of climate change that we must get better at anticipating (Diffenbaugh et al., 2017). Society will have a hard time responding to shorter intervals between rare extreme events because in the lifespan of an individual human, a person might experience as few as two or three extreme events. How likely is it that you would notice a change in the interval between events that are separated by decades, especially given that the interval is not regular but varies stochastically? A concrete example of this dilemma can be found in the past and expected future changes in storm-related flooding of New York City. The highly disruptive flooding of New York City associated with Hurricane Sandy represented a flood height that occurred once every 500 years in the 18th century, and that occurs now once every 25 years, but is expected to occur once every 5 years by 2050 (Garner et al., 2017). This change in frequency of extreme floods has profound implications for the measures New York City should take to protect its infrastructure and its population, yet because of the stochastic nature of such events, this shift in flood frequency is an elevated risk that will go unnoticed by most people.

4. The combination of positive feedback loops and societal inertia is fertile ground for global environmental catastrophes.

Humans are remarkably ingenious, and have adapted to crises throughout their history. Our doom has been repeatedly predicted, only to be averted by innovation (Ridley, 2011). However, the many stories of human ingenuity successfully addressing existential risks such as global famine or extreme air pollution represent environmental challenges that are largely linear, have immediate consequences, and operate without positive feedbacks. For example, the fact that food is in short supply does not increase the rate at which humans consume food—thereby increasing the shortage. Similarly, massive air pollution episodes such as the London fog of 1952 that killed 12,000 people did not make future air pollution events more likely. In fact it was just the opposite—the London fog sent such a clear message that Britain quickly enacted pollution control measures (Stradling, 2016). Food shortages, air pollution, water pollution, etc. send immediate signals to society of harm, which then trigger a negative feedback of society seeking to reduce the harm.

In contrast, today’s great environmental crisis of climate change may cause some harm but there are generally long time delays between rising CO2 concentrations and damage to humans. The consequence of these delays are an absence of urgency; thus although 70% of Americans believe global warming is happening, only 40% think it will harm them (http://climatecommunication.yale.edu/visualizations-data/ycom-us-2016/). Secondly, unlike past environmental challenges, the Earth’s climate system is rife with positive feedback loops. In particular, as CO2 increases and the climate warms, that very warming can cause more CO2 release which further increases global warming, and then more CO2, and so on. Table 2 summarizes the best documented positive feedback loops for the Earth’s climate system. These feedbacks can be neatly categorized into carbon cycle, biogeochemical, biogeophysical, cloud, ice-albedo, and water vapor feedbacks. As important as it is to understand these feedbacks individually, it is even more essential to study the interactive nature of these feedbacks. Modeling studies show that when interactions among feedback loops are included, uncertainty increases dramatically and there is a heightened potential for perturbations to be magnified (e.g., Cox, Betts, Jones, Spall, & Totterdell, 2000; Hajima, Tachiiri, Ito, & Kawamiya, 2014; Knutti & Rugenstein, 2015; Rosenfeld, Sherwood, Wood, & Donner, 2014). This produces a wide range of future scenarios.

Positive feedbacks in the carbon cycle involves the enhancement of future carbon contributions to the atmosphere due to some initial increase in atmospheric CO2. This happens because as CO2 accumulates, it reduces the efficiency in which oceans and terrestrial ecosystems sequester carbon, which in return feeds back to exacerbate climate change (Friedlingstein et al., 2001). Warming can also increase the rate at which organic matter decays and carbon is released into the atmosphere, thereby causing more warming (Melillo et al., 2017). Increases in food shortages and lack of water is also of major concern when biogeophysical feedback mechanisms perpetuate drought conditions. The underlying mechanism here is that losses in vegetation increases the surface albedo, which suppresses rainfall, and thus enhances future vegetation loss and more suppression of rainfall—thereby initiating or prolonging a drought (Chamey, Stone, & Quirk, 1975). To top it off, overgrazing depletes the soil, leading to augmented vegetation loss (Anderies, Janssen, & Walker, 2002).

Climate change often also increases the risk of forest fires, as a result of higher temperatures and persistent drought conditions. The expectation is that forest fires will become more frequent and severe with climate warming and drought (Scholze, Knorr, Arnell, & Prentice, 2006), a trend for which we have already seen evidence (Allen et al., 2010). Tragically, the increased severity and risk of Southern California wildfires recently predicted by climate scientists (Jin et al., 2015), was realized in December 2017, with the largest fire in the history of California (the “Thomas fire” that burned 282,000 acres, https://www.vox.com/2017/12/27/16822180/thomas-fire-california-largest-wildfire). This catastrophic fire embodies the sorts of positive feedbacks and interacting factors that could catch humanity off-guard and produce a true apocalyptic event. Record-breaking rains produced an extraordinary flush of new vegetation, that then dried out as record heat waves and dry conditions took hold, coupled with stronger than normal winds, and ignition. Of course the record-fire released CO2 into the atmosphere, thereby contributing to future warming.

Out of all types of feedbacks, water vapor and the ice-albedo feedbacks are the most clearly understood mechanisms. Losses in reflective snow and ice cover drive up surface temperatures, leading to even more melting of snow and ice cover—this is known as the ice-albedo feedback (Curry, Schramm, & Ebert, 1995). As snow and ice continue to melt at a more rapid pace, millions of people may be displaced by flooding risks as a consequence of sea level rise near coastal communities (Biermann & Boas, 2010; Myers, 2002; Nicholls et al., 2011). The water vapor feedback operates when warmer atmospheric conditions strengthen the saturation vapor pressure, which creates a warming effect given water vapor’s strong greenhouse gas properties (Manabe & Wetherald, 1967).

Global warming tends to increase cloud formation because warmer temperatures lead to more evaporation of water into the atmosphere, and warmer temperature also allows the atmosphere to hold more water. The key question is whether this increase in clouds associated with global warming will result in a positive feedback loop (more warming) or a negative feedback loop (less warming). For decades, scientists have sought to answer this question and understand the net role clouds play in future climate projections (Schneider et al., 2017). Clouds are complex because they both have a cooling (reflecting incoming solar radiation) and warming (absorbing incoming solar radiation) effect (Lashof, DeAngelo, Saleska, & Harte, 1997). The type of cloud, altitude, and optical properties combine to determine how these countervailing effects balance out. Although still under debate, it appears that in most circumstances the cloud feedback is likely positive (Boucher et al., 2013). For example, models and observations show that increasing greenhouse gas concentrations reduces the low-level cloud fraction in the Northeast Pacific at decadal time scales. This then has a positive feedback effect and enhances climate warming since less solar radiation is reflected by the atmosphere (Clement, Burgman, & Norris, 2009).

The key lesson from the long list of potentially positive feedbacks and their interactions is that runaway climate change, and runaway perturbations have to be taken as a serious possibility. Table 2 is just a snapshot of the type of feedbacks that have been identified (see Supplementary material for a more thorough explanation of positive feedback loops). However, this list is not exhaustive and the possibility of undiscovered positive feedbacks portends even greater existential risks. The many environmental crises humankind has previously averted (famine, ozone depletion, London fog, water pollution, etc.) were averted because of political will based on solid scientific understanding. We cannot count on complete scientific understanding when it comes to positive feedback loops and climate change.

#### Our internal link is reverse causal. The “spatial fix” ensures infinite environmental destruction.

Shammas and Holen 19 [(Victor L, a sociologist working at the Department of Sociology and Human Geography, University of Oslo; Tomas B., independent scholar in Oslo, Norway) “One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space,” 1-29-2019, pg. 5-6] julian

No longer terra nullius, space is now the new terra firma of capitalistkind: its naturalized terroir, its next necessary terrain. The logic of capitalism dictates that capital should seek to expand outwards into the vastness of space, a point recognized by a recent ethnography of NewSpace actors (Valentine, 2016, p. 1050). The operations of capitalistkind serve to resolve a series of (potential) crises of capitalism, revolving around the slow, steady decline of spatial fixes (see e.g., Harvey, 1985, p. 51–66) as they come crashing up against the quickly vanishing blank spaces remaining on earthly maps and declining (terrestrial) opportunities for profitable investment of surplus capital (Dickens and Ormrod, 2007a, p. 49–78).

A ‘spatial fix' involves the geographic modulation of capital accumulation, consisting in the outward expansion of capital onto new geographic terrains, or into new spaces, with the aim of filling a gap in the home terrains of capital. Jessop (2006, p. 149) notes that spatial fixes may involve a number of strategies, including the creation of new markets within the capitalist world, engaging in trade with non-capitalist economies, and exporting surplus capital to undeveloped or underdeveloped regions. The first two address the problem of insufficient demand and the latter option creates a productive (or valorizing) outlet for excess capital. Capitalism must regularly discover, develop, and appropriate such new spaces because of its inherent tendency to generate surplus capital, i.e., capital bereft of profitable purpose. In Harvey’s (2006, p. xviii) terms, a spatial fix revolves around ‘geographical expansions and restructuring…as a temporary solution to crises understood…in terms of the overaccumulation of capital'. It is a temporary solution because these newly appropriated spaces will in turn become exhausted of profitable potential and are likely to produce their own stocks of surplus capital; while ‘capital surpluses that otherwise stood to be devalued, could be absorbed through geographical expansions and spatio-temporal displacements' (Harvey, 2006, p. xviii), this outwards drive of capitalism is inherently limitless: there is no end point or final destination for capitalism. Instead, capitalism must continuously propel itself onwards in search of pristine sites of renewed capital accumulation. In this way, Harvey writes, society constantly ‘creates fresh productive powers elsewhere to absorb its overaccumulated capital' (Harvey, 1981, p. 8).

Historically, spatial fixes have played an important role in conserving the capitalist system. As Jessop (2006, p. 149) points out, ‘The export of surplus money capital, surplus commodities, and/or surplus labour-power outside the space(s) where they originate enabled capital to avoid, at least for a period, the threat of devaluation'. But these new spaces for capital are not necessarily limited to physical terrains, as with colonial expansion in the nineteenth century; as Greene and Joseph (2015) note, various digital spaces, such as the Internet, can also be considered as spatial fixes: the Web absorbs overaccumulated capital, heightens consumption of virtual and physical goods, and makes inexpensive, flexible sources of labor available to employers. Greene and Joseph offer the example of online high-speed frequency trading as a digital spatial fix that furthers the ‘annihilation of space by time' first noted by Marx in his Grundrisse (see Marx, 1973, p. 524).

Outer space serves at least two purposes in this regard. In the short-to medium-term, it allows for the export of surplus capital into emerging industries, such as satellite imaging and communication. These are significant sites of capital accumulation: global revenues in the worldwide satellite market in 2016 amounted to $260 billion (SIA, 2017, p. 4). Clearly, much of this activity is taking place ‘on the ground'; it is occurring in the ‘terrestrial economy'. But all that capital would have to find some other meaningful or productive outlet were it not for the expansion of capital into space. Second, outer space serves as an arena of technological innovation, which feeds back into the terrestrial economy, helping to avert crisis by pushing capital out of technological stagnation and innovation shortfalls.

In short, outer space serves as a spatial fix. It swallows up surplus capital, promising to deliver valuable resources, technological innovations, and communication services to capitalists back on Earth. This places outer space on the same level as traditional colonization, analyzed in Hegel’s Philosophy of Right, which Hegel thought of as a product of the ‘inner dialectic of civil society', which drives the market to ‘push beyond its own limits and seek markets, and so its necessary means of subsistence, in other lands which are either deficient in the goods it has overproduced, or else generally backward in creative industry, etc.' (Hegel, 2008, p. 222). In this regard, SpaceX and related ventures are not so very different from maritime colonialists and the trader-exploiters of the British East India Company. But there is something new at stake. As the Silicon Valley entrepreneur Peter Diamandis has gleefully noted: ‘There are twenty-trillion-dollar checks up there, waiting to be cashed!' (Seaney and Glendenning, 2016). Capitalistkind consists in the naturalization of capitalist consciousness and practice, the (false) universalization of a particular mode of political economy as inherent to the human condition, followed by the projection of this naturalized universality into space—capitalist humanity as a Fukuyamite ‘end of history', the end-point of (earthly) historical unfolding, but the starting point of humanity’s first serious advances in space.

What role, then, for the state? The frontiersmen of NewSpace tend to think of themselves as libertarians, pioneers beyond the domain of state bureaucracy (see Nelson and Block, 2018). ‘The government should leave the design work and ownership of the product to the private sector', the author of a 2017 report, Capitalism in Space, advocates. ‘The private companies know best how to build their own products to maximize performance while lowering cost' (Zimmerman, 2017, p. 27). One ethnographer notes that ‘politically, right-libertarianism prevails' amongst NewSpace entrepreneurs (Valentine, 2016, p. 1047–1048). Just as Donald Rumsfeld dismissed the opponents to the Iraq War as ‘Old Europe', so too are state entities’ interests in space exploration shrugged off as symptoms of ‘Old Space'. Elon Musk, we are told in a recent biography, unlike the sluggish Big State actors of yore, ‘would apply some of the start-up techniques he’d learned in Silicon Valley to run SpaceX lean and fast…As a private company, SpaceX would also avoid the waste and cost overruns associated with government contractors' (Vance, 2015, p. 114). This libertarianism-in-space has found a willing chorus of academic supporters. The legal scholar Virgiliu Pop introduces the notion of the frontier paradigm (combining laissez-faire economics, market competition, and an individualist ethic) into the domain of space law, claiming that this paradigm has ‘proven its worth on our planet' and will ‘most likely…do so in the extraterrestrial realms' as well (Pop, 2009, p. vi). This frontier paradigm is not entirely new: a ‘Columbus mythology', centering on the ‘noble explorer', was continuously evoked in the United States during the Cold War space race (Dickens and Ormrod, 2016, pp. 79, 162–164).

But the entrepreneurial libertarianism of capitalistkind is undermined by the reliance of the entire NewSpace complex on extensive support from the state, ‘a public-private financing model underpinning long-shot start-ups' that in the case of Musk’s three main companies (SpaceX, SolarCity Corp., and Tesla) has been underpinned by $4.9 billion dollars in government subsidies (Hirsch, 2015). In the nascent field of space tourism, Cohen (2017) argues that what began as an almost entirely private venture quickly ground to a halt in the face of insurmountable technical and financial obstacles, only solved by piggybacking on large state-run projects, such as selling trips to the International Space Station, against the objections of NASA scientists. The business model of NewSpace depends on the taxpayer’s dollar while making pretensions to individual self-reliance. The vast majority of present-day clients of private aerospace corporations are government clients, usually military in origin. Furthermore, the bulk of rocket launches in the United States take place on government property, usually operated by the US Air Force or NASA.13

This inward tension between state dependency and capitalist autonomy is itself a product of neoliberalism’s contradictory demand for a minimal, “slim” state, while simultaneously (and in fact) relying on a state reengineered and retooled for the purposes of capital accumulation (Wacquant, 2012). As Lazzarato writes, ‘To be able to be “laissez-faire”, it is necessary to intervene a great deal' (2017, p. 7). Space libertarianism is libertarian in name only: behind every NewSpace venture looms a thick web of government spending programs, regulatory agencies, public infrastructure, and universities bolstered by research grants from the state. SpaceX would not exist were it not for state-sponsored contracts of satellite launches. Similarly, in 2018, the US Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA)—the famed origin of the World Wide Web—announced that it would launch a ‘responsive launch competition', meaning essentially the reuse of launch vehicles, representing an attempt by the state to ‘harness growing commercial capabilities' and place them in the service of the state’s interest in ensuring ‘national security' (Foust, 2018b).

This libertarianism has been steadily growing in the nexus between Silicon Valley, Stanford University, Wall Street, and the Washington political establishment, which tend to place a high value on Randian ‘objectivism' and participate in a long American intellectual heritage of individualistic ‘bootstrapping' and (allegedly) gritty self-reliance. But as Nelson and Block (2018, p. 189–197) recognize, one of the central symbolic operations of capitalistkind resides in concealing its reliance on the state by mobilizing the charm of its entrepreneurial constituents and the spectacle of space. There is a case to be made for the idea that SpaceX and its ilk resemble semi-private corporations like the British East India Company. The latter, “incorporated by royal charter from Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth I in 1600 to trade in silk and spices, and other profitable Indian commodities,” recruited soldiers and built a ‘commercial business [that] quickly became a business of conquest' (Tharoor, 2017). SpaceX, too, is increasingly imbricated with an attempt on the part of a particular state, the United States, to colonize and appropriate resources derived from a particular area, that of outer space; it, too, depends on the infrastructure, contracts, and regulatory environment that thus far only a state seems able to provide. Its private character, like that of the East India Company, is troubled by being deeply embedded in the state. As one commentator has observed of SpaceX, ‘If there’s a consistent charge against Elon Musk and his high-flying companies…it’s that they’re not really examples of independent, innovative market capitalism. Rather, they’re government contractors, dependent on taxpayer money to stay afloat' (cit. Nelson and Block, 2018, p. 189).

Perhaps this should not come as a surprise. As Bourdieu (2005, p. 12) observed, ‘The economic field is, more than any other, inhabited by the state, which contributes at every moment to its existence and persistence, and also to the structure of the relations of force that characterize it'. The state lays out the preconditions for market exchanges. Under neoliberalism, the state is the preeminent facilitator of markets. The neoliberal state is not so much a Minimalstaat, night watchman state, or slim state as it is the prima causa of market society (see, e.g., Wacquant, 2012). Similarly, in the political theory of Deleuze and Guattari, any economic development presupposes the political differentiation caused by the state (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004a, p. 237–238). Even in the global environment of contemporary capitalism, the market cannot operate without the state becoming integrated with capitalism itself, as ‘it is the modern state that gives capitalism its models of realization' (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004b, p. 480). For capitalism to survive in outer space, the state must create a regulatory environment, subsidize infrastructure, and hand down contracts – in short, assemble outer space as a domain made accessible in legal, technical, and economic ways.

#### Corporate colonialism concentrates society around collective effervescence, which effaces safeguards to capital’s negative externalities.

Shammas and Holen 19 [Victor L, a sociologist working at the Department of Sociology and Human Geography, University of Oslo; Tomas B., independent scholar in Oslo, Norway) “Capitalism and Outer Space: Replies to an Interlocutor” Dr. Victor Lund Shammas Blog, https://www.victorshammas.com/blog/2019/12/17/capitalism-and-outer-space, 12/18/2019] RM

The geographer David Harvey draws on Karl Marx’s idea of surplus capital to suggest that this fundamental tendency in capitalism explains why capitalism pushed out from beyond the narrow radius of Manchester’s cotton mills in the first half of the nineteenth century to become a global, planetary-level economic system. Capital is always seeking restlessly the next great investment opportunity, and that means seeking out new places: new mines in Congo, new sweatshops in Vietnam, and so on. Capital is about appropriating more space. Places that lived under traditional, non-capitalist economic systems tend to be colonized and gobbled up, as it were, by capital. David Harvey calls this a spatial fix: Faced with the problem of mounting surplus capital, capitalists seek out new spaces to invest their capital and thereby keep the wheels of the economy going.

Outer space, then, is just one more, final space in a long line of spaces that have served as fixes to capital’s need for expansion. But because outer space is potentially limitless, it is also the ultimate spatial fix. Capitalism has expanded from Manchester to Western Europe, to cover essentially all continents on Earth, with a few notable exceptions and pockets of more traditionalist economies here and there. Now that Earth has been more or less emptied out of capital-free spaces, outer space remains as one great, final virgin territory, so to speak.

Outer space is terra incognita: we do not know what is out there. But it is also terra nullius: land without ownership. Finally, it is terra pericolosa, dangerous land, a site of extreme risk. All of this combines to make it a very difficult and yet enticing place for capitalists to invest in.

Similarly, can you define “charismatic accumulation?

As a capitalist, you cannot simply be an impersonal machine that allocates capital. To be a truly successful capitalist requires an additional human supplement: a personality, a certain charisma, to use the German sociologist’s Max Weber’s key concept. This has always been a part of the capitalist game, from Henry Ford through Steve Jobs and onward. But there’s something about outer space that seems to concentrate the capitalist mind along these lines. Since the days of the Babylonian astronomers and ancient Egyptian sky-worshipping polytheism, outer space has been a crucial site for the free play of the human imagination. Adept entrepreneurs know full well that playing up to this all-too-human longing for the transcendent can be a very useful strategy in building buzz for their brand. While the novelty has worn off a little by now, for the first couple of years every SpaceX launch was something like a quasi-religious spectacle, watched by hundreds of thousands of people, online and in real-time. Launch events were—and still are to a certain degree—capable of producing a real sense of wonder: what the French sociologist Emile Durkheim called “collective effervescence,” a kind of bubbling-up of human fellow-feeling. Space seems to offer the possibility that this terrestrial life is not all there is. This is a huge selling point in the overcrowded marketplace of ideas.

At the same time, launching these expensive, complex products into space is a highly technical feat of human engineering. It allows people like Elon Musk to sell themselves to the public as purveyors of nerd capitalism: Bill Gates, Steve Jobs, and Mark Zuckerberg initiated and exploited the trend of geeky entrepreneurs, combining business savvy and dorm-room or basement-dwelling studiousness. The form of charismatic accumulation specific to high-tech industries like outer space seems to spin off this basic Silicon Valley personality type, combined with a heavy dose of engineering derring-do. While Richard Branson’s Virgin Galactic space enterprise emphasizes the “risk-all” madness of launching into space, Musk plays up to the more traditional love of Silicon Valley geeky obsessiveness. Whatever form it takes, the basic point is that the high-tech capitalism of our age seems to love a strong personality: It’s good for business, because it attracts investors, customers, and the media.

As the German philosopher Peter Sloterdijk says, we live in an age of general excitability. If you’re not excited, you’re not alive to all the possibilities of the world, and are therefore in some sense dead to the world: “Excitability is now the foremost duty of all citizens,” Sloterdijk writes. Excitability is a kind of currency in an all-too drab, workaday world, beset with worries about crippling student debt, mortgage payments or rent, low wages, and unstable jobs. Charismatic space capitalists promise to break the monotony of this terrestrial life and feed the desire for excitement and the duty of excitability.

#### Corporate colonialism necessitates mass launch.

Shammas and Holen 19 [Victor L, a sociologist working at the Department of Sociology and Human Geography, University of Oslo; Tomas B., independent scholar in Oslo, Norway) “Capitalism and Outer Space: Replies to an Interlocutor” Dr. Victor Lund Shammas Blog, https://www.victorshammas.com/blog/2019/12/17/capitalism-and-outer-space, 12/18/2019] RM

When speaking of viability, one aspect that gets underplayed are the significant ecological effects of launching into space. For instance, SpaceX is developing the idea of Earth-to-Earth space flight, which might entail moving passengers from any point on Earth to any other point within, say, half an hour. What would be the ecological consequences of burning tremendous amounts of rocket fuel to escape Earth’s gravity well, just so that a London-based billionaire could get to Sydney in 30 minutes? There is something perverse about the idea that all the rest of us are being enjoined to cut back on flying, even as Musk and his cronies tinker away to make life easy for the hyper-rich.

Of course, this would be just one more step in a general tendency under capitalism that the geographer David Harvey calls time-space compression: The speed at which capital circulates increases and along with it life also accelerates. Both space and time are compressed by new technologies. One unfortunate consequence of Earth-to-Earth space flight, if it is ever realized, would be its damaging effects on our already CO2-saturated atmosphere. But perhaps more worrying, according to some rocket engineers, is the trail of soot and alumina left in the wake of rockets that could accumulate in the stratosphere and deplete our fragile ozone layer. The United Nations’ 2018 Quadrennial Global Ozone Assessment is the first annual UN report to take this threat seriously. Ironically, as Musk dreams of shuttling humans off Earth to Mars as a species-preserving measure, he could be co-responsible for accelerating the very destruction of Earth that he purportedly fears.

In a radically decarbonized future, heavy caps on emissions might be enough to shutter the space industry - or at least seriously rein it in. This might not be a bad thing, because as a report from the non-profit Aerospace Corporation recently noted, emissions from rockets “inherently impact the stratosphere in a way that no other industrial activity does.” Reaching space on a grand scale might entail tearing open and ripping apart our own atmosphere in the process. This is why we may need to rethink our future in space—perhaps even holding off from launching too many rockets into space—precisely in order to preserve life here on Earth.

#### That depletes the ozone layer, open the floodgates for existential UV floods, and leaves residual black carbon.

Grush 17 [Loren Grush, Loren Grush is a science reporter for The Verge, the technology and culture brand from Vox Media, where she specializes in all things space—from distant stars and planets to human space flight and the commercial space race. The daughter of two NASA engineers, she grew up surrounded by space shuttles and rocket scientists—literally. She is also the host of Space Craft, an original online video series that examines what it takes to send people to space. Before joining The Verge, Loren published stories in Popular Science, The New York Times, Nautilus Magazine, Digital Trends, Fox News, and ABC News.) “Why it’s time to study how rocket emissions change the atmosphere: Get the data now before the problem gets worse” The Verge, May 31, 2018] RM

Every time a rocket launches, it produces a plume of exhaust in its wake that leaves a mark on the environment. These plumes are filled with materials that can collect in the air over time, potentially altering the atmosphere in dangerous ways. It’s a phenomenon that’s not well-understood, and some scientists say we need to start studying these emissions now before the number of rocket launches increases significantly.

It’s not the gas in these plumes that’s most concerning. Some rockets do produce heat-trapping greenhouse gases, like carbon dioxide, but those emissions are negligible, according to experts. “The rocket business could grow by a factor of 1,000 and the carbon dioxide and water vapor emissions would still be small compared to other industrial sources,” Martin Ross, a senior project engineer at the Aerospace Corporation who studies the effects of rockets on the atmosphere, tells The Verge.

Instead, it’s tiny particles that are produced inside the trail that we need to watch out for, Ross says. Small pieces of soot and a chemical called alumina are created in the wakes of rocket launches. They then get injected into the stratosphere, the layer of Earth’s atmosphere that begins six miles up and ends around 32 miles high. Research shows that this material may build up in the stratosphere over time and slowly lead to the depletion of a layer of oxygen known as the ozone. The ozone acts like a big shield, protecting Earth against the Sun’s harmful ultraviolet radiation. However, the magnitude of this ozone depletion isn’t totally known, says Ross.

“IT’S A CALL FOR MORE RESEARCH IN THIS AREA TO KNOW EXACTLY WHAT WE’RE PUTTING INTO THE UPPER ATMOSPHERE AND IN WHAT QUANTITIES.”

That’s why he and others at the Aerospace Corporation, a nonprofit that provides research and guidance on space missions, are calling for more studies. They say it’s especially important now since the private space industry is at the early stages of a launch revolution. Currently, the number of launches each year is relatively small, around 80 to 90, so the aerospace industry’s impact on the atmosphere is not much of a concern. But in a new paper published in April, Ross and his colleague Jim Vedda argue that as launches increase, policymakers will eventually want to know what kind of damage these vehicles are causing to the environment and if regulations are necessary. When that time comes, it will be better to have as much data as possible to make the best decisions.

“It’s a call for more research in this area to know exactly what we’re putting into the upper atmosphere and in what quantities,” Vedda, a senior policy analyst at the Aerospace Corporation, tells The Verge. “So when the debates start, we have the good hard data that says, ‘Here’s a well-defined model of what’s actually happening.’”

So far, the research we have about these emissions mostly comes from lab experiments, modeling, and some direct detections of rocket plumes. At the turn of the century, a few high-altitude planes equipped with sensors flew through plumes created by the Space Shuttle and other vehicles to figure out what was inside.

It turns out that all kinds of rockets produce these emissions, but some types of vehicles produce more than others. Rockets that run on solid propellants produce a higher amount of alumina particles, a combination of aluminum and oxygen that is white and reflective. Most orbital rockets don’t run on solid propellants these days, though some launch companies like the United Launch Alliance do add solid rocket boosters to vehicles to give them extra thrust. Meanwhile, rockets that run on liquid kerosene, a type of refined oil, produce more of the dark soot particles, what is known as black carbon. Kerosene is used as a propellant for rockets such as ULA’s Atlas V and SpaceX’s Falcon 9.

ALL KINDS OF ROCKETS PRODUCE THESE EMISSIONS, BUT SOME TYPES OF VEHICLES PRODUCE MORE THAN OTHERS

Alumina and black carbon from rockets can stick around in the stratosphere for three to five years, according to Ross. As these materials collect high above the Earth, they can have interesting effects on the air. Black carbon forms a thin layer that intercepts and absorbs the sunlight that hits Earth. “It would act as a thin, black umbrella,” says Ross. That may help keep the lower atmosphere cool, but the intercepted energy from the Sun doesn’t just go away; it gets deposited into the stratosphere, warming it up. This warming ultimately causes chemical reactions that could lead to the depletion of the ozone layer.

The reflective alumina particles can also affect the ozone but in a different way. Whereas the soot acts like a black umbrella, the alumina acts like a white one, reflecting sunlight back into space. However, chemical reactions occur on the surface of these white particles, which, in turn, destroy the ozone layer, Ross says.

Black carbon and alumina have actually been proposed by scientists as possible geoengineering agents or tools for cooling down our warming climate. But while they may keep the lower atmosphere cool, geoengineering agents may have other unwanted side effects, too. They might interact with jet streams, causing droughts or more tropical storms. That’s why many scientists have criticized the idea of geoengineering to combat climate change.

However, rockets are putting these particles into the air no matter what, and this byproduct of ozone loss is particularly concerning for Ross and Vedda. As the ozone diminishes, more of the Sun’s harmful radiation could reach the ground. These UVB rays can cause skin cancer and cataracts. “That’s what we need to understand — the ozone depletion aspect of this because protection of the ozone layer is an international imperative,” says Ross. The 1987 Montreal Protocol, for example, is an international agreement to phase out materials that deplete the ozone.

Right now, Ross estimates that rocket launches around the world inject 10 gigagrams, or 11,000 tons, of soot and alumina particles into the atmosphere each year. But that number could be going up. SpaceX has vowed to increase the number of launches it does each year, and numerous other companies are going to start launching their own vehicles soon. What kind of impact that will have on the atmosphere is unclear. That’s why Ross and Vedda suggest the government and universities invest in a series of research programs, in which scientists collect more data on rocket particles from aircraft and satellites.

“WE WANT TO BE PROACTIVE BEFORE THIS TIPPING POINT OCCURS.”

#### **Ozone collapse causes extinction.**

Simmons 20 [Carla Simmons,, The Science Times, "A Repeat of One of the Biggest Extinctions Caused by Ozone Layer Erosion 359M Years Ago Possible, Warn Scientists | Science Times", May 27, 2020, https://www.sciencetimes.com/articles/25838/20200527/repeat-one-biggest-extinctions-caused-ozone-layer-erosion-359m-years.htm] BD

University of Southampton researchers have delved deeper into an extinction event that occurred about 360 million years ago. According to their research, the ozone layer's breakdown caused by ultraviolet (UV) radiation vanquished much of the Earth's marine life and greenery. Moreover, their discovery led to weighty indications for today's continually warming Earth.

Numerous episodes of mass extinction occurred in the geological past. One of the most notorious ones caused the extinction of dinosaurs about 66 million years ago. Their destruction was believed to have been caused by an asteroid hitting the Earth.

Additionally, two chapters were caused by large-scale volcanic eruptions that created the imbalance of oceans and atmospheres in the planets. Another one happened during the end of Permian Great Dying, which, according to Stanford, wiped out 96% of the Earth's aquatic species.

Scientists have discovered evidence pointing to high levels of UV radiation responsible for collapsing forest ecosystems and killing off water animal species during the Devonian geological period about 359 million years ago.

Their research revealed that warming temperatures after an intense ice age could have caused the ozone to collapse. The researchers suggest that the Earth might possibly reach comparable temperatures, thus might face the same consequences that occurred in the past.

The findings of their study are published in the journal Science Advances. Additionally, the research was partly funded by a grant from the National Geographic Society. It was also regulated in collaboration with The Sedgwick Museum of Earth Sciences at the University of Cambridge.

The team collected various rock samples during expeditions in locations in South America. They formed clues as to what was happening at the edge of the melting Devonian ice sheet, which allowed them to compare between the extinction event close to the pole and near the equator.

The rocks were then dissolved in hydrofluoric acid back in the laboratory. The dissolved rocks released microscopic plant spores, which were preserved for hundreds of millions of years. On microscopic examination, the scientists found many of the spores had bizarrely formed spines on their surface.

According to the researchers, the spikes were due to UV radiation damaging their DNA. Furthermore, they found that many spores had dark pigmented walls. These walls were thought to be a protective 'shield' against the increasing and damaging UV levels.

From their findings, the scientists have concluded that during a time of expeditious global warming, the ozone layer collapsed for a short while. Moreover, the ozone collapse exposed life on Earth to harmful UV radiation levels and, therefore, triggered a mass extinction event. This affected life on land and in shallow water at the Devonian-Carboniferous boundary.

From Climate Change to Climate Emergency

Professor John Marshall, the lead researcher from the University of Southampton's School of Ocean and Earth Science, said that our ozone layer is currently in a state of alteration. He adds that they have seen this pattern in the past, where a stimulant or impetus was unnecessary for the phenomenon to kick in.

He also says that current approximate calculations suggest that the Earth will reach similar global temperatures to those of 360 million years ago. Furthermore, they say it is possible that a similar collapse of the ozone layer could occur again, dangerously exposing surface and shallow sea life to harmful radiation.

#### UV floods cause extinction—no defense assumes rampant UV poisoning.

Lucas et al 14 (R. M. Lucas (National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, The Australian National University, Canberra 2601, Australia, Telethon Kids Institute, University of Western Australia, Perth 6008, Australia), M. Norval (Biomedical Sciences, University of Edinburgh Medical School, Edinburgh EH8 9AG, Scotland, UK), R. E. Neale (QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, Brisbane 4029, Australia), A. R. Young (King's College London (KCL), St John's Institute of Dermatology, London SE1 9RT, UK), F. R. de Gruijl (Department of Dermatology, Leiden University Medical Centre, P.O. Box 9600, NL-2300 RC Leiden, The Netherlands), Y. (Akita University Graduate School of Medicine, Akita-shi, Akita Prefecture, Japan, National Institute for Minamata Diseases, Minamata-sh, Kumamoto Prefecture, Japan) and J. C. van der Leun (iEcofys, Kanaalweg 16G, NL-3526 KL Utrecht, The Netherlands), “The consequences for human health of stratospheric ozone depletion in association with other environmental factors”, November 10th, 2014, <https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b>) CS

Effects of solar UV radiation on immune function and consequences for disease Mechanisms UV photons penetrate the epidermis and upper dermis162 and are absorbed by chromophores ([Table 2](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#tab2)), which then **initiate a cascade leading to changes in immune responses**. Table 2 Cutaneous chromophores involved in the initiation of UV-induced changes in immune function (reviewed in [ref. 163](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit163)While much of this information has been gathered from studies in vitro or in rodent models, less is known about humans. However, an action spectrum for the UV-induced suppression of the human immune response to a previously-encountered antigen (termed memory or recall immune responses) has been constructed: it has two peaks, one within the UV-B waveband at 300 nm and one at 370 nm in the UV-A waveband.[164,165](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit164) There is also evidence from studies in both humans and mice that interactive and additive effects between wavebands can occur.[166–168](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit166) Briefly, exposure to UV radiation causes up-regulation of some innate immune responses, **and down-regulation of** some acquired primary and memory **immune responses**, mainly through effects on T cell activity (reviewed in Gibbs & Norval,[163](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit163) Schwarz & Schwarz,[169](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit169) and Ullrich & Byrne[170](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit170)). The up-regulation includes the production of several antimicrobial peptides (AMPs) in the epidermis,[171,172](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit171) possibly through a vitamin D pathway (see below). The AMPs provide immediate protection against a variety of pathogens (bacteria, fungi, and viruses having a viral envelope) and they are also involved in the promotion of cell growth, healing, and angiogenesis. In contrast to these stimulatory functions, exposure to UV radiation induces T regulatory cells (Tregs) and other cell types which contribute to immunosuppression and help to restore cutaneous homeostasis.[172,173](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit172) Mediators such as platelet-activating factor, prostaglandin E2, histamine, and tumour necrosis factor-α are produced locally at the irradiated site. These alter the migration patterns and functions of various populations of immune cells. The end result is the generation of cell subsets with suppressive activity which are thought to remain for the life-time of the individual.[174,175](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit174) The UV-induced alterations in the normal immune response can be beneficial for some human diseases and detrimental for others. Vitamin D, synthesised following exposure of the skin to UV-B radiation, also has positive and negative effects on immune-related diseases. Indeed, it is difficult to distinguish between immunoregulation by vitamin D and other mediators induced by UV radiation,[176–180](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit176) since the downstream effects on immune parameters are similar. For clarity, the effects of UV radiation and those of vitamin D have been assessed separately in the sections below. We first focus on the effects of UV radiation on immunity, and address vitamin D-related effects on immune function in the section specifically on vitamin D. Polymorphic light eruption Polymorphic light eruption (PLE) is the commonest of the photodermatoses, with a prevalence of up to 20%.[181](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit181) PLE manifests as an intermittent itchy red skin eruption which resolves without scarring after a few days to weeks. It occurs 2–3 times more frequently in women than in men, with onset typically in the first three decades of life,[181](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit181) and is found predominantly in those with fair skin, although all skin types can be affected.[181](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit181) A recent study of Indian patients with dark skin phototypes (IV and V) who suffered from various photodermatoses revealed that PLE was the commonest of these, affecting 60% of the group.[182](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit182) The lesions occur most often in the spring and early summer or during a sunny holiday, following the first exposure to a large dose of sunlight. After repeated exposures, the lesions are less likely to occur. This process, called photohardening, is used therapeutically with good results. Recent investigations indicate that key events in photohardening include a decrease in the number of Langerhans cells in the epidermis and recruitment of mast cells into the dermis,[183](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit183) together with changes in systemic cytokine levels.[184](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit184) PLE is immunologically-mediated as a result of a failure to establish the normal suppression of immune responses following exposure to UV radiation. The antigen involved has not been identified but is likely to be novel, induced by the **DNA damaging properties of UV radiation**. Various abnormalities in the cutaneous immune response following UV radiation have been demonstrated in people with PLE compared with controls.[185,186](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit185) This disease therefore illustrates the positive evolutionary advantage of UV-induced immunosuppression in individuals who are not susceptible to PLE and what can happen if it is absent. Asthma **Asthma** comprises a group of diseases that evidence as wheeze, chest tightness, or shortness of breath, occurring as a result of obstruction of the airways and restriction of airflow that is usually reversible. The level of severity, frequency of symptoms, age of onset, main inflammatory phenotypes, and triggers and pathways are variable. This heterogeneity may explain the current lack of consistency in results from studies examining the relationship between UV radiation and the risk of asthma. There are anecdotal accounts that sunny holidays or living at high altitude decrease asthma symptoms. The prevalence of asthma was inversely associated with the intensity of UV radiation,[187](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit187) or past personal exposure to solar UV radiation.[188](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit188) However, in a study where different sub-types of asthma were considered, residence at latitudes closer to the equator (and with greater intensity of UV-B radiation) was associated with an increased risk of having asthma in atopic participants (with a history of allergic responses to specific antigens) but a decreased risk in those without atopy.[189](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit189) These findings highlight the importance of differentiating between subtypes of asthma in examining associations with exposure to UV radiation. Nevertheless, individual-level exposure to UV radiation was not measured (only latitude and ambient UV radiation), so the results could reflect exposure to other latitude-associated factors such as temperature and indoor heating. Infection and vaccination Studies over the past 20 years have shown that **exposure to solar UV radiation suppresses** microbe-specific acquired **immune responses in** animal models of **infection**. This modulation can lead to an **increased microbial load, reactivation from latency, and more severe symptoms, including death** (reviewed in Norval et al.[190](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit190)). A recent study showed that spending 8 or more hours outdoors per week when the UV Index was ≥4 was associated with an increased risk of ocular recurrence of herpes simplex virus (HSV) infection resulting in eruptive lesions.[191](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit191) **UV radiation prior to vaccination** causes a **less effective immune response** in several mouse models (reviewed in Norval & Woods[192](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit192)), but whether exposure to UV radiation adversely affects the course of infections and the efficacy of vaccination in humans remains an open question. Despite the paucity of new information, there remains the possibility that UV-induced immunosuppression could **convert an asymptomatic infection into a symptomatic one**, **reactivate** a range of **persistent infections**, increase the oncogenic potential of microbes, and **reduce the memory immune response,** for example after vaccination, so that it is no longer protective. Autoimmune diseases Many autoimmune diseases are considered to have both environmental and genetic risk factors. Evidence to support the importance of environmental exposures comes from geographical variation (changing incidence with changing latitude), temporal patterns (such as variations in incidence with season or season-of-birth) and results from observational epidemiological studies. Several studies show an inverse association between exposure to UV radiation and immune-mediated diseases, suggesting that the UV may be protective. In many cases, the assumed pathway has been through enhanced synthesis of vitamin D (see section on Vitamin D below). However, this evidence is now being re-evaluated in light of possible alternative pathways, including UV-induced immune modulation and altered susceptibility to relevant viral infections, and non-UV pathways such as changes in the secretion of melatonin (reviewed in Hart et al.[193](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit193)). While there have been suggestions that exposure to UV radiation may be important for conditions such as inflammatory bowel disease (for example, Nerich et al.[194](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit194)), type 1 diabetes,[195](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit195) and rheumatic diseases (including rheumatoid arthritis, systemic lupus erythematosus, dermatomyositis, and others),[196](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit196) the strongest evidence is for multiple sclerosis. Multiple sclerosis. Many studies (but not all) have shown that the prevalence, incidence, or mortality from multiple sclerosis (MS) increases with increasing latitude and decreasing altitude or intensity of ambient UV radiation, in predominantly fair-skinned populations (reviewed in Hewer et al.[197](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit197)). In the US Nurses Health Studies, a latitudinal gradient present in a cohort of female nurses born before 1946 was not apparent in a similar cohort born after 1946.[198](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit198) The findings reflected an increase in incidence in the south in the later cohort (rather than a decrease in the north). One explanation given to explain this change was that increasing sun-protective behaviours in the south had reduced the difference in personal dose of UV between the north and south.[199](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit199) Studies from the northern[200](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit200) and southern[201](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit201) hemispheres show that, compared to the general population, people with MS were more likely to have been born in late spring and less likely to have been born in late autumn. This timing would be consistent with a hypothesis that exposure of the mother to more UV radiation during the late first trimester, when the foetal nervous system is developing and maturing, is protective for the development of MS in later life.[201](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit201) Alternatively, it is also possible that exposures early in infancy, rather than in pregnancy, influence risk, or other factors that vary seasonally could be important. Animal studies suggest that UV-B irradiation can prevent the onset of experimental autoimmune encephalomyelitis, used as a model for MS,[202](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit202) and there is supportive evidence from recent studies in humans.[203,204](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit203) The role of UV-induced immune suppression in skin cancer Cutaneous malignant melanoma. Evidence that the immune response is important for the development of CMM is clearly shown by the increase in incidence following organ transplantation that requires ongoing treatment with immunosuppressive medications.[205](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit205) UV radiation, particularly UV-B, can cause suppression of many aspects of cell-mediated immunity but, until recently, how it influenced the initiation of CMM was unknown. In a transgenic mouse model, the recruitment of macrophages to the skin following UV-B irradiation and their subsequent proliferation were shown to be critical in the survival of melanocytes, including those with UV-induced DNA damage.[206–208](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit206) In addition, inflammation induced by UV radiation increased metastasis of melanoma, with neutrophils being the main drivers of the inflammatory process.[209](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit209) Consistent with these reports from animal models, in patients with metastatic melanoma there was a shorter survival time if metastases contained a high proportion of macrophages.[210](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit210) Non-melanoma skin cancer. Tumours induced by UV radiation are highly antigenic. UV-induced immune suppression plays a critical role in the development of NMSC as evidenced by the dramatically increased incidence in immunosuppressed people, for example, following organ transplantation.[211](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit211) This is especially shown for SCCs in organ transplant recipients receiving immunosuppressive drugs that suppress T cell activity, suggesting that effector T cells are of particular importance in the control of SCC.[212](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit212) Furthermore, Tregs induced by UV irradiation infiltrate SCCs and surround BCCs. Pharmacologically blocking steps in the pathway of UV-induced immunosuppression may be effective in preventing the development of skin cancers and actinic keratoses.[212–214](https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2015/pp/c4pp90033b#cit212)

#### That causes viruses to human bacterial genome to damage will ensure the next pandemic is existential

Supriya 4/19 [Lakshmi Supriya got her BSc in Industrial Chemistry from IIT Kharagpur (India) and a Ph.D. in Polymer Science and Engineering from Virginia Tech (USA). She has more than a decade of global industry experience working in the USA, Europe, and India. After her Ph.D., she worked as part of the R&D group in diverse industries starting with semiconductor packaging at Intel, Arizona, where she developed a new elastomeric thermal solution, which has now been commercialized and is used in the core i3 and i5 processors. From there she went on to work at two startups, one managing the microfluidics chip manufacturing lab at a biotechnology company and the other developing polymer formulations for oil extraction from oil sands. She also worked at Saint Gobain North America, developing various material solutions for photovoltaics and processing techniques and new applications for fluoropolymers. Most recently, she managed the Indian R&D team of Enthone (now part of MacDermid) developing electroplating technologies for precious metals.) “Humans versus viruses - Can we avoid extinction in near future?” News Medical Life Sciences, 4/19/21, https://www.news-medical.net/news/20210419/Humans-versus-viruses-Can-we-avoid-extinction-in-near-future.aspx] RM

Expert argues that human-caused changes to the environment can lead to the emergence of pathogens, not only from outside but also from our own microbiome, which can pave the way for large-scale destruction of humans and **even our extinction**.

Whenever there is a change in any system, it will cause other changes to reach a balance or equilibrium, generally at a point different from the original balance. Although this principle was originally posited by the French chemist Henry Le Chatelier for chemical reactions, this theory can be applied to almost anything else.

In an essay published on the online server Preprints\*, Eleftherios P. Diamandis of the University of Toronto and the Mount Sinai Hospital, Toronto, argues that changes caused by humans, to the climate, and everything around us will lead to changes that may have a dramatic impact on human life. Because our ecosystems are so complex, we don’t know how our actions will affect us in the long run, so humans generally disregard them.

Changing our environment

Everything around us is changing, from living organisms to the climate, water, and soil. Some estimates say about half the organisms that existed 50 years ago have already become extinct, and about 80% of the species may become extinct in the future.

As the debate on global warming continues, according to data, the last six years have been the warmest on record. Global warming is melting ice, and sea levels have been increasing. The changing climate is causing more and more wildfires, which are leading to other related damage. At the same time, increased flooding is causing large-scale devastation.

One question that arises is how much environmental damage have humans already done? A recent study compared the natural biomass on Earth to the mass produced by humans and found humans produce a mass equal to their weight every week. This human-made mass is mainly for buildings, roads, and plastic products.

In the early 1900s, human-made mass was about 3% of the global biomass. Today both are about equal. Projections say by 2040, the human-made mass will be triple that of Earth’s biomass. But, slowing down human activity that causes such production may be difficult, given it is considered part of our growth as a civilization.

Emerging pathogens

Although we are made up of human cells, we have almost ten times that of bacteria just in our guts and more on our skin. These microbes not only affect locally but also affect the entire body. There is a balance between the good and bad bacteria, and any change in the environment may cause this balance to shift, especially on the skin, the consequences of which are unknown.

Although most bacteria on and inside of us are harmless, gut bacteria can also have viruses. If viruses don’t kill the bacteria immediately, they can incorporate into the bacterial genome and stay latent for a long time until reactivation by environmental factors, when they can become pathogenic. They can also escape from the gut and enter other organs or the bloodstream. Bacteria can then use these viruses to kill other bacteria or help them evolve to more virulent strains.

An example of the evolution of pathogens is the cause of the current pandemic, the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). Several mutations are now known that make the virus more infectious and resistant to immune responses, and strengthening its to enter cells via surface receptors.

The brain

There is evidence that the SARS-CoV-2 can also affect the brain. The virus may enter the brain via the olfactory tract or through the angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) pathway. Viruses can also affect our senses, such as a loss of smell and taste, and there could be other so far unkown neurological effects. The loss of smell seen in COVID-19 could be a new viral syndrome specific to this disease.

Many books and movies have described pandemics caused by pathogens that wipe out large populations and cause severe diseases. In the essay, the author provides a hypothetical scenario where a gut bacteria suddenly starts producing viral proteins. Some virions spread through the body and get transmitted through the human population. After a few months, the virus started causing blindness, and within a year, large populations lost their vision.

Pandemics can cause other diseases that can threaten humanity’s entire existence. **The COVID-19 pandemic brought this possibility to the forefront**. If we continue disturbing the equilibrium between us and the environment, we don’t know what the consequences may be and **the next pandemic could lead us to extinction.**

#### **Black carbon locks in widespread and dangerous pollution, which kills millions**.

CHO 16 [Renee Cho, Communications Coordinator for Riverkeeper, the Hudson River environmental organization, Columbia Climate School - State of the Planet, "The Damaging Effects of Black Carbon", MARCH 22, 2016, https://news.climate.columbia.edu/2016/03/22/the-damaging-effects-of-black-carbon/] BD

Air pollution, both outdoors and indoors, causes millions of premature deaths each year. The deaths are mainly caused by the inhalation of particulate matter. Black carbon, a component of particulate matter, is especially dangerous to human health because of its tiny size. But black carbon not only has impacts on human health, it also affects visibility, harms ecosystems, reduces agricultural productivity and exacerbates global warming.

The World Health Organization’s new report on disease from preventable environmental risks attributes 3.7 million premature deaths in 2012 to outdoor air pollution, and 4.3 million to household air pollution. The breathing in of particulate matter (composed of black carbon, sulfate, nitrates, ammonia, sodium chloride, mineral dust and water) that measures 10 microns or less in diameter (PM10), poses the greatest health risks because the particles can find their way deep into lungs and the bloodstream, and cause cardiovascular and respiratory disease, and premature death. Formed by the incomplete burning of fossil fuels, biofuels and biomass, black carbon, has a diameter of less than 2½ microns (PM2.5).

A major constituent of soot, black carbon is the most solar energy-absorbing component of particulate matter and can absorb one million times more energy than CO2. The amount of energy stored in the atmosphere is measured as watts per square meter of Earth’s surface; a 2013 study estimated black carbon’s effect to be 1.1 watts per square meter per year, second only to carbon dioxide, which is responsible for 1.56 watts per square meter. In other words, black carbon is the second largest contributor to climate change after CO2. But unlike CO2, which can stay in the atmosphere for hundreds to thousands of years, black carbon, because it is a particle, remains in the atmosphere only for days to weeks before it returns to earth with rain or snow.

Because black carbon absorbs solar energy, it warms the atmosphere. When it falls to earth with precipitation, it darkens the surface of snow and ice, reducing their albedo (the reflecting power of a surface), warming the snow, and hastening melting.

#### Corporate colonialism also locks the Global South out of space, which internal link turns any negative offense because it magnifies interstellar inequality.

Stockwell 20 [Sam Stockwell is a research assistant at RAND Europe working in the area of defence, security and infrastructure. His research interests include terrorism and counter-terrorism, cybersecurity, emerging technologies in conflict environments, and space security. Prior to RAND, Stockwell was a research assistant at The Henry Jackson Society, a security think tank, where he studied the impact of coronavirus on online extremist content. He has also worked with lecturers at the University of East Anglia on Brexit-related projects. Stockwell achieved a Distinction at King's College London in conflict, security and development studies, specialising in far-right terrorism and cyber security. He holds a First Class B.A. (Hons) degree in politics from the University of East Anglia, where he also received The Thomas Paine Prize in Politics for achieving consistently high marks on assignments throughout his course.) “Legal ‘Black Holes’ in Outer Space: The Regulation of Private Space Companies” E-International Relations, July 20, 2020] RM

Corporate Space Debris, Security Tensions and Environmental Contamination

Space debris can be defined as non-purposeful man-made objects that reside in space; made up of inactive parts from former space operations and fragmentations of spacecraft, there are nearly 30,000 pieces of debris in the Earth’s orbit (Pellegrino & Stang, 2016: 25). Despite most debris being centimetres or millimetres in size satellites often travel at the speed of a bullet, meaning that a collision between the two could be catastrophic in terms of environmental, mechanical and financial damage (Black & Butt, 2010: 1).

Since the development of the Kessler Syndrome thesis in 1978 – which predicted that space debris may become so dense as to trigger a chain reaction of major collisions – space debris is considered more of a threat to security operations in the near-term than military space activity (Quintana, 2017: 95). Difficulty over determining whether a collision was accidental or a purposeful act further exacerbates this problem, given that “every object in orbit is a threat to everything else in orbit, regardless of its intended function” (Faith, 2012: 86). Such developments have led to the US administration increasingly adopting a securitisation discourse around orbital debris (Bowen, 2014: 47), which may cause concerns as to whether policymakers may react to future American satellite collisions in a militarised manner.

A number of NewSpace actors are likely to complicate these worries even further through recent satellite proposals. Whilst Boeing is proposing a constellation of up to 3,000 satellites, SpaceX has even grander goals of creating a constellation consisting of 4,425 satellites, eventually expanding to 12,000 satellites in the near-future (Kosiak, 2019: 7). Putting this into context, there are currently just around 1,400 active satellites in orbit around the Earth, highlighting the scale of these projects. The collision between a single US privately-owned Iridium satellite and state-owned Russian Cosmos satellite in 2009 underscored not only the sheer amount of debris caused by these collisions – over 1,500 pieces – but also foreshadowed the possible geopolitical tensions that may arise from them (Wang, 2010: 87-88). Given the number of various commercial satellite constellations possibly going into orbit in the near-future, this raises questions over the possibly devastating security hazards they could pose once in orbit or when they eventually become defunct.

Yet the proliferation of these commercial satellite plans also pose significant environmental issues. Article IX of the OST asserts that: “States shall pursue activities of outer space in a manner that avoids any harmful contamination or adverse environmental changes on Earth” (UN, 1967). However, the use of terms like ‘harmful’ or ‘adverse change’ underscores the lack of specificity over what exactly constitutes environmental damage, or for whom it must refrain from harming. There is also a failure to address the explicit problem of space debris since the discourse is primarily concentrated on chemical effluent pollution, undermining attempts to facilitate the removal of floating wreckage(Gupta, 2016: 26).

The inability of the OST to properly promote environmental considerations in space has been mirrored in the NewSpace community, where there has been a woeful lack of ecological consideration: “The hundreds of articles and books on outer space resource development seldom mention that such actions may adversely affect the environment in ways that will potentially disadvantage their enterprises and the humans that will be required to implement them” (Kramer, 2017: 136). Such images evoke the types of difficulties that private firms have encountered on Earth reconciling capital with the environment in a way that doesn’t damage profit margins (Magdoff & Foster, 2011: 61-66). Yet in doing so, this neglect is only likely to result in the proliferation of extra-terrestrial debris that the UN OST failed to address. Indeed, despite its vastness there is only a narrow region of orbital space that is either useable or beneficial for prolonged human missions (Brearley, 2005: 2), meaning that the increase in space debris from these massive commercial satellite constellations will likely be at the detriment of developing nations who have yet fostered spacefaring capabilities.

Elon Musk’s SpaceX company has already caused complications for Earth-bound astrologists. The brightness of his recent ‘Starlink’ satellite constellation system in comparison to other satellites has been obscuring telescopic images (see Grush, 2020). More concerningly, Starlink may be much more visible during twilight hours which could be problematic in identifying potentially hazardous asteroids in a timely manner (The Verge, 2020). In this sense, whilst private space entrepreneurs are able to increase their profitability from being able to establish constellations, such endeavours are spoiling the scientific work of researchers on Earth that may complicate the monitoring of Earth-based asteroid impacts.

Conclusion: Space as a Global Commodity

Ultimately, this essay has revealed how the UN OST fails to adequately regulate private space enterprises in outer space within an array of activities. Predominately designed from a state-centric perspective, the increasing entanglement of the state apparatus with the private sector is enabling both actors to satisfy their extra-terrestrial interests through legal ambiguities in a way that the treaty never envisaged possible.

Yet, these processes also expose the ways in which the conceptualisation of outer space by both the drafters of the OST and NewSpace actors is intimately connected to Earth-bound social relations and power structures. Whether it be contestations over resources, surveillance or the environment, the concerns raised mirror those taking place on Earth. A product of its time, the OST was broadly concerned with protecting states from damage caused by one another in a tense international terrestrial atmosphere of possible nuclear annihilation, rather than seeking to protect the space environment as an aspiration “in its own right” (Brearley, 2005: 19). Despite framing themselves as the saviours of an anthropogenic extinction, the emphasis of NewSpace entrepreneurs on profit accumulation in space also emulates the types of criticisms private enterprises have faced on Earth, and risk the extension of existing wealth inequalities into the cosmos. The precedent set by NASA in April 2020 that will likely lead to the further involvement of private firms such as SpaceX in space endeavours will therefore serve to restrict public access to the extra-terrestrial domain – and the benefits that may arise from this. Indeed, the notion of outer space as a ‘global commons’ is slowly turning into one of a ‘global commodity’.

#### It’s terrestrially unsustainable---underlying market principles, failed economic policy, and income inequality.

Jackson 19(Jackson, Tim--- ecological economist and professor of sustainable development at the University of Surrey. (2019). The Post-growth Challenge: Secular Stagnation, Inequality and the Limits to Growth. Ecological Economics, 156, 236–246. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2018.10.010, sci-hub.tw/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2018.10.010) MWE

A decade after the financial crisis, growth rates in advanced economies have still not returned to those experienced in the pre-crisis era. A long-term decline in the rate of labour productivity growth is one of the underlying factors contributing to this situation. Understanding that long-term decline is clearly vital. Debt overhang, shifting patterns of demand and the geo-politics of resource supply all play some contributing role. Perhaps the most troubling possibility is that the wide-spread technological advances facilitated by ready abundance of high-quality energy resources in the first seventy years of the 20th century are no longer available to advanced economies in the 21st. Evidence of a decline in the quality of some physical resources already exists. Sooner or later further declines are inevitable. As they arrive, they are likely to depress labour productivity growth still further. The critical question is how policy should respond to this not-so- new reality. The conventional response has been to look for conditions – technological, fiscal, monetary – to keep growth going, whatever the cost. The prevalent ‘ rescue narrative ’ relies on an assumption that with appropriate policy incentives, new technological breakthroughs will emerge and productivity growth will recover. Candidate ‘ saviours ’ in this rescue narrative are various. For some (NCE 2014 2017), innovation will arrive from investment in the same clean, low-carbon technologies that are needed to tackle climate change and off set resource depletion. For others ( Ford, 2015; Avent, 2016 ), innovation will come from the emerging digital revolution: increased automation, robotisation, artificial intelligence. But to date, none of the productivity gains foreseen by these technologies have been manifest at the macro- economic level and this latter world could lead to the ‘ immiseration ’ of labour ( Susskind, 2017) and levels of inequality reminiscent of the worst scenarios outlined in the previous section. In historical perspective, it is clear that the advanced economies now stand at a distinct, and uncomfortable cross-roads. Two competing theories about how to maintain growth (Keynesianism and monetarism) have dominated macroeconomics over the last half century. Neither is adequate to the challenge of resolving current conditions. Developed in response to the Great Depression in the 1930's, John Maynard Keynes' macroeconomics saw a critical role for government in maintaining economic stability ( Keynes, 1936 ). If supply potential was not enough to keep growth going (as Says had argued), governments could not rely on households and firms simply to go on spending during the hard times. They must play an active role in stimulating the economy to ‘ kick-start ’ growth again. The strategy worked, up to a point. It was exemplified in particular by Franklin D Roosevelt's ‘ New Deal ’ in the States. The subsequent ‘ failure ’ of Keynesianism to solve the problems of ‘ stagflation ’ during the oil crises led to a temporary disillusionment with the idea and in the early 1980s, western governments (pre- dominantly led by the anglo-centric nations) abandoned Keynes and turned instead to monetarism – the brainchild of Chicago school economist Milton Friedman. Built on a neoliberal philosophy with a strong belief in the free market as the best regulator of human affairs, monetarism had no time for fiscal stimulus (or indeed with government intervention generally) and argued instead that the route out of low growth was to reduce the cost of money, so that firms would more easily invest in the productive capacity of the economy and households could fund any temporary constraints on spending through debt. These mechanisms for financial liquidity would free up the economy to grow again, allowing prices to fall and employment to bounce back. At first these policies seemed to be successful. In the wake of the oil crises, conditions improved. Greater liquidity spurred investment, re- stored levels of consumer demand and even (arguably) stimulated innovation in the energy sector which brought down the price of oil, for almost two decades. In the long run, however, things were not so simple. Loose monetary policy and tight fiscal policy were slowly creating increasing fragility in financial markets. Though they facilitated a continued reduction in public debt burdens, this only proved possible by transferring debt to the private sector. While interest rates were low and debt burdens were not too high, this didn't seem to matter much. But as more and more households accumulated more and more debt, the conditions for instability were accumulating. By the early 2000s, firms, banks and households had become ‘ overleveraged ’ . The policy response was to pump more and more money into the system by lowering interest rates again and relaxing financial regulations even further. All it needed was a change in the rate of defaults on ‘ subprime ’ loans and the bubble would have to burst. This was the era of ‘ easy money ’ , the ‘ age of irresponsibility ’ as then Prime Minister Gordon Brown called it, and it led inexorably to the financial crisis. 8 ‘ The question then arises, ’ wrote Summers (2014, p68) ‘ can we identify any stretch [in the last decades] during which the economy grew satisfactorily under conditions that were financially sustainable?. ’ His answer, and indeed the answer of a number of other mainstream economists, was: no. Chasing growth through loose monetary policy in the face of challenging underlying fundamentals had led to financial bubbles which destabilised finance and culminated in crisis. Perhaps the most pernicious impact of this period of loose monetary policy – and indeed of the crisis itself – was the steady rise in inequality within advanced nations. There were several channels through which this acceleration occurred. In the first place, cheap money led to financial speculation. Those with access to capital could achieve substantial capital gains as asset prices rose. When wealth is already unequally distributed, this tendency leads directly to higher income inequality. As income inequality increases, it leads to excessive investment funds, because richer households tend to have a high propensity to save than poorer ones. This excess of savings leads to more speculation, pushing asset prices up again and accelerating inequality further. It is also likely to depresses growth, partly through the reduced spending power of poorer households and partly through the crowding out of investment in the real economy. Policy responses which attempt to stimulate investment by reducing the interest rate, end up making money cheaper and incentivising more speculation, fuelling a vicious cycle of rising inequality ( Credit Suisse, 2014 , p34). But this cycle of rising inequality was by no means inevitable. Nor is it inevitable in the future. More correct would be to argue that rising instability (both social and financial) is the result of our persistent at- tempts to breathe new life into capitalism, in the face of underlying fundamentals that are now beginning to point in the opposite direction. Reversing the trend by raising the labour productivity growth rate through selective technologies is a highly uncertain strategy that may well intensify the environmental and social problems of the 21st century. By privileging the interests of the owners of capital over the interests of those employed in wage labour in the economy, it may be possible for short time to keep a certain kind of economic growth going. But the end result is a somewhat frightening sense that, as the Institute for Public Policy Research ( IPPR, 2018 ) recently pointed out, when the next crisis hits there will be neither fiscal nor monetary room for manoeuvre. In short, this paper has argued that the ‘ growth fetish ’ which has dominated western political thinking for over half a century lies at the heart of the problems now encountered by advanced economies. It has hindered ecological innovation, exacerbated financial instability and reinforced inequality. There is a case to be answered, of course, that this strategy has continued to benefit the few. But its legitimacy as a strategy to ensure a better life for the many is severely dented. Prosperity itself is being undone by an allegiance to growth at all costs. Reaching beyond these potentially destructive conditions is clearly challenging, but by no means impossible. There is an emerging (and increasingly timely) interest in ideas around de-growth ( D'Alisa et al., 2014 ; Kallis, 2015 ; Van den Bergh, 2015 ) and in the economics of a ‘ post-growth ’ society ( Cassiers et al., 2017 ; Blewitt and Cunningham, 2014 ; Jackson, 2009, 2017). These approaches tend to accept that beyond a certain point, and for a variety of reasons, relentless economic growth may be neither desirable nor indeed feasible. Whether for secular reasons, or from a decline in resource quality, or from the need to curtail damaging environmental impact, proponents of these ideas attempt to envision the social conditions (and economic implications) of a world in which, for the advanced economies at least, it is necessary to ‘ manage without growth ’ (Victor, 2008/2018 ). Perhaps the most interesting avenue that emerges from this ex- ploration relates to the fundamental challenge which lies at the heart of it, the decline in labour productivity growth. Amongst the potential causes of such a decline lies one which carries the seeds of a new way of thinking about the role of enterprise and work in a post-growth society. Structural changes from primary (extractive) and secondary (manufacturing) towards tertiary (service) sector industries may be partially responsible for the transition towards a lower productivity growth (Nordhaus, 2006). Though often presented in conventional economics as a problem – for instance as the source of Baumol's (2012) ‘ Cost disease ’– there are certain service-based sectors which are both lighter (more sustainable) in material terms and contribute particular benefits in terms of the quality of life. These human services – particularly those based around care, craft and creativity – might well provide the clue to a lighter (more sustainable) economy capable of delivering a lasting prosperity without the need for economic growth. 9 The US writer Wendell Berry (2008) once remarked that ‘ human and earthly limits, properly understood, are not con fi nements, but ra- ther inducements ... to fullness of relationship and meaning ’ . Nowhere is this observation more true than in the context of the post-growth challenge facing the advanced economies in the 21st Century. That challenge, properly conceived, is not to pursue ever more desperate policies to regain the lost footings of a fossil-fuel driven hyper-pro- ductivity, but rather to create the conditions for an economy that works for everyone, within the constraints of a fi nite planet. As I have argued extensively elsewhere ( Jackson, 2017), that task is precise, de fi nable, pragmatic and achievable.

#### NewSpace actors engage in historical revisionism that moralistically justifies endless accumulation by displacing neoliberal guilt.

Johnson ‘20 (Johnson, Matthew Robert. "Mining the high frontier: sovereignty, property and humankind’s common heritage in outer space." PhD diss., University of Technology Sydney. Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, 2020-08-26; JPark)

The trope of the frontier speaks to both violent appropriation and – as it appears in NewSpace discourse – redemption and freedom. Frontier mythology has a highly emotive resonance: it appeals to individual and collective psyches through the frontier’s promise of liberation, salvation and re-birth. As Blouet notes, “states are clever in promoting ambitions in the cloak of emotional appeals” (1994, p.285). The European colonial powers claimed theirs was a ‘civilising mission’ (Said 1995), a valorous project of “bringing light, faith and trade to ‘the dark places’ of the earth” as they murdered and subordinated indigenous populations on the imperial horizon (Lindqvist 2002, p.12). Ever since the Apollo program, outer space has held an important place in the emotional fabric of American national culture. What mythic elements can we discern in NewSpace cosmopolitics? What stories is NewSpace telling to render its colonial project as commensurate with the ‘benefit of all mankind’? Political mythologies are not opposed to political rationality – they permeate and are indissociable from them (Dean 2006). Political economist Mitchell Dean has illustrated that “mythic, poetic and symbolic elements” permeate spatial and cartographic notions of political order (2006, p.1). Deploying Connery’s term ‘geo-mythography’ (2001), he describes the mythic foundations of Schmitt’s conceptions of nomos. For instance, Schmitt begins The nomos of the earth by saying: “In mythical language, the earth became known as the mother of law...” (Schmitt 2003, p.42). Pagan concepts of the Earth Mother are evident in Schmitt’s account, which also drew on his conservative Catholicism in noting the herdsman or shepherd in the etymological roots of nomos (ibid, p.339-340). Indeed, Schmitt focuses on the nomos of medieval Europe’s respublica Christiania, an empire with Holy Rome at its centre acting as katcheon or ‘restrainer’ of the Antichrist (ibid, pp.58-62; Dean 2006). The contrasts that Schmitt makes between terra firma and mare libre arrive at a sort of telluric mythos, his genealogy of spatial law and order invoking the “consecrated sites” and “sacred orientations” of landed existence (Schmitt, in Dean 2006, p.10). The NewSpace imaginary of course involves a break from the ‘Earth Mother’ – a point Ormrod has argued while drawing on Freudian psychoanalytics (2007, pp.266-7) – but geo-myths are nonetheless an important part of their public justifications for space colonisation. ‘Manifest Destiny’ is a geopolitical discourse that emerged from Enlightenment progress ideology and is evident in many phases of American history and in the NewSpace vision (Parker 2009). Beginning with the 19th century impulse to “conquer and civilize the ‘empty continent’”, it was the United States’ destiny to continue expanding (Ó Tuathail 1994, p.159). Like lebensraum, which had been inspired by Friedrich Ratzel’s visit to frontier America, manifest destiny was a means of justifying imperial expansionism. This geo- mythography was wedded to American exceptionalism: if expansionism was America’s ‘destiny’, the violence of this expansionism was morally justifiable. The political geographer Gerard Ó Tuathail summarises Manifest Destiny with the following quote from founding father Thomas Paine: “The cause of America...is in great measure the cause of all mankind” (1994, p.159). The idea that humanity needs space to expand on the off-world frontier is a techno- utopian version of Manifest Destiny. In his essay ‘Capitalists in Space’ (2009), Parker has noted the parallels between off-world expansionism and westward frontiers in American culture. He draws attention to the US historian Frederick Jackson Turner (1893), who had argued that when the westward journey ended on the Pacific Coast and the American frontier was effectively closed, it “augured badly for the future of the USA. American character was defined by novelty, adaptation and growth, so without this imaginative geography of a frontier, there was a danger of atrophy” (Parker 2009, p.89). I am reminded here of Gerard 208 O’Neill’s remark that a steady state economy would allegedly produce a constriction of innovation and creativity that would be “abhorrent” (in Kilgore 2003, p.159). For NewSpace and neoliberalism, Property represents Progress. Yet the notion of private property as inherently virtuous rests upon unstable myths (Christman 2014). Like American exceptionalism, the **valorisation of private property rights in the NewSpace** and neoliberal **imaginary** requires **erasing** or simply forgetting the **violence of enclosure and colonialism**. Space writer and policy analyst Rand Simberg produced Homesteading the Final Frontier (2012) for the Atlas Network’s Competitive Enterprise Institute. He asserts that: “...under the view of the universe as a frontier full of potential, the resources that could be developed from it offer great opportunity for human flourishing. Centuries of history demonstrate that the best means of doing that is via the free exchange of goods and services, undergirded by legally enforceable private property rights” (Simberg 2012, p.4). In Simberg’s view, ‘centuries of history’ validate private property – and not common property – as the driver of human flourishing. With the ahistoricity characteristic of neoliberalism and neoclassical economics, Simberg sweeps aside centuries of appropriation, displacement and violence that followed in capitalism’s imperial wake. The history of private property is tainted with discrimination, coercion and the heavy hand of empire – this is inconsistent with the truth claims of universal beneficence inherent in NewSpace private property advocacy (**regardless** of how violent or peaceful space colonisation ends up being). In his Mythologies (1973), Roland Barthes looked to capitalist myths. His description of the ‘privation of history’ offers some insight into NewSpace’s erasure of property’s violent past. According to Barthes, the privation of history was a myth of estrangement that divorced objects from their history. “Myth deprives the object of which it speaks of all History. In it, history evaporates. It is a kind of ideal servant: it prepares all things, brings them, lays them out, the master arrives, it silently disappears: all that is left for one to do is enjoy this beautiful object without wondering where it came from” (1973, p.165). Severing an object from its history – this is clearly taking place in NewSpace’s revisionist history of private property. Consider the following remark from Moon Express’ Bob Richards: “As a country built on the foundations of Earth’s frontiers, the United States stands unique in all the world with the opportunity to focus the power of its entrepreneurial history and enterprising vision to open up the space frontier, and in so doing, create a peaceful, prosperous and boundless future for all humanity” (Richards 2017, p.1). The United States was actually built upon ‘foundations of the frontier’, but only because the expansion of Anglo-American sovereignty involved the imposition of European law upon the foundational nomoi of native American law. The (un)settling of the American frontier was ultimately not a ‘peaceful, prosperous and boundless’ process for all Americans. The privation of property history excises the violence, so that colonial power can be ascribed a **measure of ‘innocence’** (Whyte 2018, p.237), “as if one can take the good parts of a metaphor, setting the unseemly ones aside” (Messeri 2017). In NewSpace representations of property and discussions of space colonisation that appear in neoliberal advocacy (see also Singal 2018), the off-world frontier presents a zone of guilt-free appropriation, an opportunity to escape what Hegel described as the “slaughter- bench” of history (2001, p.35). Hegel’s Philosophy of History described how, in the name of progress, “the happiness of peoples, the wisdom of States, and the virtue of individuals have been victimized” (ibid, p.33). Hegel viewed the violence of western civilisation as ultimately worthwhile, if it meant the eventual realisation of Freedom – a teleological account of human history that NewSpace appears to share with Hegel, that “the History of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of Freedom” (2001, p.33). For NewSpace libertarians, off-world property represents a paradoxical freedom from the empire that is enabled by the empire. In their heroic colonisation of the off-world, they are relieved from repressing resistant ‘commoners’, from negotiating over prior land rights and from managing the ecological impacts of resource exploitation – all that needs to be done is undermine international treaty law (e.g. Gump 2018). Escaping history, the NewSpace salvationist narrative renders unilateral private property law as commensurate with “the common interest of all mankind in the progress of the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes” (Outer Space Treaty 1967, preamble).

#### NewSpace valorizes private property, advances American exceptionalism, and uses the frontier to greenlight exploitation, colonialism, and violence.

Johnson ‘20 (Johnson, Matthew Robert. "Mining the high frontier: sovereignty, property and humankind’s common heritage in outer space." PhD diss., University of Technology Sydney. Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, 2020-08-26; JPark) **[Bolded Brackets]** inserted for footnote clarity

5. Privateering the cosmic frontier: empire, myth and the violence of property93 There is an intractable link between national sovereignty and private property (Chapter 2), particularly as manifest in mining rights (Chapter 3). A neoliberal constitution has emerged in international law that fortifies corporate rights to extract from and pollute the global commons, as Atlas organisations pressure sovereign states to undermine alternate legal orders that recognise collective rights and responsibilities. NewSpace’s ‘constitutional’ arguments attempt to create a legal justification for private off-world resource appropriation in advance of this speculative project being realised (Chapter 4). In this chapter, we will move further into the realm of the anticipatory, as I discuss how state-corporate appropriation on the cosmic frontier might transpire. I will do this by counter-posing my own speculations against an episode in NewSpace myth-making, a tale of off-world privatisation. The now-defunct NewSpace start-up MirCorp had briefly privatised the Russian space station Mir – this was essentially NewSpace’s first and only corporate outpost in space. The story of MirCorp is told by NewSpace protagonists in the documentary film, Orphans of Apollo (2008). This text is arguably the zenith of the network’s anti-statist and anti-bureaucratic mythos: it is a paean to NewSpace entrepreneurialism that implicates NASA and the US Government in the failure of MirCorp, while simultaneously absolving speculative capital. The documentary invokes the figure of the pirate – the original extra-territorial anarcho-libertarian – and in doing so, it broaches the tension between national appropriation and private mineral ownership that is at the heart of this dissertation. I will use the Orphans’ pirate imagery as a heuristic for establishing precedents for space mining in the age of maritime colonialism (returning to themes I raised in section 3.2.1). I posit that the state-backed space mining firm bears closer resemblance to the privateers and charter companies of maritime colonialism: pirates for hire and commercial vanguards for empire, pushing back the frontier. To describe a place or space as a frontier is to give it an ostensibly geographical designation: it can describe the furthest extent of a civilisation, the periphery at spatial remove from the core (Wallerstein 1974). It can also denote areas that are particularly 182 difficult to access, like mountainous regions, jungles, deserts and outer space (Hall 2013, p.53). As Derek Hall notes in his political economy of land, “frontiers are areas where states fall well short of exercising administrative control” (2014, p.52). Yet using physical or political-geographic terms to describe frontiers is to neglect their cultural characteristics and their mythoi. The future studies scholar William Kramer (2014) reports on the ongoing use of frontier metaphors in NASA mission planning and lists the adjectives that can accompany frontier discourses and the role of the valorous pioneer within them. The frontier can be: “unknown, vast, lonely, godless, godforsaken, virgin, barren, unbroken, untamed, heathen, wild, desolate, savage, unforgiving, cold, hostile, foreboding, limitless, dangerous, uncivilized and even angry. These, then, contribute to the suite of terms that describe aspects of pioneers’ relationship to that frontier, such as fear, battle, challenge, assault, conquering, conquest, subduing, civilizing, and taming” (Kramer 2014, p.181). To varying extents, frontiers are anomic or lawless (anomos; discussed in section 2.3) – at least from the perspective of colonisers. Frontiers either lack a nomos, or there is an older, indigenous nomos that is displaced by a new colonial nomos through state-sanctioned violence (Walker 2013, pp.400-401). To tame, to conquer and to subdue – more than mere geophysical marker, ‘**the frontier’ indelibly connotes the violence of colonialism**. ‘The frontier’ has always been a central trope in NewSpace discourse, one in which discourses of individual freedom or deregulation merge with the inherent patriotism of the US-centred movement. The Tea Party in Space is one organisation that participates in the ‘March Storm’ or ‘August Blitz’ inter-organisational lobbying events held by the Alliance for Space Development (ASD 2019, p.1). In their policy platform, they state: “Only through fiscally responsible policy, which limits government bureaucracy and stimulates the free market, will the United States expand on its leadership in space. By removing barriers of entry to the utilization of the solar system, new business models become viable. This sound free-market-based approach will create new sectors of the economy and strengthen America as the vanguard of freedom and opportunity as we spread throughout the solar system. We will carry forth the American values that made our nation great. The United States will settle space as it settled the American continent. The days of Lewis and Clark, and Apollo, are over. This is the Oregon Trail space policy” (Tea Party in Space 2014). The Tea Party in Space’s platform invokes some historically durable motifs – not least of all the mythological figure of Apollo, namesake of the US’s lunar program. In addition to 183 neoliberal edicts of ‘fiscal responsibility’ and removing barriers to entry, the Tea Party in Space’s platform is, in their words, “grounded in American exceptionalism” (Tea Party in Space 2014). This exceptionalism is expressed in spatio-historic terms through the invocation of the frontier. NewSpace will ‘carry forth the American values that made our nation great’ onto unsettled celestial bodies like the civilian pioneers westward bound on the Oregon Trail. NewSpace believes it will be the exceptional, valorous entrepreneur who is skyward bound as ‘the vanguard of freedom and opportunity’ – America’s destiny manifest in a union with free- market capitalism. Parker (2009, pp.89-90) has noted the synergy between the westward frontier and the libertarian space frontier. Henry David Thoreau (1817-1862) had said, “Eastward I go only by force; but westward I go free” – on the frontier, one could “forget the Old World and its institutions” that lay across the Atlantic, because “we go westward as into the future” (2008 [1862]; Parker 2009, p.89). For libertarian space advocates, beyond the atmosphere lies an open expanse of extraterritorial liberty, an endless frontier in which to exercise one’s inalienable right to private property ownership, untethered to terrestrial polity or regulation. However, unacknowledged in the frontier romanticism of Thoreau and the Tea Party in Space is the fact that the Oregon Trail had been blazed, in large part, by the Hudson’s Bay Company (Douthit 1992). This British charter company was incorporated by King Charles II in 1670 for the purpose of "finding some Trade for Furs, Minerals, and other considerable Commodities...[from which] there may probably arise very great Advantage to Us and Our Kingdom” (Royal Charter of the Hudson’s Bay Company, HBC Heritage 2016). The Company was granted powers of de facto government, and had exercised the rights bestowed by the Crown “to send either Ships of War, Men or Ammunition...unto any their Plantations, Forts, Factories, or Places of Trade aforesaid, for the Security and Defence” of the land it had claimed along the fabled ‘pioneer’ trail from Missouri to Oregon (HBC Heritage 2016). Also missing from the above frontier mythologies is the fact that the American continent had been pioneered millennia before the arrival of early industrial civilisation. The indigenous societies that lived and worked the land prior to the Oregon Trail were often key sources of trade for Anglo-American wagon trains and, through disease and violence, were frequently killed through contact with white settlers. Far from forgetting the institutions of the Old World, “free from all worldly engagements” (Thoreau 2008), the frontier freedoms of white pioneers were enabled by European monarchical sovereignty – often expressed and solidified through 184 colonial violence. Myth-making is abundant in NewSpace. By myth, I mean both a falsehood and a ‘legend’ that “still powerfully conveys some important moral and social lesson” regardless of its veracity (Christman 2014, p.3). The mythic frontier appears in the policy platforms of NewSpace organisations. It appears in the promotional material of prospective space miners: Moon Express, for example, looks to new colonial horizons and core-periphery relationships when asserting that “The Moon is Earth’s 8th continent, a new frontier for humanity with precious resources that can bring enormous benefits to life on Earth and our future in space” (n.d.). The frontier trope is also evident in the private property advocacy formulated and published by neoliberal think-tanks. In contrast with Thoreau’s wistful sauntering in the wilderness, for Edward Hudgins of the Cato Institute, the off-world frontier promises commercial infinitude and boundless capital accumulation, so long as it is tamed through private property rights. “In the past patriots fought to establish political and economic conditions of free exchange and private property rights. These conditions opened commercial frontiers on Earth and allowed us to create material wealth and technical capacities never dreamed of. By establishing these conditions throughout the solar system, we will open boundless new commercial frontiers.” (Hudgins 2002, p.xxv) Hudgins claims private property will open new frontiers, rather than enclose them or establish new barriers to open access. Much like the Tea Party in Space, Hudgins fuses together the heroic narrative of American nationalism with neoliberalism’s omniscient market and the trailblazing entrepreneur. This chapter explores the ‘geo-mythography’ (Connery 2001; Dean 2006) of the frontier and its role in NewSpace’s political imaginary. I begin by discussing Orphans of Apollo and its invocation of the pirate, and move into a discussion of the privateer – an alternate figure in maritime colonialism that brings us closer to a precedent for the state- backed frontier mineral rights of the CSLCA.94 To what extent would the NewSpace mining **[FOOTNOTE 94]** As a point of revision, space mining start-ups represent the contemporary, ‘business face’ of NewSpace’s utopianism. The business model for space mining currently appears geared towards more sober, feasible projects in the form of extracting water from asteroids, separating it into hydrogen and oxygen for fuel and selling it (through presently non-existent mechanisms for off-world trade) to national space agencies and their ‘big aerospace’ contractors. However, civil society organisations and several founders of the space mining firms within the broader NewSpace network consider in situ resource utilisation as the vehicle for the permanent settlement of other celestial bodies. From O’Neill and the L-5 Society through to SpaceX’s proposed Colonial Fleet (Musk 2017, p.49), NewSpace has consistently treated off-world resource **[PAGE ENDS, FOOTNOTE CONTINUES]** appropriation as the key to ‘humanising’ the cosmos (O’Neill 1977). I thus treat space mining and space colonisation, the visioneer’s contradictory impulses of technical pragmatism and utopianism (McCray 2013), as intractable elements in this chapter**. [FOOTNOTE 94 ENDS]** 185 project mirror the frontier appropriations of the privateer and the joint-stock company? On the one hand, I venture that the legislative guarantee of private mineral rights represents the first, pre-emptive step in a neo-colonial entwinement of US resource imperialism and NewSpace’s humanising mission. In the off-world, there is an unrealised, anticipatory violence lurking behind the promise of property ownership – such as the Trump Administration’s 2019 establishment of a US Space Force that would (among other geostrategic priorities) protect American commercial interests in space (DoD 2018). On the other hand, NewSpace colonialism is discordant with the piratical and imperial violence that has plagued the frontiers of Earth. For NewSpace, the Solar System represents the guilt-free frontier – a benign colonialism. To use Hegel’s words, it is an attempt to escape from the “slaughter bench” of history (2001 [n.d.], p.35).

### 1AC – Framing

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

#### Existential threats independently outweigh – all life has infinite value and extinction eliminates the possibility for future generations

GPP 17 (Global Priorities Project, Future of Humanity Institute at the University of Oxford, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, “Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance,” Global Priorities Project, 2017, <https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf>,

1.2. THE ETHICS OF EXISTENTIAL RISK In his book Reasons and Persons, Oxford philosopher Derek Parfit advanced an influential argument about the importance of avoiding extinction: I believe that if we destroy mankind, as we now can, this outcome will be much worse than most people think. Compare three outcomes: (1) Peace. (2) A nuclear war that kills 99% of the world’s existing population. (3) A nuclear war that kills 100%. (2) would be worse than (1), and (3) would be worse than (2). Which is the greater of these two differences? Most people believe that the greater difference is between (1) and (2). I believe that the difference between (2) and (3) is very much greater. ... The Earth will remain habitable for at least another billion years. Civilization began only a few thousand years ago. If we do not destroy mankind, these few thousand years may be only a tiny fraction of the whole of civilized human history. The difference between (2) and (3) may thus be the difference between this tiny fraction and all of the rest of this history. If we compare this possible history to a day, what has occurred so far is only a fraction of a second.65 In this argument, it seems that Parfit is assuming that the survivors of a nuclear war that kills 99% of the population would eventually be able to recover civilisation without long-term effect. As we have seen, this may not be a safe assumption – but for the purposes of this thought experiment, the point stands. What makes existential catastrophes especially bad is that they would “destroy the future,” as another Oxford philosopher, Nick Bostrom, puts it.66 This future could potentially be extremely long and full of flourishing, and would therefore have extremely large value. In standard risk analysis, when working out how to respond to risk, we work out the expected value of risk reduction, by weighing the probability that an action will prevent an adverse event against the severity of the event. Because the value of preventing existential catastrophe is so vast, even a tiny probability of prevention has huge expected value.67 Of course, there is persisting reasonable disagreement about ethics and there are a number of ways one might resist this conclusion.68 Therefore, it would be unjustified to be overconfident in Parfit and Bostrom’s argument. In some areas, government policy does give significant weight to future generations. For example, in assessing the risks of nuclear waste storage, governments have considered timeframes of thousands, hundreds of thousands, and even a million years.69 Justifications for this policy usually appeal to principles of intergenerational equity according to which future generations ought to get as much protection as current generations.70 Similarly, widely accepted norms of sustainable development require development that meets the needs of the current generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.71 However, when it comes to existential risk, it would seem that we fail to live up to principles of intergenerational equity. Existential catastrophe would not only give future generations less than the current generations; it would give them nothing. Indeed, reducing existential risk plausibly has a quite low cost for us in comparison with the huge expected value it has for future generations. In spite of this, relatively little is done to reduce existential risk. Unless we give up on norms of intergenerational equity, they give us a strong case for significantly increasing our efforts to reduce existential risks. 1.3. WHY EXISTENTIAL RISKS MAY BE SYSTEMATICALLY UNDERINVESTED IN, AND THE ROLE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY In spite of the importance of existential risk reduction, it probably receives less attention than is warranted. As a result, concerted international cooperation is required if we are to receive adequate protection from existential risks. 1.3.1. Why existential risks are likely to be underinvested in There are several reasons why existential risk reduction is likely to be underinvested in. Firstly, it is a global public good. Economic theory predicts that such goods tend to be underprovided. The benefits of existential risk reduction are widely and indivisibly dispersed around the globe from the countries responsible for taking action. Consequently, a country which reduces existential risk gains only a small portion of the benefits but bears the full brunt of the costs. Countries thus have strong incentives to free ride, receiving the benefits of risk reduction without contributing. As a result, too few do what is in the common interest. Secondly, as already suggested above, existential risk reduction is an intergenerational public good: most of the benefits are enjoyed by future generations who have no say in the political process. For these goods, the problem is temporal free riding: the current generation enjoys the benefits of inaction while future generations bear the costs. Thirdly, many existential risks, such as machine superintelligence, engineered pandemics, and solar geoengineering, pose an unprecedented and uncertain future threat. Consequently, it is hard to develop a satisfactory governance regime for them: there are few existing governance instruments which can be applied to these risks, and it is unclear what shape new instruments should take. In this way, our position with regard to these emerging risks is comparable to the one we faced when nuclear weapons first became available. Cognitive biases also lead people to underestimate existential risks. Since there have not been any catastrophes of this magnitude, these risks are not salient to politicians and the public.72 This is an example of the misapplication of the availability heuristic, a mental shortcut which assumes that something is important only if it can be readily recalled. Another cognitive bias affecting perceptions of existential risk is scope neglect. In a seminal 1992 study, three groups were asked how much they would be willing to pay to save 2,000, 20,000 or 200,000 birds from drowning in uncovered oil ponds. The groups answered $80, $78, and $88, respectively.73 In this case, the size of the benefits had little effect on the scale of the preferred response. People become numbed to the effect of saving lives when the numbers get too large. 74 Scope neglect is a particularly acute problem for existential risk because the numbers at stake are so large. Due to scope neglect, decision-makers are prone to treat existential risks in a similar way to problems which are less severe by many orders of magnitude. A wide range of other cognitive biases are likely to affect the evaluation of existential risks.75

**Pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable.**

**Moen 16** [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] SJDI

Let us start by observing, empirically, that **a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable.** **On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues.** This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for **there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have.** “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 **The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values.** If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, **I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so**, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but **for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable.** You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” **If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.**3 As Aristotle observes**: “We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.**”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that **pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value.**

#### Thus, the standard is maximizing expected well-being – prefer:

#### 1] Actor specificity – Governments must aggregate since every policy benefits some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action. Actor-specificity comes first since different agents have different ethical standings.

#### 2] **No act-omission distinction—governments are responsible for everything in the public sphere so inaction is implicit authorization of action: they have to yes/no bills, which means everything collapse to aggregation.**