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#### Space tourism is a burgeoning market --- 2021 was just the beginning

Howell 21 [Elizabeth Howell, Ph.D., is a contributing writer for Space.com; she holds a Ph.D. and M.Sc. in Space Studies from the University of North Dakota, and a Bachelor of Journalism from Canada's Carleton University. Her latest book, NASA Leadership Moments, is co-written with astronaut Dave Williams. “Space Tourism Took a Giant Leap in 2021: Here’s 10 Milestones from the Year.” December 27, 2021. https://www.space.com/space-tourism-giant-leap-2021-milestones]

This year saw more space tourists fly to space on a bunch of different systems, and the story has only just begun. Virgin Galactic, Blue Origin and SpaceX each flew their first tourist-focused missions this year, sending aloft several people each with minimal training in professional spaceflight. Meanwhile, Roscosmos (the Russian federal space agency) brought two sets of space tourists into space, including a mission with Space Adventures. With 2022 also set to be busy, between more tourist flights and the expected addition of company Axiom Space (using a SpaceX Crew Dragon), we rounded up some of the main milestones of 2021 below. The four members of the Axiom Space Ax-1 crew: Michael Lopez-Alegria, former NASA astronaut, Axiom Space vice president and Ax-1 commander; Larry Connor, U.S. real estate entrepreneur and Ax-1 pilot; Mark Pathy, Canadian investor and philanthropist; and Eytan Stibbe, Israeli businessman and fighter pilot. (Image credit: collectSPACE.com) Axiom Space revealed its clients Jan. 26 for its first privately-funded and operated mission to the International Space Station (ISS). Called Axiom Mission 1 (Ax-1), the flight is arranged under a commercial agreement with NASA. Slated to launch on a SpaceX Dragon spacecraft are Larry Connor, an American real estate and technology entrepreneur; Eytan Stibbe, a businessman and former Israeli fighter pilot; Mark Pathy, a Canadian investor and philanthropist; and Michael Lopez-Alegria, a retired NASA astronaut with nearly 260 days in space already across four missions. In June, SpaceX and Axiom announced an agreement to fly three more missions to the orbiting complex after Ax-1. NASA officially cleared the Ax-1 crew for flight on Dec. 20. 2) Starship launches test flight and sticks the landing After several attempts on previous test landing that didn't make it safely to landing, SpaceX's Starship SN-15 prototype launched its own test flight May 5 and made it all the way from takeoff to touchdown. The uncrewed test flight coincidentally fell on the 60th anniversary of the United States' first-ever crewed spaceflight, which saw NASA astronaut Alan Shepard make it to suborbital space. SpaceX has said it hopes to use Starship to branch out in the solar system, especially for crewed Mars missions. 3) Virgin Galactic launches Richard Branson On July 11, Virgin Galactic launched its first operational tourist flight, featuring founder Richard Branson. It was "the experience of a lifetime," Branson said during a live broadcast of the flight. The four-person crew and two pilots of the Unity 22 test flight mission took off from the company's Spaceport America facility in New Mexico and flew just above the boundary of space, where everyone experienced about four minutes of weightlessness. Future flights of Virgin Galactic, though, have been delayed due to a Federal Aviation Administration investigation into a reported incident that happened during the spaceflight. That said, Virgin has opened up tickets again to paying spaceflyers, now at $450,000 apiece. 4) Blue Origin launches Jeff Bezos to space Days after the Virgin flight, Blue Origin launched its first crewed spaceflight on July 20, featuring founder Jeff Bezos and a set of other three space tourists, including Mercury 13 aviator Wally Funk. Since the system flies autonomously, no pilots were required to be on board (although Funk is highly qualified as an aviator) as the New Shepard system lifted off from Blue Origin's Launch Site One near the West Texas town of Van Horn. While Bezos and Branson denied their companies were in competition, the broadcast of Bezos' flight made several cutting remarks about the company flying above the Kármán line, an internationally recognized boundary of spaceflight that Virgin Galactic flights don't reach. Bezos also said in an interview in July that Blue Origin is not focused on competition, but building a "road to space." The company has adopted that catchphrase as a tagline and repeats it frequently during live broadcasts. 5) SpaceX stacks tallest booster ever with Starship SpaceX's first orbital Starship SN20 is stacked atop its massive Super Heavy Booster 4 for the first time on Aug. 6, 2021 at the company's Starbase facility near Boca Chica Village in South Texas. They stood 395 feet tall, taller than NASA's Saturn V moon rocket. (Image credit: SpaceX) SpaceX's newest Starship prototype (SN-20) perched on its massive Super Heavy booster for the first time on Friday (Aug. 6), briefly setting a new record for the world's tallest rocket during preparations for an orbital mission. The hour-long fit check brought the stack to 395 feet tall (120 m), taller than NASA's massive Saturn V moon rocket, which was 363 feet tall (110 m). Super Heavy alone stands 230 feet (70 meters) tall and Starship SN4 includes another 165 feet (50 m) of height. The next major milestone for Starship is the orbital launch that may take place in 2022, pending an environmental review by the Federal Aviation Administration and related government groups. SpaceX founder Elon Musk has pushed back launch estimates several times due to the review. 6) Inspiration4 launches 4 civilians on first orbital mission Billionaire Jared Isaacman's privately chartered spaceflight launched on Sept. 15, 2021 aboard a SpaceX Crew Dragon spacecraft, flying high in Earth orbit on a nearly three-day mission. Inspiration4 was the first crewed orbital mission with no professional astronauts on board (as the Virgin Galactic and Blue Origin flights preceding it were all suborbital missions.) Isaacman, a pilot, commanded the flight and was accompanied by physician assistant Hayley Arceneaux, data engineer Chris Sembroski, and geoscientist and science communication specialist Sian Proctor. Sembroski and Proctor won their seats in contests to support St. Jude Children's Research Hospital in Memphis, while Arceneaux is employed at that hospital. Resilience and its crew circled Earth for three days, splashing down off the Florida coast on Sept. 18. The mission exceeded its fundraising goal for St. Jude. 7) Blue Origin launches William Shatner A "Star Trek" star boldly went into suborbital space Oct. 13 on Blue Origin's second crewed space mission, called NS-18. William Shatner, 90, is best known for playing Captain James T. Kirk on "Star Trek: The Original Series." "That was unlike anything they described," Shatner was heard saying via a radio link as the capsule parachuted back to Earth, after carrying him and three other crew members to suborbital space. Shatner is now the oldest person to have ever flown to space, beating the record set by Wally Funk, 82, who flew on Blue Origin's first crewed flight July 20. Crew member Glen de Vries died in a plane crash weeks after the flight and Blue Origin dedicated their next crewed mission in December to him. 8) Russian film crew shoots drama on ISS Russian actress Yulia Peresild (center), director Klim Shipenko (second from right) and cosmonaut Oleg Novitskiy (right) bid farewell to their Russian crewmates Anton Shkaplerov (second from left) and Pyotr Dubrov before returning to Earth on Oct. 17, 2021. (Image credit: Roscosmos/Anton Shkaplerov via Twitter) Just days after Shatner's ride to space, a Russian film crew including actress Yulia Peresild and producer Klim Shipenko landed with cosmonaut Oleg Novitskiy of the Russian federal space corporation Roscosmos on Oct. 17. "Вызов" ("Challenge" in English) is the movie in production. It follows the fictional story of a surgeon (Peresild) who is launched to the station to perform emergency surgery on a cosmonaut (Novitskiy, who would play the role well given he is a cosmonaut in real life.) The effort is a joint production of Roscosmos, the Russian television station Channel One and the studio Yellow, Black and White. Given the small crew on hand in space, Shipenko took on several behind-the-scenes roles, including director, make-up artist, sound editor and cinematographer. 9) Blue Origin launches 'Good Morning America' host to space Blue Origin's next (and likely last) crewed flight of 2021 filled out all six seats in the New Shepard spacecraft during a successful launch and landing Dec. 11. The starring guest was Michael Strahan, host of "Good Morning America", who is a retired football player. (The crew threw mini-footballs in space to celebrate his past career.) Strahan said the experience was amazing. "I want to go back," he told Blue Origin founder Jeff Bezos after returning to Earth. "Touchdown has a new meaning now!!!" he wrote on Twitter after the flight. Also on the flight was Laura Shepard Churchley, 74, the daughter of NASA astronaut Shepard after whom the New Shepard system is named, and four other individuals who paid for their seats. Blue Origin has not yet released per-seat pricing for customers, and we are also awaiting details on their next planned crew launch. 10) Japanese billionaire Yusaku Maezawa flies to ISS A Russian Soyuz spacecraft carrying Japanese billionaire Yusaku Maezawa, video producer Yozo Hirano and cosmonaut Alexander Misurkin launched on Dec. 8 to the International Space Station for a 12-day mission to the orbiting lab. Maezawa is also planning to fly around the moon on a SpaceX mission that he paid for, tentatively slotted for 2023, but chose to visit the space station as well on a mission brokered by the U.S. space tourism company Space Adventures with Russia's Roscosmos space agency. It was not revealed how much Maezawa paid for the flight, but single seats in the past have cost up to $35 million. And Maezawa bought two seats, one for himself and for Hirano, who recorded videos of Maezawa in space. Maezawa, the CEO of Start Today and the founder of online clothing retailer ZOZO, bought the seats for himself and Hirano. Hirano documented the mission and participate in some health and performance research. They also made the first Uber Eats delivery in space on the flight. The trio returned to Earth on Dec. 19. And that's a wrap at the biggest space tourism moments in 2021. The year 2022 is expected to bring more milestones as the company Axiom Space plans to launch its first fully private crew to the International Space Station early in the year, with SpaceX, Blue Origin and Virgin Galactic all expected to continue their private spaceflight pace.

#### The new space race is here --- space hotels are catering to tourist demand

Bacchi 19 [Umberto Bacchi is a journalist for Reuters. “Stellar view? Space hotels race to offer tourists a room in the sky.” December 1, 2019. *Reuters*. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-space-lawmaking-tourism/stellar-view-space-hotels-race-to-offer-tourists-a-room-in-the-sky-idUSKBN1Y602W]

* Parenthesis in the quote are from the original text

TBILISI (Thomson Reuters Foundation) - Tired of your ordinary earthly vacations? Some day soon you might be able to board a rocket and get a room with a view - of the whole planet - from a hotel in space. At least, that is the sales pitch of several companies racing to become the first to host guests in orbit on purpose-built space stations. “It sounds kind of crazy to us today because it is not a reality yet,” said Frank Bunger, founder of U.S. aerospace firm Orion Span, one of the companies vying to take travelers out of this world. “But that’s the nature of these things, it sounds crazy until it is normal.” U.S. multimillionaire Dennis Tito became the world’s first paying space tourist in 2001, traveling to the International Space Station (ISS) aboard a Russian Soyuz rocket for a reported $20 million. A few others have followed. Since then, companies like Boeing, SpaceX and Blue Origin have been working on ways to bring the stars into reach for more people - opening up a new business frontier for would-be space hoteliers. U.S. space agency NASA announced in June that it plans to allow two private citizens a year to stay at the ISS at a cost of about $35,000 per night for up to a month. The first mission could be as early as 2020. But the growing movement has raised questions about the adequacy of current space laws, which mainly deal with exploration and keeping space free of weapons, not hotels and holidaymakers. “It is difficult now to want to do things in space and get a clear answer from (space law),” said Christopher Johnson, a space law adviser at the Secure World Foundation, a space advocacy group. “For something as advanced as hotels in space there is no clear guidance.” ORBITAL HOLIDAY Orion Span plans to host the first guests on its Aurora Station - a capsule-shaped spacecraft roughly the size of a private jet - by 2024, said Bunger. Accompanied by a crew member, up to five travelers at a time would fly up to the station for a 12-day stay costing at least $9.5 million per head, he said. In orbit, guests would take part in scientific experiments, enjoy some 16 sunrises and sunsets a day and play table tennis in zero gravity, he said, adding about 30 people had already put down a $80,000 deposit to save a seat. “We haven’t seen this kind of excitement about space since the Apollo era,” Bunger told the Thomson Reuters Foundation by phone. Californian company the Gateway Foundation is hoping to build a massive space station able to sleep more than 400 people - including tourists, researchers, doctors and housekeepers. Solar-powered and shaped like a wheel, the station would spin around its core to create artificial gravity on its perimeter, equal to about one-sixth of that on earth, said its architect Tim Alatorre. “The problem is that you can only spin so fast before you start feeling sick,” he said. “We could easily create earth gravity on the station by spinning it faster but you wouldn’t be very comfortable.” The group aims to complete the station, named after Wernher von Braun, the former Nazi rocket scientist who later worked on the U.S. Apollo program, by 2028. Without disclosing how much a space holiday would cost, Alatorre said the goal was to make the station “accessible to the everyday person”. “So somebody can save up and go on a vacation to the United States or they can save up and go on a vacation to space,” he said.

#### Industry is projected to grow to over 1,000 launches per year

Rosenblum 13 [Andrew Rosenblum is a guest contributor to MIT Technology Review who reports on drones, artificial intelligence, security, and commercial space travel for Popular Science, Wired, Fortune, and other publications. “Space Tourism’s Black Carbon Problem.” May 16, 2013. https://www.popsci.com/science/article/2013-05/space-tourism-experiment-geo-engineering/]

Here’s where space tourism comes into play: The number of space launches annually around the world numbers around 70 today, but that figure could rise drastically, as private companies jockey to turn space tourism into routine adventure travel. The aerospace research firm Futron forecasts that by 2021 the space tourism market will consist of 13,000 potential customers, with possible revenues of roughly $650 million per year. Assuming the business is successful, commercial space travel might very well reach 1,000 launches per year some time in the next decade – XCOR alone plans to ramp up to four launches per day, as part of its “Southwest airlines” model. That creates 1,000 opportunities to shoot black carbon directly into the stratosphere. The amount of black carbon emitted during combustion on Earth, or in the trophosphere, where airlines fly, tends to be low, because of the relatively rich supply of oxygen. Once you get into the stratosphere, where low pressure leads to less oxygen, black carbon can amount to as much as 5% of the products of combustion. The Federal Aviation Administration (F.A.A.), the organization responsible for assessing environmental impacts and deciding whether to grant licenses to launch vehicles into space, says the effects of black carbon in the stratosphere are unclear. “Although black carbon is known to be a short-term climate forcer, research on the potential climate change impacts of black carbon from rockets is in a very early stage, and any projections of impacts are speculative,” writes George Nield, the F.A.A.’s associate administrator for commercial space transportation, in an email. The space-tourism industry has downplayed black carbon’s potential harm. Virgin Galactic declined repeated inquiries to comment. Andrew Nelson, the chief operating officer of XCOR Aerospace, which is currently selling $95,000 tickets for sub-orbital flights, says that the blend of kerosene and liquid oxygen in his XR-5K18 rocket engine powering its Lynx suborbital spaceplane will emit much less in the way of “aromatic” hydrocarbons than traditional kerosene-based rocket fuel. And he says the XR-5K18 will burn much more cleanly than the solid rocket boosters used in the Space Shuttle or “hybrid” rocket engines, which burn both solid and liquid propellant. “XCOR will have di minimus impact on our environment,” Nelson says. “Our fuels are almost completely free of particulate matter. [They have ] 20-40 times less aromatics than traditional rocket fuels, and hundreds, if not thousands of times less particulate matter than hybrids or solids. So the concern about carbon or other particles is moot for us.” Toohey still wants to see peer-reviewed studies of the actual interaction of XCOR and other engines with the stratosphere. “I have not seen any publications that confirm (or refute) the claims of particle-free emissions from combustion of any fuel in the upper atmosphere,” Toohey says. “So I think it is fair to say that we need studies to benchmark the emissions of all rocket types in order to be able to assess their impacts.”

#### Scenario 1 is ozone.

#### The Montreal Protocol worked --- the ozone hole is healing slowly, but new destruction pushes it past the brink

Stone 18 [Maddie Stone is a science journalist. “Our Best Evidence Yet That Humans Are Fixing the Ozone Hole.” January 5, 2018. https://gizmodo.com/our-best-evidence-yet-that-humans-are-fixing-the-ozone-1821808429]

The ozone hole feels like the quintessential ‘80s problem, but unlike car phones and mullets, it remains relevant in a number of ways. For starters, it’s still there, chilling over Antartica. More importantly, it’s slowly healing, and a new study offers some of the best evidence yet that sound environmental policy is responsible. It’s been nearly 30 years since the world adopted the Montreal Protocol, a landmark treaty banning the use of ozone-destroying chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs). But despite a firm scientific understanding of the link between CFCs and ozone depletion, it’s been tough to tell how much of a success the protocol was, because the ozone hole didn’t start showing signs of recovery until a few years back. Moreover, nobody had actually measured the chemistry of the hole to see if ozone-destroying compounds are declining as we’d expect due to the Montreal Protocol. A study published this week in Geophysical Research Letters addresses that knowledge gap. The authors, from NASA’s Goddard Spaceflight Center, made use of data collected by NASA’s Aura satellite, which measures a suite of trace atmospheric gases to understand changes to the ozone layer, Earth’s climate, and air pollution. “It kind of surprised me that no one had done this,” lead study author Susan Strahan told Earther. “The data is there if you’re careful about what data to use.” Strahan and her colleague Anne Douglass looked at changing ozone levels above Antarctica throughout the austral winter from 2005 to 2016, and found that ozone depletion had declined by about 20 percent. Then, they looked at levels of hydrochloric acid in the stratosphere at the end of winter, an indicator of how much ozone had been destroyed by CFCs. Sure enough, chlorine levels declined as well, at a rate of about 0.8 percent per year. That’s in line with model expectations of how much CFC levels should have declined over the same time period thanks to the Montreal Protocol’s ban. “This reaffirms our scientific understanding of what’s controlling ozone,” she said. Bill Randall, an atmospheric scientist at the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research who was not involved with the study, told Earther he thought the paper’s analysis was “very well done.” “They’re seeing net decreases in chlorine that are very consistent with the Montreal Protocol,” he said. “That’s a big take home message, that the Montreal Protocol is doing what we think it should be doing.”

#### Space tourism destroys the ozone --- 2 internal links:

#### First, black carbon buildups, soot, and particle emissions --- destroys ozone and causes catastrophic warming

LiveScience 10 [Live Science Staff. “New Climate Change Worry: Space Tourism Soot.” October 22, 2010. https://www.livescience.com/10202-climate-change-worry-space-tourism-soot.html]

Humans’ attempts to visit space may not be good for the folks back home, according to a new study that finds soot emitted by space tourism rockets could significantly contribute to global climate change in coming decades. The researchers assumed that a fast-growing suborbital space tourism market will develop over the next decade, and they examined the climate impact of soot and carbon dioxide emissions from 1,000 suborbital rocket flights per year, the approximate number advertised in recent materials promoting space tourism. "Rockets are the only direct source of human-produced compounds above about 14 miles (22.5 kilometers), and so it is important to understand how their exhaust affects the atmosphere," said the study's chief researcher, Martin Ross of The Aerospace Corp. in El Segundo, Calif. He and his colleagues describe their findings in a scientific paper that has been accepted for publication in Geophysical Research Letters. A layer of soot According to the study, soot particles emitted by the proposed fleet of space tourism rockets would accumulate at about 25 miles (40 km) altitude, three times higher than the altitude of airline traffic. Unlike soot from jets or coal power plants, which is injected lower in the atmosphere and falls to earth within weeks, the particles created by rockets remain in the atmosphere for years, efficiently absorbing sunlight that would otherwise reach the Earth's surface. The result is a global pattern of change, according to researcher Michael Mills of the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) in Boulder, Colo. "The response of the climate system to a relatively small input of black carbon is surprising," Mills said in a statement. "Our results show particular climate system sensitivity to the type of particles that rockets emit." Using a computer model of the Earth's atmosphere, the researchers discovered that beneath the predicted layer of soot, the Earth's surface would cool by as much as 1.2 degrees Fahrenheit (0.7 degrees Celsius). Antarctica would warm by 1.5 degrees F (0.8 degrees C). Meanwhile, equatorial regions could lose about 1 percent of their ozone, while the poles could gain 10 percent. The global effect would be an increase in the amount of solar energy absorbed by the Earth's atmosphere. That means the soot from the rockets contributes to atmospheric heating at a rate higher than the carbon dioxide from those same rockets. An earlier study by Ross, published in March 2009 in the journal Astrophysics, found that rocket emissions are particularly harmful to the ozone because they're injected directly into the stratosphere where the ozone layer resides. Considering black carbon The researchers based their predictions on business plans for suborbital space travel in the year 2020, Ross said. The current global fleet of hydrocarbon-fueled orbital rockets emits about one-tenth of the soot assumed in the study. "Climate impact assessments of suborbital and orbital rockets must consider black carbon emissions, or else they ignore the most significant part of the total climate impact from rockets," Ross said. "This includes existing assessments that may need to be brought up to date."

#### Second, water vapor and rocket emissions

Larson 16 (Erik J L Larson (PhD in Atmospheric and Oceanic Studies, Postdoctoral fellow in Organismic and Evolutionary Biology at Harvard, Research Scientists at University of Colorado Boulder), Robert W Portmann (Researchesr from Chemical Sciences Division at NOAA), Karen H Rosenlof (NOAA research scientist), David W. Fahey (Directo of the Chemical Science Division at NOAA), John S Daniel (Chemical Sciences Division NOAA), and Martin N Ross (The Aerospace Corporation). “Global atmospheric response to emissions from a proposed reusable space launch system” Earth’s Future. Volume 5. Issue 1. November 16, 2016. Accessed August 12, 2019.)

1 Introduction

The expected availability of low cost, reusable launch systems and increasing demand for space services suggest that the global space transport industry will grow significantly in the coming decades. Relatively few studies of the chemical and climate effects of rocket emissions have been published that use current state‐of‐the‐art atmospheric models to address the future growth scenarios. Rocket emissions are becoming more like aviation emissions in that the space sector exhibits consistent growth that cannot be reduced without serious economic disruption. Unlike the aviation sector, the most significant method of managing emissions is through prudent use of the various available propellants. Hydrogen (H2) fuel and reusability are likely to play important roles in any future scheme to minimize the atmospheric impacts of rockets; therefore, it is important to understand the consequences of H2 fuel and reentry emissions. Significant increases in space transport will be associated with proportional increases in combustion emissions. Some of the proposed propulsion systems make greater use of “clean‐burning” H2 fuel [Li et al., 2004; Khan et al., 2013], which has H2O as the primary emission and thus avoids the effects of chlorine, alumina, and black carbon emissions associated with current conventional technology [Ross et al., 2009, 2010]. H2 burning rocket engines may also reduce payload‐to‐space costs, which could dramatically increase the number of rocket launches.

Reaction Engines Ltd. (http://www.reactionengines.co.uk/) has proposed the Skylon vehicle, which is a reusable H2‐burning rocket [Martin et al., 2008]. Skylon would be considered a medium lift launch vehicle in the current space transport vernacular. There is a concept plan to use this vehicle to build a space‐based solar power system. To be economically viable, the plan calls for a minimum of 104 launches per year for 10 years [Martin et al., 2008; Henson, 2014]. This rate would transport enough payload to space to build 3000 1‐GW solar power stations as estimated by the National Security Space Office [SBSP Study Group, 2007] and Reaction Engines [Martin et al., 2008].

It is often assumed that H2‐fueled rocket engines have no impact on the global atmosphere since the only significant emission is H2O. However, in great enough quantities the emissions from these rockets can alter the stratosphere in many ways. H2O emissions can change stratospheric temperatures and alter the photochemistry controlling ozone (O3). Furthermore, rockets burning liquid H2 and oxygen (O2) use an H2‐rich mixture rather than a stoichiometric ratio for enhanced thrust and emit H2 and HOX in the plume in addition to H2O. Enhancements in HOX can catalytically destroy O3 [Crutzen, 1969]. Superheated air in the engine and exhaust plume result in the production of NOx, which also catalytically destroys O3 [Johnston, 1971; Ross et al., 2009; Lee et al., 2010]. NOx is also created in the mesosphere due to the heat produced during rocket reentry [Park, 1976]. Here we use the Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model (WACCM) [Marsh et al., 2013] and the 2D National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration/National Center for Atmospheric Research (NOCAR) model [Portmann and Solomon, 2007] to evaluate the potential effects of high Skylon launch rates on the climate and stratospheric O3.

2 Calculating Emissions

Vertical profiles of NOX, H2, and H2O emitted during a Skylon rocket launch and reentry are estimated based on trajectory data from Reaction Engines Ltd. [http://www.reactionengines.co.uk/tech\_docs.html]. Skylon rockets have two combustion phases as they ascend through the atmosphere. The first phase is air breathing from the surface to 28.5 km. During this phase the engines act as H2 burning jet turbines, combusting H2 with ambient air. The main exhaust is H2O, which can be calculated directly from the amount of H2 fuel consumed. During the second phase from 28 to 80 km the engines run in rocket mode, burning H2 and liquid O2. The H2O produced in rocket mode is calculated from the mass of fuel used assuming a 6:1 mass ratio of oxygen to hydrogen; this assumption is made to be consistent with the fact that many rockets burn hydrogen‐rich fuel for greater thrust (stoichiometric ratio for combustion is 8:1) [Colasurdo et al., 1998]. Although the excess H2 likely oxidizes into H2O in the plume due to high temperatures, H2 emissions are also considered in our simulations as a bounding condition. The bounding cases assume either all or none of the excess H2 is oxidized to H2O in the plume. As discussed in the results, the intermediate combustion products HOX and H2O2 were tested with the NOCAR model and found not to be important contributors to O3 destruction. Thus they are not included in WACCM simulations.

H2 and H2O emission profiles (kg/km/flight) are interpolated with 1‐km vertical resolution (Figure 1a). The spike in emissions at 28 km is due to the spacecraft transition into rocket mode. The total amount of H2O produced from a single flight is estimated to be 6 × 105 kg (assuming completely oxidized H2) with about 4 × 105 kg emitted into the stratosphere (above 17 km). The projected 105 flights per year would deposit 4 × 1010 kg of H2O in the stratosphere every year. To get a sense of how large a perturbation this represents, the yearly emissions are compared to the total amount of stratospheric water. Assuming a uniform mixing ratio of 4.5 parts per million by volume (ppmv) of H2O above 100 hPa (17 km), there is 1.5 × 1012 kg of H2O in the stratosphere. The projected 105 flights would emit approximately 3% of the current stratospheric H2O burden every year. Assuming a constant flight frequency and a 3‐year lifetime of the H2O, when emitted above 100 hPa, this would increase globally averaged stratospheric H2O by approximately 9%. The actual steady‐state perturbation of H2O due to these emissions in WACCM above 100 hPa is 10%; however, the local perturbation would be much larger and increase with height.

Estimating a NOX emission profile for the Skylon vehicle is problematic. Several flight phases must be considered: H2 burned with air as a jet fuel, H2 burned with liquid oxygen as a rocket fuel, and heating of air due to aerodynamic interactions. It is important to note that we consider the shock heating of air during reentry as an emission. When air is heated to temperatures exceeding 1800 K, as in a jet engine or behind the shock wave around a spacecraft during reentry, NOX is produced through the extended Zeldovich mechanism [Zeldovich et al., 1947]. This mechanism is exponentially dependent on temperature so that representative temperatures are required in order to calculate the thermally produced NOX. Detailed estimates of the NOX emissions have not yet been calculated by the rocket designers [R. Varvill, 2015, personal communication]. For this study, reliable estimates of NOX emissions from jet and rocket engines are scaled to the Skylon vehicle with the caveat that our estimates have high uncertainty. Lee et al. [2010], using the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) emissions databank, estimated that 14 ± 3 g of NOX are produced for every kilogram of fuel combusted in jet engines. Emissions may be lower at supersonic speeds and are also a function of the temperature difference between high pressure (∼100 atmospheres) liquid H2 and jet fuel. Most of the engines in the ICAO databank use jet fuel with a 2:1 H:C ratio. The higher fuel density must be taken into consideration in the NOX estimates from H2 combustion. For complete combustion in the jet engine air‐burning phase, two hydrogen and one carbon atoms (14 g/mol) react with three oxygen atoms. For a pure H2 fuel at complete combustion, three oxygen atoms will oxidize six hydrogen atoms (6 g/mol). Thus, from a stoichiometric perspective, burning 1 kg of jet fuel requires as much air as 6/14 kg of H2 fuel. Thus 6/14 kg of H2 fuel is assumed here to produce 14 g (11–17) of NOX during the air‐burning phase. Alternatively, using the heat of combustion per fuel mass to scale the NOX production gives consistent results that are within the uncertainty range. The total production of NOX during the air‐burning Skylon ascent is estimated to be 1400 ± 300 kg, although we acknowledge this range does not encompass all the uncertainties in the assumptions.

Zero NOX emission is assumed during the liquid oxygen burning phase of ascent. NOX would only be produced in H2‐fueled rocket engines in significant amounts (>0.01% of total flow) in afterburning reactions, which occur when ambient air is entrained into the hot underoxidized plume [Brady et al., 1997]. Afterburning is generally not a significant factor for rocket engines above the tropopause. Therefore it is assumed that during this phase of flight, at altitudes greater than 28 km, significant NOX production is unlikely.

Finally, NOX is also produced in the shock wave during spacecraft reentry. Using analytic approximations and a numerical integration, Park [1976] calculated that the NOX produced during a Space Shuttle reentry is 4.5–9% of the mass of the spacecraft. Park and Rakich [1980] later updated this value to 17.5 ± 5.3% of the spacecraft mass, with a peak emission at 68 km. While the predicted Skylon mass is comparable to the Space Shuttle mass, the Skylon reentry flight path is different from that of the Shuttle, and this would affect NOX production. Skylon is expected to require more time above 5 km/s during reentry than the Shuttle did, which would tend to produce more NOX. However, these high speeds would occur at a higher altitude than for the Space Shuttle, which would tend to decrease NOX production [Park, 1976]. Given the compensating factors, and in the absence of actual flight data, Skylon is assumed to have the same vertical profile of reentry NOX emission as the Space Shuttle, with the total values scaled by vehicle mass. The estimated total amount of NOX produced during reentry is therefore 9880 ± 2760 kg per flight. This range does not encompass the uncertainty in all the assumptions made, and thus the stated value of NOX production is considered only representative. The estimated altitude profiles of NOX emissions from the ascent and reentry phases are shown in Figure 1b.

Park [1976] compared NOX formation between the Space Shuttle and meteorites based on the total mass entering the top of the atmosphere. Assuming the natural formation rate of upper atmospheric NOX is from 5.7 × 107 kg of meteorites producing their weight in NOX every year [Park, 1976], then 105 Skylon flight reentries would produce a factor of 20 more NOX than natural production from meteorites. Meteorites produce roughly 5× more NOX per mass than the Space Shuttle due to their much higher velocity when entering the atmosphere.

3 Model Descriptions

Table 1 summarizes the simulations that are run and includes the rocket emissions considered in each case. The Community Earth System Model (CESM v1.0.6) using the WACCM model [Marsh et al., 2013] is used to simulate these emissions. WACCM was chosen because the model domain extends higher than most climate models (140 km) and it can include interactive chemistry. Simulations are run with fixed sea surface temperatures and perpetual year 2000 anthropogenic emissions and CO2 concentrations at 1.9 × 2.5° resolution with 66 vertical levels using a hybrid sigma coordinate system. Cases with different emissions and flight frequency are compared to a zero‐emission control case. Vertical emission profiles of H2O, H2, and NOX are included into two model horizontal grid cells spanning the equator. An equatorial launch is assumed because the energy required to put a rocket into orbit increases with launch latitude. Sensitivity tests are also run with the NOCAR model as these tests would be computationally expensive using WACCM. The NOCAR model is used to evaluate the sensitivity of our results to launch location, chlorine and greenhouse gas concentrations, emissions products, and number of launches per year. Including emissions into global model grid cells effectively dilutes the concentration of emissions compared to an actual rocket plume. The size of the equatorial grid cells is roughly 200 × 250 km2, which is about 1000 times larger in area than a rocket plume. The concentrations used in the model are thus 1000 times less than exist in the initial rocket plumes. Another assumption is that the emissions fill the grid cell before any chemical changes take place. Studies such as Lohn et al. [1999] and Ross et al. [1997] have looked into O3 depletion and other atmospheric effects inside rocket plumes. Lohn et al. [1999] found that solid rocket motor exhaust plumes from Titan class rockets destroy all of the O3 in the wake of the rocket. These predictions were verified by in situ plume measurements [Ross et al., 1997]. The ozone‐depleted regions are several square kilometers in size and last about an hour before dissipating to background concentrations. It is expected that plume chemistry will affect the composition and abundance of the rocket emissions that exist at the grid scale after the plume disperses. However, for the Skylon emissions, the amount of excess H2 emitted during rocket mode that is oxidized in the plume versus the amount present at the grid scale is unknown. Thus, the limiting cases are explored, one in which all the excess H2 is immediately oxidized (simulation 4) and one in which it all persists to the grid scale (simulation 5). The sensitivity of two of our assumptions are tested with the NOCAR model; specifically that H2O and H2 are the only relevant HOY species emitted, and secondly, that year 2000 greenhouse gas and chlorine levels are appropriate choices for this study. Some hydrogen will be emitted as HOY species, although it is likely to be very small. Swain et al. [1990] measured H2O2 in hydrogen burning engine exhaust and found it to be undetectable under normal operating conditions and up to 1000 ppmv under extremely inefficient conditions when the fuel to air ratio was around 5. Despite this, we simulate some of the hydrogen emitted as HOX or H2O2 using the NOCAR model. Note that due to the family chemistry scheme in NOCAR, we cannot emit OH directly, but instead emitted an equivalent quantity as HOX, which should produce the same amount of ozone destruction. The H2O2 can be emitted directly because it is long lived. Table 2 displays the global mean total column ozone changes relative to simulation 7 (Table 1) with and without these emissions. Including these emissions, even at relatively high amounts (1% mole fraction), results in essentially no change in O3 loss. The global mean total column ozone loss in these simulations is within 0.05 Dobson Units (DU) of the base case (simulation 7). Thus, these species (OH and H2O2) are not important to include in the WACCM simulations. The WACCM simulations assume year 2000 conditions; however, we note that flights of the Skylon space plane, especially at rates assumed in this paper, are decades away at best. Future levels of greenhouse gases and chlorine are estimated to be much higher and lower, respectively, than in the year 2000 [IPCC, 2013]. Thus, we also test the sensitivity of ozone loss on greenhouse gas and chlorine levels with the NOCAR model. These results are shown in Table 3. Using year 2100 chlorine levels increases the global total column ozone loss by 6% compared to simulation 7. Under a lower chlorine concentration, NOX increases destroy more ozone due to reduced formation of chlorine nitrate. However, water vapor increases induce less ozone destruction from polar stratospheric cloud (PSC) increases due to decreased chlorine. The net effect is increased ozone losses from rocket emissions. Increasing greenhouse gas levels to year 2100 offsets some of this extra loss and the sign of the final change depends on the relative amounts of the three greenhouse gases in the scenario. CO2 increases cause the rocket‐induced change to increase, while CH4 and N2O increases cause it to decrease. However, the changes are relatively small in all cases using the NOCAR model and we consider our WACCM simulations using year 2000 values as representative of any time between now and year 2100.

4 Stratospheric Ozone and Temperature Perturbations

Our base case scenario for 105 flights per year is simulation 7 in Table 1, which includes NOX, H2, and H2O emissions. The components of the emissions are modeled separately in simulations 1–6 to better understand the changes to O3. Plots of the O3 change due to the individual emission components can be found in the supplement. Preliminary WACCM simulations using a different emissions profile than Figure 1 and 104 flights per year did not produce any statistically significant global changes to the atmosphere. At 105 flights per year, as seen in simulation 7, stratospheric NOX concentrations increase by 0.3–3 parts per billion (ppb) and stratospheric H2O increases by 0–3 ppm. At this and higher flight frequencies significant changes occur in the stratosphere as shown in Figure 2.

At 105 flights per year O3 decreases significantly at all latitudes at altitudes above about 25 km and above 20 km at the poles as seen in simulation 7 (Figure 2a). The overlaid hatching (Figure 2a) indicates statistical significance from two different tests. As seen in Table 1, this depletion in O3 is predominantly due to catalytic destruction by NOX [Crutzen, 1970]. Our simulations with just NOX emissions (simulation 1) had almost the same amount of ozone destruction as the simulation with NOX, H2O, and H2 (simulation 7), and much more than simulations without NOX (simulations 4 and 5). Both sources of NOX, air‐breathing ascent and reentry, contribute to the destruction of O3 as seen in simulations 2 and 3. However, the models disagree about the relative contribution from these two emission sources. The NOCAR model attributes more O3 loss than WACCM does to NOX created in the mesosphere during reentry (simulation 2). In addition, including H2 emissions may further reduce total O3 compared to H2O emissions alone in WACCM simulations. Note that including H2 emissions does not exacerbate O3 loss in the NOCAR runs; in fact O3 loss is lessened between simulations 4 and 5. Moreover, assuming H2O emissions alone seems to lead to an increase in O3 in WACCM; however these results are within the range of internal variability.

#### That crosses tipping points

Loren Grush 18. Senior reporter. "Why it’s time to study how rocket emissions change the atmosphere". The Verge. 5-31-2018. https://www.theverge.com/2018/5/31/17287062/rocket-emissions-black-carbon-alumina-particles-ozone-layer-stratosphere

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. 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. Drifting plumes created by the Space Shuttle Atlantis. Image: NASA 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. 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. “All of this plays into the scenario in which we’re envisioning a very significant increase in the number of launches, as these very large satellite constellations are deployed and as more nations get involved in space activities,” says Vedda. “Rocket emissions have been a pretty minuscule part of the emissions into the atmosphere, but this is going to change as the activity accelerates.” Vedda and Ross argue we should get ahead of the pollution issue before it has more drastic consequences, as we should have done with space debris. In the early days of spaceflight, no one was really concerned with how many spacecraft were put into space. But soon, experts recognized that this space debris could collide and build up over time, making low Earth orbit unusable someday. So now, there are regulations in place to prevent the problem from getting worse, but a lot of the damage had already been done. The researchers hope to be much more prepared about these rocket emissions: study as much as we can now, so we can make the best policy decisions in the future. “At some point, there will be a tipping point where all of a sudden, everybody says, ‘Wait a minute we need to understand this better,’” says Ross. “We want to be proactive before this tipping point occurs.”

#### Rocket launches sufficient to destroy the ozone

Martin Ross & James Vedda 18. Martin Ross, Ph.D. planetary science from UCLA, senior project engineer in civil and commercial launch programs at the Aerospace Corporation; James Vedda, Ph.D. political science from the University of Florida, senior policy analyst at the Aerospace Corporation’s Center for Space Policy & Strategy. "Time To Clear The Air About Launch Pollution". SpaceNews. 7-3-2018. https://spacenews.com/op-ed-time-to-clear-the-air-about-launch-pollution/

In recent years, governments, intergovernmental organizations, and businesses have begun to focus on the challenge posed by orbital debris. As often seems to be the case, we appear to be a decade or two too slow in coming to consensus on the risks. If we had foreseen a half-century ago the challenges that orbital debris presents today, what would we have done differently? Combustion emissions from launch vehicles present the space industry with a comparable concern that we can begin to address now, before it grows and becomes a potential impediment to space access. Most human-generated pollution is concentrated on or near the surface of the Earth, whether on land, sea, or in the troposphere, the lowest layer of the atmosphere. However, rockets emit a variety of gases and particles directly into all levels of the stratosphere, the only industrial activity to do so. The stratosphere extends roughly from 10 to 50 kilometers above the Earth’s surface and contains the Earth’s ozone layer. The global civil aviation fleet generally cruises in the troposphere, only occasionally polluting the stratosphere directly. Among the most consequential emissions are soot and alumina, which are long-lived and accumulate in the stratosphere. These accumulations promote chemical reactions and absorption and scattering of sunlight that modify the composition and flow of radiation in the stratosphere. Ultimately, these processes reduce stratospheric ozone, warm the stratosphere, and cool the Earth’s surface. Little is known about these particle accumulations and their contributions to stratospheric ozone depletion and thermal perturbations because of a lack of consistent and focused research. Since 1987, emissions of ozone-depleting pollutants are highly regulated by international agreement through the Montreal Protocol on Substances That Deplete the Ozone Layer. Even with recent advances in reusability and the introduction of large launch vehicles and new launch sites around the globe, rocket launches occur irregularly so that concerns about the damage done to the ozone layer by rocket emissions have not elicited regulation. But with projections that the global launch rate will at least double in the coming decade, increased scrutiny under the Montreal Protocol is likely. Increased concerns about the environmental impact of rocket launches, provoked by perceptions of a rapidly growing launch industry, could result in international calls for launch limitations or the phase-out of propellants that the launch industry has come to depend on. The timing and intensity of a regulatory backlash as launch rates increase is impossible to predict accurately, especially because the science of rocket emissions is still not well understood. Rather than allow a legal and regulatory process to unfold in the absence of high-quality, peer-reviewed data, governments and the launch industry should conduct the scientific research needed to fill the knowledge gaps. This will allow the launch community to engage in future far reaching discussions regarding the impacts of rocket emissions with the support of empirical data and computer models that carry the imprimatur of the rocket engineering and atmospheric science communities. The launch industry has enjoyed freedom of action with respect to rocket engine emissions since the start of the space age. Studies of future launch architectures, market demand, and lifecycle costs rarely consider regulation of emissions as a potential future risk factor. Even when emissions are considered, the impacts are examined on a system-by-system basis; the cumulative impact of the global launch fleet is not acknowledged. The net impacts of the global launch industry, across all propellant types, are the parameters of interest to international regulators and, therefore, the global impacts create the regulatory risk. In addition to acknowledging the risks and potential unintended consequences of launch emissions for ozone and the flow of radiation in the atmosphere, the space industry must recognize the extent that other emerging actors may interact with the stratosphere. For example, so-called “geoengineering” or “climate intervention” schemes propose to inject particles into the stratosphere to intercept sunlight and mitigate the warming effects of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases. Regulation of such geoengineering activity is already under discussion. Space launch operators, as contributors of stratospheric emissions, could get swept up into these discussions, which involve the same types of particulate matter associated with rocket emissions. Any resulting regulations or guidelines must include adequate consideration of launch activities, which will require a better understanding of rocket emissions than we have today. To improve that understanding, industry should encourage and support scientific research on rocket engine emissions and how they affect the atmosphere. There has been little research to date. The few research papers that have appeared in recent decades mostly point out the knowledge gaps rather than add to the knowledge base. The research has been unfocused, disorganized, and not suited to the needs of the launch industry. As it stands today, the scientific community can predict ozone depletion attributable to rocket emissions to no better than an order of magnitude. In an environment of growing launch rates, new propellants, larger, reusable launch vehicles, and the emergence of other stratospheric polluters, this is not sufficient. Lack of accurate information inevitably invites distorted competitive claims and unwarranted and overly restrictive regulation. A vigorous research program would be guided by the goal to collect high confidence information and data that describe rocket emissions as inputs into global atmosphere models and would include the following components: All of the instrumentation, models, and expertise to carry out this research already exists within the engineering and scientific communities. The in situ and test stand measurements would validate combustion and plume models. Validated models permit the development of emission profiles for particular rocket engine types. These profiles, with various growth assumptions, would be used to construct global emission projections. Finally, the global emissions scenarios would provide data to construct input profiles for modern three-dimensional whole atmospheric chemistry and climate models in order to estimate ozone loss, climate forcing, and a variety of secondary effects such as changes in the global circulation and cloud formation. A policy to promote objective and vigorous research, across the full range of propellant types, will provide the space industry with the information required to take ownership of the problem and exert strong influence on the future debate. By accepting the reality of the risk to freedom of action presented by rocket emissions, and promoting a full and complete scientific understanding of the global impacts, the industry can best inoculate itself from attempts to regulate or limit launch development and operations and disassociate itself from other polluters. There is historical precedent for such an approach. In order to promote supersonic civil aviation development, during the 1990s NASA partnered with the aviation industry to carry out the High Speed Research (HSR) program. One of the goals of HSR was to understand how High Speed Civil Transport (HSCT) aircraft would affect stratospheric ozone. Earlier HSCT efforts in the 1970s were severely and wrongly hampered by knowledge gaps with respect to ozone depletion. HSR demonstrated the airframe, engine, and operational combinations that would minimize ozone impacts and permit (if the economics had been convincing) unregulated development and deployment. The launch industry should organize around a similar approach and partner with the scientific and regulatory communities to determine how space launch can freely develop while minimizing the risks of regulatory intervention. As launch rates and launch vehicle sizes increase, the impact of rocket emissions approaches a “tipping point” when international regulation becomes likely, probably beginning with efforts to protect the ozone layer or limit stratospheric pollution to ward off geoengineering. If the launch industry moves quickly to support the necessary scientific research and fully understand these impacts – in concert with other private-sector and government stakeholders – it is more likely that future regulation will be well-informed and as limiting as possible. As with other large-scale ventures, the application of specialized expertise is essential to anticipating the risks and needs of the enterprise and to managing the impacts on society. With irrefutable data, modeling, and analyses, emissions-related regulations or limitations can be anticipated and configured to ensure that space-based capabilities and systems continue to enhance and improve human life and extend the space industry’s progress made over the past six decades.

#### Extinction --- disease, food insecurity, and ocean biodiversity loss

Michele M. Betsill 16. Professor in Residence and Chair of Political Science department at Colorado State University, Ph.D in Environmental Politics and Policy, “Impacts Of Stratospheric Ozone Depletion” http://www.climate-policy-watcher.org/hydrology/impacts-of-stratospheric-ozone-depletion.html

Stratospheric ozone depletion was recognized as an environmental problem in need of international attention because it impacts both humans and the natural environment. When stratospheric ozone levels decrease, the amount of UV-B reaching Earth's surface increases (WMO, 1995). The changes in UV-B radiation are highest at high and midlatitudes in both hemispheres while the increases are fairly small in the tropics (UNEP, 1994). Increased levels of UV-B affect human health, the productivity of plant and animal species, as well as the composition of ecosystems. Impacts on Human Health Ultraviolet exposure does have some benefits for humans. For example, it initiates the production of vitamin D3, which is believed to inhibit the growth of tumor cells (UNEP, 1996). However, the balance of evidence indicates that the effects of stratospheric ozone depletion on human health are negative. The major risks include increased incidence of eye diseases, skin cancer, and infectious diseases. When UV-B levels increase, two main organ systems are exposed: the eyes and the skin. The impacts of ozone depletion are mediated through these two systems (Longstreth et al„ 1995; UNEP, 1998). Evidence suggests that increased UV-B radiation exposure may be associated with an increase in the incidence of cataracts, a clouding of the lens of the eye (Longstreth et al, 1995; UNEP, 1998). One review of research on this problem reported that a 1% increase in stratospheric ozone depletion would result in a 0.6 to 0.8% increase in the incidence of cataracts (UNEP, 1994; see also UNEP, 1998). The most widely known impact of increased UV-B radiation on human health is skin cancer. UV-B radiation damages deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA), which may cause gene mutations and the formation of cancer cells. Some studies estimate that a sustained 10% decrease in average stratospheric ozone concentrations would result in 250,000 new cases of nonmelanoma skin cancer. This is in addition to the 1.2 million cases already reported each year (Longstreth et al., 1995; UNEP, 1996). Many animal species, such as cows, goats, sheep, cats, and dogs, are also at increased risk of developing skin cancer as a result of increased exposure to UV-B radiation (UNEP, 1998). In an assessment of the effect of the Montreal Protocol and its amendments in protecting the ozone layer, Slaper and his colleagues (1996) concluded these efforts will substantially decrease the growth rate of the incidence of skin cancer over the next century. They found that under a scenario where there were no limits on the production and consumption of ozone-depleting substances, there would be a quadrupling in the incidence of skin cancer by the year 2100. Under the provisions of the Montreal Protocol (a 50% reduction in the production of CFCs by 1999), a doubling in the incidence of skin cancer could be expected in that same period. In contrast, they found the Copenhagen Amendments scenario (a complete phase-out in the production of 21 ozone-depleting substances by January 1, 1996) would result in a 10% increase in skin cancer incidence, peaking in the year 2060. This study lends support to the importance of international efforts to combat stratospheric ozone depletion. Researchers believe that skin exposure to increased levels of UV-B radiation is also linked to modifications in the human immune system. As a result, the ability of the immune system to respond to certain infectious diseases, such as tuberculosis, leprosy, and Lyme disease, is impaired (UNEP, 1998). Longstreth and her colleagues (1995) predict that higher levels of UV-B will result in increased severity and duration of diseases such as lupus rather than an increase in their incidence. Impacts on Aquatic Systems The balance of evidence indicates that increased UV-B radiation can have harmful effects on many species of aquatic organisms and the aquatic systems in which they live (SCOPE, 1993; UNEP, 1998). For example, studies in the Antarctic have linked increased UV-B levels to reduced phytoplankton productivity. Phytoplankton are the basis for the oceanic food chain. UV-B radiation affects the DNA, photosynthesis, enzyme activity, and nitrogen incorporation of phytoplankton. Reduced phytoplankton productivity will likely lead to reduced productivity further up the food chain. It has been estimated that a 16% reduction in stratospheric ozone could lead to a 5% loss of phytoplankton causing a loss of 7 million tons of fish worldwide per year (Hader et al., 1995; UNEP, 1994, 1996). Figure 1 illustrates the effects of UV-B radiation on phytoplankton. Researchers have also found that enhanced UV-B radiation disrupts the early development of several species of fish, shrimp, and crabs, ultimately affecting their motility (Hader et al., 1995). In damaging aquatic organisms, stratospheric Effects of enhanced solar UV-B irradiation on phytoplai Motility Vertical distribution In the water column Global consequences Reduced carbon dioxide sink? Effects of enhanced solar UV-B irradiation on phytoplai Motility Vertical distribution In the water column Reduced biomass production? Competition between species? Temperature increase? Food web in the ocean? Figure 1 Effects of UV-B radiation on phytoplankton (from Hader et al, 1995, p. 178). ozone depletion has serious implications for the world food supply. Globally, 30% of the animal protein consumed by humans comes from the oceans. The percentage is much higher in developing countries (UNEP, 1998). These impacts are particularly worrisome in light of the growing world population. Impacts on Terrestrial Plants and Ecosystems Scientific understanding of the impact of enhanced UV-B on terrestrial plants and ecosystems is incomplete. The majority of studies have been conducted in growth chambers and greenhouses under controlled conditions, conditions that are often quite different from those experienced in the field. Thus, researchers contend it is necessary to use caution in making generalizations about the impacts of enhanced UV-B on terrestrial plants. The results of existing studies need to be verified under field conditions (Caldwell et al., 1995). Keeping the limitations of existing research in mind, it is still possible to make some statements about the effect of enhanced UV-B on terrestrial plants. It appears that increased UV-B radiation may have both direct and indirect effects on plants. Some plant species exhibit a reduction in leaf area and/or stem growth when exposed to higher levels of UV-B. In addition, UV-B may also inhibit photosynthesis, damage plant DNA, and alter the time of flowering as well as the number of flowers in some species. The latter has implication for the availability of pollinators and thus the reproductive capacity of plants (Caldwell et al., 1995; UNEP, 1998). The effects of UV-B on plants are not always straightforward but rather depend on the species, the cultivar, and developmental stage of the plants as well as mineral nutrition in the soil, drought, and local air pollutants (Caldwell et al., 1995; UNEP, 1998). In affecting plants, enhanced UV-B radiation may ultimately lead to changes in entire ecosystems. In nonagricultural ecosystems (e.g., forests and grasslands), the balance of plants may change as some species are less able to respond to increases in UV-B radiation and their productivity declines. At the same time, the productivity of more responsive species will likely increase. The overall species composition of ecosystems will change, as will species interactions and ecosystem dynamics (Caldwell et al., 1995; UNEP, 1998).

#### Disease causes extinction

Yaneer Bar-Yam 16, Founding President of the New England Complex Systems Institute, “Transition to extinction: Pandemics in a connected world,” NECSI (July 3, 2016), http://necsi.edu/research/social/pandemics/transition

Watch as one of the more aggressive—brighter red — strains rapidly expands. After a time it goes extinct leaving a black region. Why does it go extinct? The answer is that it spreads so rapidly that it kills the hosts around it. Without new hosts to infect it then dies out itself. That the rapidly spreading pathogens die out has important implications for evolutionary research which we have talked about elsewhere [1–7].¶ In the research I want to discuss here, what we were interested in is the effect of adding long range transportation [8]. This includes natural means of dispersal as well as unintentional dispersal by humans, like adding airplane routes, which is being done by real world airlines (Figure 2).¶ When we introduce long range transportation into the model, the success of more aggressive strains changes. They can use the long range transportation to find new hosts and escape local extinction. Figure 3 shows that the more transportation routes introduced into the model, the more higher aggressive pathogens are able to survive and spread.¶ As we add more long range transportation, there is a critical point at which pathogens become so aggressive that the entire host population dies. The pathogens die at the same time, but that is not exactly a consolation to the hosts. We call this the phase transition to extinction (Figure 4). With increasing levels of global transportation, human civilization may be approaching such a critical threshold.¶ In the paper we wrote in 2006 about the dangers of global transportation for pathogen evolution and pandemics [8], we mentioned the risk from Ebola. Ebola is a horrendous disease that was present only in isolated villages in Africa. It was far away from the rest of the world only because of that isolation. Since Africa was developing, it was only a matter of time before it reached population centers and airports. While the model is about evolution, it is really about which pathogens will be found in a system that is highly connected, and Ebola can spread in a highly connected world.¶ The traditional approach to public health uses historical evidence analyzed statistically to assess the potential impacts of a disease. As a result, many were surprised by the spread of Ebola through West Africa in 2014. As the connectivity of the world increases, past experience is not a good guide to future events.¶ A key point about the phase transition to extinction is its suddenness. Even a system that seems stable, can be destabilized by a few more long-range connections, and connectivity is continuing to increase.¶ So how close are we to the tipping point? We don’t know but it would be good to find out before it happens.¶ While Ebola ravaged three countries in West Africa, it only resulted in a handful of cases outside that region. One possible reason is that many of the airlines that fly to west Africa stopped or reduced flights during the epidemic [9]. In the absence of a clear connection, public health authorities who downplayed the dangers of the epidemic spreading to the West might seem to be vindicated.¶ As with the choice of airlines to stop flying to west Africa, our analysis didn’t take into consideration how people respond to epidemics. It does tell us what the outcome will be unless we respond fast enough and well enough to stop the spread of future diseases, which may not be the same as the ones we saw in the past. As the world becomes more connected, the dangers increase.¶ Are people in western countries safe because of higher quality health systems? Countries like the U.S. have highly skewed networks of social interactions with some very highly connected individuals that can be “superspreaders.” The chances of such an individual becoming infected may be low but events like a mass outbreak pose a much greater risk if they do happen. If a sick food service worker in an airport infects 100 passengers, or a contagion event happens in mass transportation, an outbreak could very well prove unstoppable.

**Ocean biodiversity solves extinction.**

Robin Kundis Craig 3. Professor at Florida State University College of Law, leading environmental law scholar who has written important works on water and ocean and coastal issues, Winter 2003, “Taking Steps Toward Marine Wilderness Protection? Fishing and Coral Reef Marine Reserves in Florida and Hawaii,” 34 McGeorge L. Rev. 155, Lexis

The world’s oceans contain many resources and provide many services that humans consider valuable. “Occupying more than seventy percent of the Earth’s surface and ninety-five percent of the biosphere,” oceans provide food; marketable goods such as shells, aquarium fish, and pharmaceuticals; life support processes, including carbon sequestration, nutrient cycling, and weather mechanics; and quality of life, both aesthetic and economic, for millions of people worldwide. Indeed, it is difficult to overstate the importance of the ocean to humanity’s well-being: “The ocean is the cradle of life on our planet, and it remains the axis of existence, the locus of planetary biodiversity, and the engine of the chemical and hydrological cycles that create and maintain our atmosphere and climate.” Ocean and coastal ecosystem services have been calculated to be worth over twenty billion dollars per year, worldwide. In addition, many people assign heritage and existence value to the ocean and its creatures, viewing the world’s seas as a common legacy to be passed on relatively intact to future generations. (It continues…) More generally, “ocean ecosystems play a major role in the global geochemical cycling of all the elements that represent the basic building blocks of living organisms, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorous, and sulfur, as well as other less abundant but necessary elements”. In a very real and direct sense, therefore, **human degradation** of marine ecosystems **impairs the planet’s ability to support life**. Maintaining biodiversity is often critical to maintaining the functions of marine ecosystems. Current evidence shows that, in general, an ecosystem’s ability to keep functioning in the face of disturbance is strongly dependent on its biodiversity, “indicating that more diverse ecosystems are more stable. Coral reef ecosystems are particularly dependent on their biodiversity. [\*265] Most ecologists agree that the complexity of interactions and degree of interrelatedness among component species is higher on coral reefs than in any other marine environment. This implies that the ecosystem functioning that produces the most highly valued components is also complex and that many otherwise insignificant species have strong effects on sustaining the rest of the reef system. n860 Thus, maintaining and restoring the biodiversity of marine ecosystems is critical to maintaining and restoring the ecosystem services that they provide. Non-use biodiversity values for marine ecosystems have been calculated in the wake of marine disasters, like the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska. n861 Similar calculations could derive preservation values for marine wilderness. However, economic value, or economic value equivalents, should not be "the sole or even primary justification for conservation of ocean ecosystems. Ethical arguments also have considerable force and merit." n862 At the forefront of such arguments should be a recognition of how little we know about the sea - and about the actual effect of human activities on marine ecosystems. The United States has traditionally failed to protect marine ecosystems because it was difficult to detect anthropogenic harm to the oceans, but we now know that such harm is occurring - even though we are not completely sure about causation or about how to fix every problem. Ecosystems like the NWHI coral reef ecosystem should inspire lawmakers and policymakers to admit that most of the time we really do not know what we are doing to the sea and hence should be preserving marine wilderness whenever we can - especially when the United States has within its territory relatively pristine marine ecosystems that may be unique in the world.We may not know much about the sea, but we do know this much: **If we kill the ocean we kill ourselves, and** we will take most of **the biosphere** with us.

#### Food insecurity causes extinction --- hot-spots escalate.

John Castellaw 17, Teaching Fellow at the College of Business and Global Affairs at the University of Tennessee, on the National Security Advisory Council of the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition, former Chief of Staff for the U.S. Central Command, Lieutenant General, Marine Corps (Ret.), 5/1/2017, “Opinion: Food Security Strategy Is Essential to Our National Security”, https://www.agri-pulse.com/articles/9203-opinion-food-security-strategy-is-essential-to-our-national-security

The United States faces many threats to our National Security. These threats include continuing wars with extremist elements such as ISIS and potential wars with rogue state North Korea or regional nuclear power Iran. The heated economic and diplomatic competition with Russia and a surging China could spiral out of control. Concurrently, we face threats to our future security posed by growing civil strife, famine, and refugee and migration challenges which create incubators for extremist and anti-American government factions. Our response cannot be one dimensional but instead must be a nuanced and comprehensive National Security Strategy combining all elements of National Power including a Food Security Strategy.¶ An American Food Security Strategy is an imperative factor in reducing the multiple threats impacting our National wellbeing. Recent history has shown that reliable food supplies and stable prices produce more stable and secure countries. Conversely, food insecurity, particularly in poorer countries, can lead to instability, unrest, and violence.¶ Food insecurity drives mass migration around the world from the Middle East, to Africa, to Southeast Asia, destabilizing neighboring populations, generating conflicts, and threatening our own security by disrupting our economic, military, and diplomatic relationships. Food system shocks from extreme food-price volatility can be correlated with protests and riots. Food price related protests toppled governments in Haiti and Madagascar in 2007 and 2008. In 2010 and in 2011, food prices and grievances related to food policy were one of the major drivers of the Arab Spring uprisings. Repeatedly, history has taught us that a strong agricultural sector is an unquestionable requirement for inclusive and sustainable growth, broad-based development progress, and long-term stability.¶ The impact can be remarkable and far reaching. Rising income, in addition to reducing the opportunities for an upsurge in extremism, leads to changes in diet, producing demand for more diverse and nutritious foods provided, in many cases, from American farmers and ranchers. Emerging markets currently purchase 20 percent of U.S. agriculture exports and that figure is expected to grow as populations boom.¶ Moving early to ensure stability in strategically significant regions requires long term planning and a disciplined, thoughtful strategy. To combat current threats and work to prevent future ones, our national leadership must employ the entire spectrum of our power including diplomatic, economic, and cultural elements. The best means to prevent future chaos and the resulting instability is positive engagement addressing the causes of instability before it occurs.¶ This is not rocket science. We know where the instability is most likely to occur. The world population will grow by 2.5 billion people by 2050. Unfortunately, this massive population boom is projected to occur primarily in the most fragile and food insecure countries. This alarming math is not just about total numbers. Projections show that the greatest increase is in the age groups most vulnerable to extremism. There are currently 200 million people in Africa between the ages of 15 and 24, with that number expected to double in the next 30 years. Already, 60% of the unemployed in Africa are young people. ¶ Too often these situations deteriorate into shooting wars requiring the deployment of our military forces. We should be continually mindful that the price we pay for committing military forces is measured in our most precious national resource, the blood of those who serve. For those who live in rural America, this has a disproportionate impact. Fully 40% of those who serve in our military come from the farms, ranches, and non-urban communities that make up only 16% of our population. ¶ Actions taken now to increase agricultural sector jobs can provide economic opportunity and stability for those unemployed youths while helping to feed people. A recent report by the Chicago Council on Global Affairs identifies agriculture development as the core essential for providing greater food security, economic growth, and population well-being.¶ Our active support for food security, including agriculture development, has helped stabilize key regions over the past 60 years. A robust food security strategy, as a part of our overall security strategy, can mitigate the growth of terrorism, build important relationships, and support continued American economic and agricultural prosperity while materially contributing to our Nation’s and the world’s security.

**Warming causes extinction and turns every impact – no adaptation & each degree is worse**

**Krosofsky ’21** [Andrew, Green Matters Journalist, “How Global Warming May Eventually Lead to Global Extinction”, Green Matters, 03-11-2021, https://www.greenmatters.com/p/will-global-warming-cause-extinction]//pranav

Eventually, yes. **Global warming will invariably result in the mass extinction of millions of different species,** humankind included. In fact, **the Center for Biological Diversity says that global warming is currently the greatest threat to life on this planet**. **Global warming causes a number of detrimental effects on the environment that many species won’t be able to handle long-term**. Extreme weather patterns are shifting climates across the globe, eliminating habitats and altering the landscape. **As a result, food and fresh water sources are being drastically reduced**. Then, of course, **there are the rising global temperatures themselves, which many species are physically unable to contend with**. Formerly frozen arctic and antarctic regions are melting, increasing sea levels and temperatures. Eventually, **these effects will create a perfect storm of extinction conditions**. The melting glaciers of the arctic and the searing, **unmanageable heat indexes being seen along the Equator are just the tip of the iceberg, so to speak.** **The species that live in these climate zones have already been affected by the changes caused by global warming.** Take polar bears for example, whose habitats and food sources have been so greatly diminished that they have been forced to range further and further south. **Increased carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere and oceans have already led to ocean acidification**. **This has caused many species of crustaceans to either adapt or perish and has led to the mass bleaching of more than 50 percent of Australia’s Great Barrier Reef**, according to National Geographic. According to the Center for Biological Diversity, the current trajectory of global warming predicts that more than 30 percent of Earth’s plant and animal species will face extinction by 2050. By the end of the century, that number could be as high as 70 percent. We won’t try and sugarcoat things, humanity’s own prospects aren’t looking that great either. According to The Conversation, **our species has just under a decade left to get our CO₂ emissions under control. If we don’t cut those emissions by half before 2030, temperatures will rise to potentially catastrophic levels. It may only seem like a degree or so, but the worldwide ramifications are immense.** The human species is resilient. We will survive for a while longer, even if these grim global warming predictions come to pass, **but it will mean less food, less water, and increased hardship across the world — especially in low-income areas and developing countries. This increase will also mean more pandemics, devastating storms, and uncontrollable wildfires**.

#### Scenario 2 is debris.

#### Increased space tourism pushes debris over the brink – that wrecks satellites.

Tehrani ‘21 [James Tehrani; Spark‘s editor-in-chief, an award-winning writer and editor; 04-01-2021; “Space Junk: A Safety and Sustainability Problem Moving at 18,000 MPH”; Spark; https://sphera.com/spark/space-junk-a-safety-and-sustainability-problem-moving-at-18000-mph/; Accessed 12-26-2021] AK

Most of the current debris is found in the low Earth orbit (LEO), which is about 600 to 1,200 miles (1,000 to 2,000 kilometers) above the planet. NASA calls LEO an “orbital space junkyard.” The junk isn’t sitting idly in a landfill; it is moving around at speeds up to 18,000 mph (29,000 kph), or 23 times the speed of sound.

While the Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee was designed to coordinate space debris efforts, there are currently no international laws in place regarding removing space debris. Since a single satellite can cost between $50 million and $400 million, the risk of damage from space debris to a satellite is clearly significant. And as more debris is left behind, there is obviously more risk of collisions, especially when space tourism picks up. The orbiting junk was explored in the 2013 film “Gravity,” starring George Clooney and Sandra Bullock; it’s known as the Kessler Effect.

Don Kessler, the former NASA scientist who studied space debris even told the Guardian back in 2011 in regard to formulating a plan to deal with space junk: “The longer you wait to do this, the more expensive it’s going to be. … This scenario of increasing space debris will play out even if we don’t put anything else in orbit,” he said.

On that point, the European Space Agency has contracted with a Swiss startup called ClearSpace that plans to launch its first mission to remove space debris in 2025.

The Gravity of the Situation

Without a doubt, space debris is an Operational Risk; even the International Space Station has to dodge space junk at times. Former NASA Administrator Jim Bridenstine even tweeted last September that the “Space Station has maneuvered 3 times in 2020 to avoid debris. In the last 2 weeks, there have been 3 high concern potential conjunctions. Debris is getting worse!” Some of the larger debris that doesn’t burn up re-entering the atmosphere (about one object per day) even crashes back on Earth. Since most of the Earth’s surface is covered in water, it’s not surprisingly that most of the junk winds up in oceans, so the risk to humans is statistically very low. That doesn’t mean nil though.

For example, there is debris from Russian Proton rockets that has been found in Siberia, including that of old fuel tanks containing toxic fuel residue, which can be harmful to plants, animals and humans.

The environmental risks of space junk need to be explored further. A piece of space junk floating through the ocean is certainly not nearly as concerning as our plastic problem, but it’s nothing to ignore either.

LCA Leads the Way

Just as more and more companies are assessing the Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) of their products and services from cradle to grave on Planet Earth, it stands to reason that LCA could be just as important in outer space. That’s especially true when you consider space tourism is poised to blast off to become a potential $1.5 billion industry by 2028. The more activity, the more debris.

#### That triggers missile radars.

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

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

#### Nuclear war.

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

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

#### Debris triggers miscalculated war.

Peter Dockrill 16. Award-winning science & technology journalist. “Space Junk Accidents Could Trigger Armed Conflict, Study Finds.” https://www.sciencealert.com/space-junk-accidents-could-trigger-armed-conflict-expert-warns.

The increasingly crowded space in Earth's low orbit could set the stage for an international armed conflict, says a new study. Researchers from the Russian Academy of Sciences warn that accidents stemming from the steady rise in space junk floating around the planet could incite political rows and even warfare, with nations potentially mistaking debris-caused incidents as the results of intentional aggressive acts by others. In a paper published in Acta Astronautica, the team suggests that space debris in the form of spent rocket parts and other fragments of hardware hurtling at high speed pose a "special political danger" that could dangerously escalate tensions between nations. According to the study, destructive impacts caused by random space junk cannot easily be told apart from military attacks. "The owner of the impacted and destroyed satellite can hardly quickly determine the real cause of the accident," the authors write. The risks of such an event occurring are compounded by the sheer volume of debris now orbiting Earth. Recent figures from NASA indicate that there are more than 500,000 pieces of space junk currently being tracked in orbit, travelling at speeds up to 28,160 km/h (17,500 mph). The majority of those objects are small – around the size of a marble – but some 20,000 of them are bigger than a softball. In addition to these 500,000 or so fragments – which are big enough for scientists to know about them – NASA estimates that there are millions of undetectable pieces of debris in orbit that are too small to be monitored. But even extremely small fragments such as these pose a threat – in fact, they're considered a greater risk than trackable debris, as their invisible status means spacecraft and satellites can't do anything to avoid them until it's too late. As NASA observed in 2013: "Even tiny paint flecks can damage a spacecraft when travelling at these velocities. In fact a number of space shuttle windows have been replaced because of damage caused by material that was analysed and shown to be paint flecks… With so much orbital debris, there have been surprisingly few disastrous collisions." While we may have been lucky in the past, we can't rely on that to continue. The study by the Russian team cites the repeated sudden failures of defence satellites in past decades that were never explained. The researchers attribute two possible causes: either unrecorded collisions with space junk, or aggressive actions from adversaries. "This is a politically dangerous dilemma," the authors write.

#### It goes nuclear.

Les Johnson 14. Baen science fiction author, popular science writer, and NASA technologist. “Living without satellites”. https://www.baen.com/living\_without\_satellites.

Satellite imagery is used by the military and our political leaders to maintain the peace. When your potential adversaries can’t hide what they’re doing, where their armies are moving and what they are doing with their civilian and military infrastructure, then the danger of surprise attack is diminished. In our nuclear age with instant death only minutes away by missile attack, the doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) only works if both sides know whether or not they are being attacked. The launch of missiles or a bomber fleet can easily be seen from space far in advance of either reaching their potential targets halfway around the globe. The danger of surprise attack is therefore small, making an accidental war far less likely. So what does all this mean? And what do we do about it? First of all, it means that the advocates of space development, exploration and commercialization have succeeded far beyond their initial expectations and dreams. The economies and security of countries in the developed world are now dependent on space satellites. We space advocates should celebrate our success and be terrified of it at the same time. Should we lose these fragile assets in space, our economy would experience a disruption like no other: ship, air and train travel would stop and only restart/operate in a much-reduced capacity for years (GPS loss). Many banking and retail transactions would cease (VSAT loss). Distribution of news and vital national information would be crippled (communications satellite loss). Lives would be put at risk and the productivity of our farming would dramatically decrease (weather satellite loss). The risk of war, including nuclear war, would increase (loss of spy satellites) and our military’s ability to react to crises would be significantly reduced (loss of military logistics and intelligence gathering satellites).

#### Tipping point is now --- studies conclude LEO has reached a critical density which makes space exploration and scientific research impossible.

Paul Ratner 06-29-18. Writer for Big Think and the Washington Post. "How the Kessler Syndrome can end all space exploration and destroy modern life," Big Think, https://bigthink.com/paul-ratner/how-the-kessler-syndrome-can-end-all-space-exploration-and-destroy-modern-life

Exploring space is one of humanity’s most hopeful activities. By going out into the great unknown of the Universe, we hope to extend our reach, find new resources and life forms, while solving many of our earthly problems. But going to space is not something to take for granted—it can actually become impossible. There is a scenario, called the Kessler Syndrome, that can cause the end of all space exploration and dramatically impact our daily lives. In 1978, the NASA scientist Donald J. Kessler proposed that a chain reaction of exploding space debris can end up making space activities and the use of satellites impossible for generations. He predicted that the number of objects that we keep launching into Low Earth Orbit (LEO) can create such a dense environment above the planet that inevitable collisions could cause a cascading effect. The space junk and shrapnel generated by one collision could make further collisions much more possible. And if you have enough collisions, the amount of space debris could overwhelm the orbital space entirely. What makes that situation possible is the fact that there are millions of micrometeoroids as well as man-made debris that is already orbiting Earth. The danger posed by even a small fragment that’s traveling at high speeds is easy to see. As calculated by NASA, a 1-centimeter “paint fleck” traveling at **10km/s (22,000 mph)** can cause the same damage as a **550-pound** object traveling 60 miles per hour on Earth. If the size of the shard was increased to 10 centimeters, such a projectile would have the force of 7 kilograms of TNT. Now imagine thousands of such objects flying around at breakneck speeds and crashing into each other. If a chain reaction of exploding space junk did occur, filling the orbital area with such dangerous debris, the space program would indeed be in jeopardy. Travel that goes beyond the LEO, like the planned mission to Mars, would be made more challenging but still conceivably possible. What would, of course, be affected if the Kessler Syndrome’s worst predictions came to pass, are all the services that rely on satellites. Core aspects of our modern life—GPS, television, military and scientific research—all of that would be under threat. NASA experienced a small-scale Kessler Syndrome incident in the 1970s when Delta rockets that were left in orbit started to explode into shrapnel clouds. This inspired Kessler, an astrophysicist, to show that there is a point when the amount of debris in an orbit gets to critical mass. At that point, the collision cascading would start even if no more things are launched into space. And once the chain of explosions begins, it can keep going until the orbital space can no longer be used. In Kessler’s estimate, it would take 30 to 40 years to get to such a threshold. NASA says that its experts caution that we are already at critical mass in the low-Earth orbit, which is about 560-620 miles (900 to 1,000 kilometers) out. According to NASA estimates, the Earth’s orbit currently has 500,000 pieces of space debris up to 10cm long, over 21,000 pieces of debris longer than 10cm, and more than **100 million pieces** of space debris smaller than 1cm. A 2009 incident dubbed the Cosmos-Iridium collision featured a space collision between Russian and American communication satellites that provided a preview of potential attractions in the massive debris field it created. The accident resulted in more than 2,000 pieces of relatively large space junk. While there are some safety measures being taken, like the Space Surveillance Network run by the military, the sheer amount of stuff already floating in space makes the domino effect of explosions a likely possibility. Check out this video about the Kessler Syndrome that features Don Kessler himself. And here’s Kessler’s original paper on the subject, titled 'Collision Frequency of Artificial Satellites: The Creation of a Debris Belt'.

#### Kessler syndrome ensures extinction---satellites solve every impact. It’s specifically key to military readiness.

George Dvorsky 15. Senior Staff reporter at Gizmodo. "What Would Happen If All Our Satellites Were Suddenly Destroyed?" https://io9.gizmodo.com/what-would-happen-if-all-our-satellites-were-suddenly-d-1709006681.

Lastly, there’s the Kessler Syndrome to consider. This scenario was portrayed in the 2013 film Gravity. In the movie, a Russian missile strike on a defunct satellite inadvertently causes a cascading chain reaction that formed an ever-growing cloud of orbiting space debris. Anything in the cloud’s wake — including satellites, space stations, and astronauts — gets annihilated. Disturbingly, the Kessler Syndrome is a very real possibility, and the likelihood of it happening is steadily increasing as more stuff gets thrown into space. Given these grim prospects, it’s fair to ask what might happen to our civilization if any of these things happened. At the risk of gross understatement, the complete loss of our satellite fleet would instigate a tremendous disruption to our current mode of technological existence — disruptions that would be experienced in the short, medium, and long term, and across multiple domains. Compromised Communications Almost immediately we’d notice a dramatic reduction in our ability to communicate, share information, and conduct transactions. “If our communications satellites are lost, then bandwidth is also lost,” Jonathan McDowell tells io9. He’s an astrophysicists and Chandra Observatory scientist who works out of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics. McDowell says that, with telecommunication satellites wiped out, the burden of telecommunications would fall upon undersea cables and ground-based communication systems. But while many forms of communication would disappear in an instant, others would remain. All international calls and data traffic would have to be re-routed, placing tremendous pressure on terrestrial and undersea lines. Oversaturation would stretch the capacity of these systems to the limit, preventing many calls from going through. Hundreds of millions of Internet connections would vanish, or be severely overloaded. A similar number of cell phones would be rendered useless. In remote areas, people dependent on satellite for television, Internet, and radio would practically lose all service. “Indeed, a lot of television would suddenly disappear,” says McDowell. “A sizable portion of TV comes from cable whose companies relay programming from satellites to their hubs.” It’s important to note that we actually have a precedent for a dramatic — albeit brief — disruption in com-sat capability. Back in 1998, there was a day in which a single satellite failed and all the world’s pagers stopped working. Get Out Your Paper Maps We would also lose the Global Positioning System. In the years since its inception, GPS has become ubiquitous, and a surprising number of systems have become reliant on it. “Apart from the fact that everyone has forgotten to navigate without GPS in their cars, many airplanes use GPS as well,” says McDowell. Though backup systems exist, airlines use GPS to chart the most fuel-efficient and expeditious routes. Without GPS and telecomm-sats, aircraft controllers would have tremendous difficulty communicating with and routing airplanes. Airlines would have to fall back to legacy systems and procedures. Given the sheer volume of airline traffic today, accidents would be all but guaranteed. Other affected navigation systems would include those aboard cargo vessels, supply-chain management systems, and transportation hubs driven by GPS. But GPS does more than just provide positioning — it also provides for timing. Ground-based atomic clocks can perform the same function, but GPS is increasingly being used to distribute the universal time standard via satellites. Within hours of a terminated service, any distributing networks requiring tight synchronization would start to suffer from “clock drift,” leading to serious performance issues and outright service outages. Such disruptions could affect everything from the power grid through to the financial sector. In the report, “A Day Without Space: Economic and National Security Ramifications,” Ed Morris, the Executive Director of the Office of Space Commerce at the Department of Commerce, writes: If you think it is hard to get work done when your internet connection goes out at the office, imagine losing that plus your cell phone, TV, radio, ATM access, credit cards, and possibly even your electricity. [...] Wireless services, especially those built to CDMA standard, would fail to hand off calls from one cell to the next, leading to dropped connections. Computer networks would experience slowdowns as data is pushed through finite pipelines at reduced bit rates. The same would be true for major networks for communication and entertainment, since they are all IP-based today and require ultra-precise timing to ensure digital traffic reaches its destination. The lack of effective synch would hit especially hard in banking, where the timing of transactions needs to be recorded. Credit card payments and bank accounts would likely freeze, as billions of dollars could be sucked away from businesses. A financial crash is not out of the question. The Loss of Military Capability The sudden loss of satellite capability would have a profound effect on the military. The Marshall Institute puts it this way: “Space is a critical enabler to all U.S. warfare domains,” including intelligence, navigation, communications, weather prediction, and warfare. McDowell describes satellite capability as as the “backbone” of the U.S. military. And as 21st century warfare expert Peter W. Singer from New America Foundation tells io9, “He who controls the heavens will control what happens in the battles of Earth.” Singer summarized the military consequences of losing satellites in an email to us: Today there are some 1,100 active satellites which act as the nervous system of not just our economy, but also our military. Everything from communications to GPS to intelligence all depend on it. Potential foes have noticed, which is why Russia and China have recently begun testing a new generation of anti-satellite weapons, which in turn has sparked the U.S. military to recently budget $5 billion for various space warfare systems. What would happen if we lost access to space? Well, the battles would, as one U.S. military officer put it, take us back to the “pre digital age.” Our drones, our missiles, even our ground units wouldn’t be able to operate the way we plan. It would force a rewrite of all our assumptions of 21st century high tech war. We might have a new generation of stealthy battleships...but the loss of space would mean naval battles would in many ways be like the game of Battleship, where the two sides would struggle to even find each other. Moreover, and as McDowell explains to io9, the loss of satellite capability would have a profound effect on arms control capabilities. Space systems can monitor compliance; without them, we’d be running blind. “The overarching consideration is that you wouldn’t really know what’s going on,” says McDowell. “Satellites provide for both global and local views of what’s happening. We would be less connected, less informed — and with considerably degraded situational awareness.” Compromised Weather Prediction and Climate Science One great thing satellites have done for us is improve our ability to forecast weather. Predicting a slight chance of cloudiness is all well and good, but some areas, like India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh, are dependent on such systems to predict potentially hazardous monsoons. And in the U.S., the NOAA has estimated that, during a typical hurricane season, weather satellites save as much as $3 billion in lives and property damage. There’s also the effect on science to consider. Much of what we know about climate change comes from satellites. As McDowell explains, the first couple of weeks without satellites wouldn’t make much of a difference. But over a ten-year span, the lack of satellites would preclude our ability to understand and monitor such things as the ozone layer, carbon dioxide levels, and the distribution of polar ice. Ground-based and balloon-driven systems would help, but much of the data we’re currently tracking would suddenly become much spottier. “We’re quite dependent on satellites for a global view of what’s happening on our planet — and at a time when we really, really need to know what’s happening,” says McDowell. It’s also worth pointing out that, without satellites, we also wouldn’t be able to monitor space weather, such as incoming space storms. Time to Recover With all the satellites gone, both governmental and private interests would work feverishly to restore space-based capabilities. Depending on the nature of the satellite-destroying event, it could take decades or more to get ourselves back to current operational standards. It would take a particularly long time to recover from a Carrington Event, which would zap many ground-based electronic systems as well. The U.S. military is already thinking along these lines, which is why it’s working on the ability to quickly send up emergency assets, such as small satellites parked in Low Earth Orbit (LEO). Cube satellites are increasingly favored, as an easy-to-launch, affordable, and effective solution — albeit a short-term one. The U.S. Operationally Responsive State Office is currently working on the concept of emergency replenishment and the ability to “rapidly deploy capabilities that are good enough to satisfy warfighter needs across the entire spectrum of operations, from peacetime through conflict.” As for getting full-sized, geostationary satellites back into orbit, that would prove to be a greater challenge. It can take years to built a new satellite, which typically requires a big, costly rocket to get it into space. Lastly, if a Kessler Syndrome wipes out the satellites, that would present an entirely different recovery scenario. According to McDowell, it would take a minimum of 11 years for LEO to clear itself of the debris cloud; any objects below 500 km (310 miles) would eventually fall back to Earth. Thus, we would only be able to start re-seeding LEO in a little over a decade following a Kessler event. Unfortunately, the area above 600 km (372 miles) would remain out of touch for a practically indefinite period of time; objects orbiting at that height tend to stay there for a long, long time. We’d probably lose this band for good — unless we manually removed the debris field, using clean-up satellites or other techniques. It’s worth noting that a single Kessler event could hit the LEO zone or the GEO zone (geosynchronous orbit) but realistically not both; LEO debris could never reach GEO, and vice versa — though a spent rocket in GTO (geosynchronous transfer orbit) or SSTO (supersynchronous transfer orbit) passes through or near both zones and could potentially affect either of them. The spent rockets in GTO do not stay too close to the GEO arc for long due to orbital perturbations, so a GEO Kessler event is very unlikely to be triggered by one of them. Suffice to say, we should probably take the prospect of a Kessler Syndrome more seriously, and be aware of what could happen if we’re no longer able to use these spaces.

#### Plan: States ought to ban the appropriation of outer space by private entities for private space tourism.

Cooper 8 [Cooper, Nikhil D. "Circumventing Non-Appropriation: Law and Development of United States Space Commerce." Hastings Const. LQ 36 (2008): 457.]

The latest piece of congressional legislation regulating the commercial space industry was the Commercial Space Launch Act (CSLA) 77 that was spurred on in part by the host of new technologies capable of commercially exploiting space. 78 The CSLA streamlined the earlier space-launch bureaucracy and mandated the DOT to issue licenses for all commercial space launch programs, 79 regulate forms of space tourism8 and space advertising, 8 ' impose minimum liability insurance and financial responsibility requirements, and82 provide for administrative and judicial review of DOT Secretariat decisions.83 Il. A Legal System? The CSLA represents the most recent and comprehensive United States space commerce legislation; but, in the years since its passage, no one has seriously questioned its consistency with United States international obligations of "non-appropriation." The issue is especially apt now, however, because the current and future capacities of commercially exploiting space seem primed to challenge non-appropriation as the guiding theme in space commerce. Therefore, the question we must ask now is whether or not the United States is circumventing the intent of non-appropriation by encouraging and protecting private commercial expansion into space. A. Treaties Versus Congressional Acts Whether the regulatory regime outlined in the CSLA conflicts with the national non-appropriation principle, as outlined in the Outer Space Treaty of 1967 and in its succeeding treaties, is an issue that could be reviewed by the federal judiciary under its constitutional grant of subject-matter jurisdiction over cases "arising under" treaties.8 4 The judiciary's power to interpret treaties is a power distinct from the treaty-making authority delegated to the executive and legislative branches. Article II of the United States Constitution authorizes the president to ratify treaties with the consent of two-thirds membership of the Senate. 5 Treaties entered into in this manner are the supreme law of the United States and bind state constitutions, legislatures, and judiciaries.8 6 Generally, courts employ distinct methods of interpretation when called on to perform the separate but related tasks of interpreting treaties and resolving treaty-statutory disputes. As to the former, courts generally will liberally construct a treaty "to give effect to the purpose which animates it" and will prefer that liberal construction "[e]ven where a provision of a treaty fairly admits of two constructions, one restricting, the other enlarging [of] rights which may be claimed under it."87 A preference for broad construction, however, is not a license for courts to impose any interpretation they deem appropriate. For example, although courts have a greater ability to construct treaties more broadly than private contracts, they are still precluded from interpreting a treaty beyond the "apparent intent and purport" of its language.88 in this way, determining a treaty's "intent" delineates the boundaries of how broadly or narrowly the court may interpret a treaty's provision. Courts obviously have a much easier time determining a treaty's intent where the treaty language is unambiguous. In these instances, courts expressly forbid looking beyond the language of the treaty to supply the intent of the parties at the time the treaty was drawn.89 When the language of the treaty is ambiguous, however, the court will attempt to effectuate the drafter's intent through a broader inquiry into "the letter and spirit of the instrument," and may take into account "considerations deducible from the situation of the parties; and the reasonableness, justice, and nature of the thing, for which provision has been made." 90 The United States Supreme Court summarized its interpretive process in the case Eastern Airlines Inc., v. Floyd: When interpreting a treaty, [begin] "with the text of the treaty and the context in which the written words are used." 91 [When confronted with difficult or ambiguous passages, the Court provided that] [o]ther general rules of construction may be brought to bear[.] [And it finally noted that] treaties are construed more liberally than private agreements, and to ascertain their meaning we may look beyond the written words to the history of the treaty, the negotiations, and the practical construction adopted by the parties. 92 Treaty interpretation as described above is important when determining whether the treaty conflicts with an act of Congress. Each being the supreme law of the land, treaties and congressional acts are governed by the last-in-time rule: when they conflict, courts must privilege the last enacted treaty or congressional act over the other. 93 Still, federal courts often avoid finding such conflicts between congressional acts and treaty obligations. As Justice Marshall opined in 1804: [A]n act of Congress ought never to be construed to violate the law of nations if any other possible construction remains, and consequently can never be construed to violate neutral rights, or to affect neutral commerce, further than is warranted by the law of nations as understood in this country. 94 Supreme Court jurisprudence since has largely followed the same presumption and, therefore, courts are inclined to harmonize treaties and congressional legislation that are seemingly antithetical to one another. 95 In the event that a congressional act were to supplant United States treaty obligations, courts would look for unambiguous evidence appearing “clearly and distinctly" in the text of the statute or treaty provision. 96 In other words, repeals of prior statutes or treaty provision must likely be made express. In contrast, "repeals by implication" are generally disfavored "unless the last statute is so broad in its terms and so clear and explicit in its words as to show that it was intended to cover the whole subject, and, therefore, to displace the prior statute. 97 B. CSLA Versus the Outer Space Treaty Both being duly enacted, the CSLA and the Outer Space Treaty are considered the supreme law of the land. If there is a conflict between the United States space commerce provisions as outlined in the CSLA and the Outer Space Treaty, a reviewing court would first be called upon to interpret the intent of the treaty itself. Recall that in the context of treaty interpretation, a court would be at liberty to give the treaty a broad construction to effectuate its intent. The key provision of the Outer Space Treaty at issue would be the language of Article II which forecloses "national appropriation" of space by claims of sovereignty, means of use, occupation, or any other means.98 Black's Law Dictionary defines "appropriation" as "the exercise of control over property, a taking of possession." 99 If defined broadly enough, the joint enterprise nature of the United States space commerce, as implemented in the CSLA, might violate the "spirit" of non-appropriation as outlined in the Outer Space Treaty of 1967. The best argument one could make against the CSLA's provisions is to advocate the court to broadly interpret the "appropriation" principle of the Outer Space Treaty. The proponent of this argument would urge that in so doing, a court should look beyond the words of the treaty and examine the history, negotiations, and practical considerations at the time of the treaty's negotiation to determine its true intent. 100 One would also want to argue that the space commerce industry violates perhaps not the "letter" of the treaty, but circumvents entirely its "spirit" if a court were taking into account "considerations deducible from the situation of the parties; and the reasonableness, justice, and nature of the thing, for which provision has been made."' 01 One who attacked the CSLA's general legitimacy in this way could argue that the United States is effectively "appropriating" space through its protection and encouragement of private industry. Such an appropriation would take place not by realizing a "sovereign" right to space property or the uses of space as expressly proscribed in the Outer Space Treaty, but, instead, through the effective use of government power, services, and contracts to encourage and support the rapid development of the private space commerce industry in the United States. In essence, the result of such government encouragement might not amount to wholesale sovereign appropriation, but, at the very least, a kind of sovereign and private space activity that would cast doubt on whether the non-appropriation principle is actually being respected. Therefore, one arguing that such activities were tantamount to sovereign appropriation would highlight the interrelatedness of government and private industry and argue for a broad interpretation of "appropriation" that encompassed the practical effects of such a relationship. In addition to the regulatory interaction between the CSLA and private space commerce industries, the interrelatedness between government and private industry is clearly illustrated by the interaction between CSLA and the 1972 Liability Convention. Recall that the Outer Space Treaty and its progeny envision a "state-oriented" system of responsibility 10 2 where each member state is responsible for all actions in outer space undertaken by the state and its nationals. 10 3 The Liability Convention further binds member states by holding each strictly liable for its actions or the actions of its nationals within outer space and permits only member states to petition for remuneration under the terms of the treaty. 1 04 In its text, the CSLA cites to such international obligations,'0 5 while also mitigating the United States' liability under the Liability Convention. 0 6 The CSLA licensing program ensures overall safety of private space ventures, 0 7 raises the funds necessary to pay "potential treaty claims through its liability insurance requirement,' 10 8 and limits the United States' joint and several liability exposure through restricting private use of foreign launch and reentry facilities.'09 These provisions effectively allow the United States to pass on the financial cost and recover from their private entities the amount of damages for which they are internationally liable. 110 In this way, the government is limiting its international liability exposure by passing on the cost to the private sector. When highlighting the further interrelatedness between government and private industry, one could also note that the United States government holds something of a monopoly in launch services and currently requires that decisions regarding commercial space-launch must be approved through the CSLA. 1' In addition, one making this argument would want to highlight the highly interdependent nature of investment flowing from government to private space commerce: in a February 4, 2008 press release, NASA Deputy Administrator Shana Dale justified the agency's 2009 budget request of $17.6 billion by claiming that "[t]he development of space simply cannot be 'all government all the time[]' . . . . NASA's budget for [fiscal year] 2009 provides $173 million for entrepreneurs-from big companies or small ones-to develop commercial transport capabilities. . . [and] NASA is designating $500 million toward the development of this commercial space capability." 2

#### Existing treaty regimes fail --- spaceflight uniquely requires a new framework

Beck 09 [Brian Beck, JD, associate at Kenyon & Kenyon LLP. “THE NEXT, SMALL, STEP FOR MANKIND: FIXING THE INADEQUACIES OF THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE LAW TREATY REGIME TO ACCOMMODATE THE MODERN SPACE FLIGHT INDUSTRY.” April 23, 2009. Vol. 19. 1.]

* Ellipses in original text

The fact is, while space flight shares common features with other forms of travel, it is fundamentally different in a way that requires a wholly different legal regime from other forms of travel or other issues. Problems of sovereignty are more complex than in any Earth-based area of law, as outer space is necessarily res communis, but spacecraft can seriously affect any nation’s sovereign territory. Problems of liability are different from those of airplanes or ships, due to the cost of space flight and the fact that a failed spacecraft is less controllable and may land in a greater variety of locations on Earth. In simplest terms, what makes space flight unique is that outside of a few particular orbits, a spacecraft cannot take off from the United States and go into orbit without overflying a nation as remote as Thailand at some point. An airplane or ship, on the other hand, can always travel from the United States to Great Britain without, absent a rare emergency situation, having to enter the sovereign territory or airspace of any other nation. Recognizing this fact, the international community established a treaty regime to regulate space flight . . . in some ways.

### 1AC - Framing

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing. Prefer ---

#### Extinction outweighs.

--- must preserve infinite lives and generations.

--- question of intergenerational equity.

--- existential threats are underestimated: global public good, intergenerational, unprecedented, scope neglect.

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, Accessed 7/22/2017, Kent Denver-jKIM)

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

#### 2. Weigh consequences.

Hirschel-Burns 16—PhD Student in Political Science @ Yale (Danny, In Defense of Consequentialism: A Response to Shadi Hamid," Apr 19, 2016, https://thewideninglens.wordpress.com/2016/04/19/in-defense-of-consequentialism-a-response-to-shadi-hamid/)

My difference of opinion is fundamental: I believe most US foreign policy to be short-sighted, and consequentialism, or the weighing of long-term ramifications against the initial intended effect of a particularly intervention to represent the ideal method of policymaking. Policies cannot solely be judged on intention, due to the frequency with which good intentions produce negative outcomes, nor can they be judged solely on initial effects due to the long-running causal chains produced by order-altering things like military interventions. However, Hamid is right that it is impossible to foresee some ramifications (even if we can see general correlations) of foreign policy, but he doesn’t apply that standard of doubt consistently across his analysis. Early in the essay, Hamid makes the point that to evaluate the Libyan intervention, it is necessary to compare the current situation with the counterfactual: what would Libya look like if the US hadn’t intervened. In general, the assertion is correct, but the practice of counterfactuals is tricky. Hamid’s analysis of where the Libyan conflict was at when the US intervened is enlightening, but his conclusion that Libya would likely look like Syria today had the US not intervened is highly questionable. Political prediction, especially on rare events like mass atrocities or civil wars, is really, really hard. And when you consider all the differences between Libya and Syria (total population, population density, salience of sectarian divides, regime configuration, military capability of opposition, etc.) along with all contingencies that could have occurred in the past four years, it is impossible to say with any certainty that Libya would bear a resemblance to Syria. Syria is merely a convenient standard of comparison because it’s an ongoing civil war in the Middle East, but saying Libya would be Syria doesn’t actually tell us that much about Libya or the effects of intervention. It’s not that the intervention can’t be justified with counterfactuals, but they need to be more carefully constructed. The central thrust of Hamid’s essay is to deride what he calls consequentialism, or evaluating the efficacy of foreign policy based on events years after the initial intervention in the target location. For Hamid, such an approach is particularly problematic because it a policy cannot be retroactively deemed a mistake if the limited goal of the intervention is achieved initially. Therefore consequentialism creates an impossibly high bar for foreign policy decisions: unless a foreign policy results in a peaceful, liberal democracy, than it’s a failure. This is, however, a major straw man. Certainly there are some critics that would deem the Libyan intervention a failure based on this standard, but Hamid lumps in those with reasonable concerns that a civil war (likely to continue for many years based on what we know about civil wars and foreign intervention) at least partially produced by the NATO intervention will have more negative long-term effects on Libyans than Gaddafi’s intended repression. Worrying about consequences does not preclude making foreign policy decisions. Recognizing that every decision has potential positive and negative effects is no more than an accurate framework for analyzing policy. There are an additional two problems with Hamid’s argument here. First, the dismissal of consequentialism is one of the central dynamics that leads Western policymakers to struggle with conflict prevention. Short-term thinking produces short-term solutions. Policymakers become trapped in a vicious circle of continual crises that overwhelm them and prevent longer-term thinking that could go a long way in preventing violence. Second, Hamid’s insistence that the initial moral righteousness of an intervention negates any negative effects, is deeply problematic. As many before me have argued, focusing only on moral imperatives disincentives careful planning and allows policymakers to wash their hands of responsibility if the situation starts to go south. Evaluating military interventions isn’t personal morality, because very rarely can doing the right thing in your personal life lead to deaths of thousands of people. Afghanistan is a valid example. The United States was going after the Taliban in response to 9/11 initially, but the war has had disastrous long-term effects for the country. It would take quite a bit of chutzpah to declare it a success. Moral arguments without strategic and humanitarian (writ large) considerations are also prone to abuse, because liberal interventionists and neoconservatives aren’t actually that far apart: both believe in the wisdom of Western democracies to improve the world through military force. Without more consequentialist standards, there’s not a clear line the prevents Iraq-like decisions. So Hamid’s own argument that Obama being right about Iraq decreases his likelihood he’ll be right about other situations is undermined by a lack of a standard that allows leaders to tell the difference between the two.

#### Space tourism requires appropriation --- current legal frameworks don’t take into account emerging property rights

Freeland 10 [Steven Freeland, BComm, LLB, LLM (UNSW); Professor of International Law, University of Western Sydney; Visiting Professor of International Law, University of Copenhagen; Member of the Space Law Committee, International Law Association; Member of the Directorate of Studies, International Institute of Space Law; Faculty Member, London Institute of Space Policy and Law. “FLY ME TO THE MOON: HOW WILL INTERNATIONAL LAW COPE WITH COMMERCIAL SPACE TOURISM?” 20210. *Melbourne Journal of international Law.* https://picture.iczhiku.com/resource/paper/ShkEfLtwIHttavmv.pdf]

VIII DOES SPACE TOURISM ASSUME THE NEED FOR ‘CELESTIAL PROPERTY RIGHTS’? The fundamental principle of ‘non-appropriation’, upon which the international law of outer space is based, stems from the desire of the international community to ensure that outer space remains an area beyond the 21 jurisdiction of any state(s).84 Similar ideals emerge from UNCLOS (in relation to the High Seas) as well as the Antarctic Treaty, 85 although in the case of the latter treaty, it was finalised after a number of claims of sovereignty had already been made by various states and therefore was structured to ‘postpone’ rather than prejudice or renounce those previously asserted claims.86 As noted above, by the time that the Outer Space Treaty was finalised, both major space superpowers of the time, the US and the Soviet Union, had already been engaged in an extensive range of space activities; yet neither had made a claim to sovereignty over any part of outer space, including celestial bodies, notwithstanding the planting by the Apollo 11 astronauts of an American flag on the surface of the Moon. As a result, although it was of great importance to formalise this principle of non-appropriation of outer space, the drafting process leading to the finalisation of art II of the Outer Space Treaty was relatively uncontroversial, particularly given its early acceptance as a fundamental concept by these two major space faring states.87 The exploration and use of outer space is expressed in art I of the Outer Space Treaty to be ‘the province of all mankind’, a term whose meaning is not entirely clear, but which has been interpreted by most commentators as evincing the desire to ensure that any state is free to engage in space activities, without reference to any sovereign claims of other states. This freedom is reinforced by other parts of the same article and is repeated in the Moon Agreement (which also applies to ‘other celestial bodies within the solar system, other than the earth’).88 Even though both the scope for space activities and the number of private participants have expanded significantly since these treaties were finalised, it is still suggested by some commentators that the non-appropriation principle constitutes ‘an absolute legal barrier in the realization of every kind of space activity’.89 The amount of capital expenditure required to research, scope, trial, and implement a new space activity is significant. To bring this activity to the point where it can represent a viable ‘stand-alone’ commercial venture takes many years and almost limitless funding. From the perspective of a private enterprise contemplating such an activity, this would quite obviously be an important element in its decision to devote resources to this activity that it is able to secure the highest degree of legal rights for the protection of its investment. 84 One should note, however, that, in accordance with art VIII of the Outer Space Treaty read together with the Registration Agreement, registration of a space object gives the ‘State of registry’ (as defined in art I(c) of the Registration Agreement) ‘jurisdiction and control over such object, and over any personnel thereof, while in outer space or on a celestial body’. 85 Opened for signature 1 December 1959, 402 UNTS 71 (entered into force 23 June 1961) 86 Ibid art IV(2) has the effect of suspending all claims to territorial sovereignty in Antarctica for the duration of that instrument, as well as prohibiting any ‘new claim, or enlargement of an existing claim’. The Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, opened for signature 4 October 1991, 30 ILM 1461 (entered into force 14 January 1998), augments the Antarctic Treaty by protecting Antarctica from commercial mining for a period of 50 years. 87 See also Freeland and Jakhu, above n 44, 44. 88 Article 4(1) of the Moon Agreement provides that ‘[t]he exploration and use of the moon shall be the province of all mankind’. 89 Diederiks-Verschoor and Kopal, above n 53, 26. 22 Melbourne Journal of International Law [Vol 11 Security of patent and other intellectual property rights, for example, are vital prerequisites for private enterprise research activity on the ISS. These rights are specifically addressed by the partners to the project and are applicable to all experiments undertaken on board the ISS.90 In relation to space tourism activities, not only intellectual property rights (for example, how does Richard Branson protect the rights to his ‘Virgin’ label in outer space?), but various forms of tangible property rights may also become relevant. To take one example, it is quite foreseeable that as space tourism activities develop, the demand will emerge for the constant presence of tourists on the Moon and other celestial bodies, necessitating the construction of celestial hotels. Naturally, it will be important for the ‘owner’ of such a structure to gain some legal protection in relation to the site of the hotel — perhaps akin to some form of a leasehold (or even freehold) title, with which we are familiar on Earth. Here the problem presents itself: in the absence of ‘sovereignty’, it is not possible under existing international space law to assert that any particular jurisdiction applies to the area on which the hotel is to be constructed, and perhaps even within the hotel, given that ‘jurisdiction and control’ only arises upon the registration of a ‘space object’. The definition of a ‘space object’ is vague91 and unlikely to include a structure such as a hotel, which is designed as a stationary, (semi-)permanent construction. Even if it could be interpreted as falling within the meaning of a ‘space object’, this would only solve the jurisdictional questions relating to the inside of the hotel but not to the surface of the Moon. Without a right of any state to exercise jurisdiction — that is, to make (and enforce) laws — it is impossible to determine how such a title can be established. The Moon Agreement only provides a partial answer to this lack of a jurisdictional base for such structures, specifying that states parties ‘retain jurisdiction and control over their personnel, vehicles, equipment, facilities, stations and installations on the moon’.92 This does not, however, provide a legal basis upon which to assert some form of property rights over the area upon which a space tourist hotel would be constructed. In theory, there would remain under current space law a right of free access to that area, and the construction of the hotel — and presumably its location in a specific area — could not interfere with the activities of other parties to the Moon Agreement. 93 While the Moon Agreement does not specify the consequences of a breach of these requirements, it appears that the construction of a hotel on a celestial body raises uncertainties under current international space law principles. Indeed, the Moon Agreement expressly provides that the surface (and subsurface) of the Moon ‘shall [not] become property of any State, international intergovernmental or nongovernmental 90 Article 21 of the ISS Agreement specifically deals with jurisdictional issues relating to intellectual property rights on board the ISS. 91 Article I(d) of the Liability Convention defines a space object as including the ‘component parts of a space object as well as its launch vehicle and parts thereof’. This definition is also contained in art I(b) of the Registration Agreement. 92 Moon Agreement art 12(1) (emphasis added). 93 Ibid art 8(3). 2010] How Will International Law Cope with Commercial Space Tourism? 23 organization, national organization or nongovernmental entity or of any natural person’.94 Notwithstanding this provision, the Moon Agreement, which is largely directed towards the exploitation of the natural resources of the moon, contemplates the development and removal of these resources, albeit under the management of an international regime established for that purpose. This is notwithstanding the fact that it also includes a provision that virtually mirrors art II of the Outer Space Treaty. 95 What this means in the context of the Moon is that what might be termed ‘extraterrestrial exploitative rights’ in relation to the natural resources of outer space do not contravene the non-appropriation principle, provided that such rights, and the exercise thereof, comply with the principles set out in the space treaties (and any applicable customary international law).96 Such rights might be considered, by way of analogy, as similar to terrestrial ‘mining rights’ allocated by the state to public and/or national or foreign private entities to exploit the natural resources within their territorial jurisdiction. The terms of exploration or mining (exploitation) licences granting these rights will dictate the precise scope of the rights, as well as the conduct to which a licensee must adhere in exercising them. However, in terms of the ownership of the natural resources to be exploited, this remains within the permanent sovereignty of the relevant state, in accordance with long-recognised principles of customary international law.97 What this means for future space tourism activities is that there may also be the need for some other form of quasi-property rights associated with the construction of tourism related facilities on celestial bodies that may relate to the (seemingly) exclusive occupation of that part of the surface of a celestial body upon which a privately owned facility is built. Even though, like the extraterrestrial exploitative rights described above, this may (arguably) not be inconsistent with the non-appropriation principle, it is not entirely clear how these rights should be specified and what their legal status and enforceability might be. Clearly, there is a need for careful consideration of precisely how any such rights should evolve.