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### Advantage 1: Space Debris

#### The amount of space junk orbiting Earth is currently at a tipping point, there is a high chance of fatal leaks and catastrophic outcomes.

**BBC 11**, (2011, September 2). “Space junk at tipping point, says report.” BBC News. Accessed December 27, 2021, from https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-14757926

[A report](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13244) by the National Research Council says the debris could cause **fatal leaks** in spaceships or **destroy** valuable **satellites**. It calls for international regulations to limit the junk and more research into the possible use of launching large magnetic nets or giant umbrellas. The debris includes clouds of minuscule fragments, old boosters and satellites. Some computer models show the amount of **orbital rubbish** "has **reached a tipping point,** with enough currently in orbit to continually collide and create even more debris, **raising the risk of spacecraft failures,"** the research council said in a statement on Thursday. Hopes of limiting the amount of space junk in orbit suffered two major setbacks in recent years. In 2007, China conducted an anti-satellite weapon test which destroyed a decommissioned weather satellite, smashing the object into 150,000 pieces larger than 1cm. Two years later, two satellites - one defunct and one active - crashed in orbit, creating even more debris. "Those two single events doubled the amount of fragments in Earth orbit and completely wiped out what we had done in the last 25 years," said Donald Kessler, who led the research. **There are 22,000 pieces of debris** large enough to track from the ground, but smaller objects could still cause serious damage. The International Space Station must occasionally dodge some of the junk, which flies around the Earth at speeds of up to 17,500 mph (28,164 km/h). In June, some debris narrowly missed the space station, forcing its six crew to go to their escape capsules and prepare for an emergency evacuation back to Earth. The situation is critical, said Mr Kessler, a retired Nasa scientist, because **colliding debris creates even more** of the junk. "We've lost control of the environment," he said.

#### Moreover, private companies are cramming more satellites into space, producing even more pieces of space junk.

**Wood, 20** (Therese)- “Who owns our orbit: Just how many satellites are there in space?” World Economic Forum. Accessed December 27, 2021, from https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/10/visualizing-easrth-satellites-sapce-spacex

Right now, There are nearly **6,000 satellites** circling our tiny planet. About 60% of those are defunct satellites—space junk—and roughly 40% are operational. As highlighted in the chart above, [The Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS)](https://www.ucsusa.org/resources/satellite-database), determined that **2,666 operational satellites** circled the globe in April of 2020. Over the coming decade, it’s estimated by Euroconsult that 990 satellites will be launched every year. This means that by 2028, there could be **15,000 satellites** in orbit. With SpaceX’s planned Starlink constellation of 12,000 satellites and Amazon’s proposed constellation in the works, the new space race continues its acceleration. Let’s take a closer look at who operates those satellites and how they apply their technology. Humans have long used space for navigation. While sailors once relied on the stars, today we use satellites for GPS, navigation, and various other applications. **More than half of Earth’s** operational **satellites are launched for commercial purposes.**

#### Lethal nontrackable debris form clusters uniquely escalates the risk of collisions.

#### Dr. Darren **McKnight 17**, “Proposed Series of Orbital Debris Remediation Activities,” Retrieved December 27, 2021, from <https://iaaspace.org/wp> content/uploads/iaa/Scientific%20Activity/debrisminutes0321.pdf

While protecting operational satellites from the trackable population via collision warnings provides a quantifiable risk mitigation mission, the primary threat to operational spacecraft comes from the lethal nontrackable (LNT) environment that will produce the vast majority of the anomalies and failures examined by the activity just outlined. LNT debris ranges from about 5mm to 10cm; these are fragments that are large enough to disrupt and terminate a satellite’s mission upon impact but are too small to be cataloged. There is an estimated 500,000-700,000 LNT in LEO currently. Therefore, the cataloged population (~18,000 in LEO) that is evaded through active maneuvering is less than 5% of the lethal population. In the future, this population will be added to primarily **form collisions between large objects** in orbit as the number of LNT produced is **proportional to the mass involved in a collision** (or explosion).2 Cataloged debris produced from a catastrophic collision will be liberated at about 1-3 fragments per kilogram of mass involved while LNT production is around 10-40 fragments per kilogram of mass involved. The Iridium/Cosmos collision involved a total mass of 2,000kg and produced over 3,000 trackable fragments and likely 10,000-15,0003 LNT debris. The Feng-Yun purposeful collision yielded over 2,200 trackable fragments and likely over 30,000 LNT from only ~850kg of mass involved. While it is important to prevent these types of events from occurring in the future, the consequence of a collision (based on number of LNT produced) will be proportional to the mass involved in the collision. The term “mass involved” implies a good coupling of the impactor mass with the target mass. For a large fragment (e.g., several kilograms) striking a typical payload (that is densely built) in its main satellite body (vice striking a solar array or other appendage) at hypervelocity speeds (i.e., above 6km/s) will result in all the mass being “involved” in the debris. However, a large fragment striking a derelict rocket body, due to the way that the mass is concentrated at the ends of a rocket body, will likely not result in all of the mass being “involved” in the liberated debris. However, it is likely that **when two large** derelicts, either rocket **bodies** or payloads, **collide** with each other, then **all of the mass will be involved** due to the likely direct physical interaction between the mass. The table below summarizes the mass involvement scenarios which highlight why the massive-on-massive collisions are the focus of our analyses. Therefore, it is best to prevent the collision of the most massive objects with each other (higher consequence) and the ones that are the most likely (higher probability) since risk is probability multiplied by consequence. Our ability to model and predict the rate of collisions is based empirically upon only one catastrophic accidental collision event and a model developed on the kinetic theory of gases (KTG). However, **clusters of massive objects** that have identical inclinations plus similar and overlapping apogees/perigees may indeed **have a greater** **probability of collision than predicted by** the KTG-based **algorithms** as they are not randomly distributed and their orbital element evolution (e.g., change in right ascension of ascending node and argument of perigee) is also similar. It is hypothesized that these similarities could result in resonances of collision dynamics that may lead to larger probability of collision values than predicted with current algorithms. The not well-known fact is that many of the most **massive objects are in** tightly clumped **clusters that** will likely **produce greater probability of collision** than estimated by the KTG approach (see attached paper) and with the much larger consequence (i.e., creation of catalogued LNT fragments). The attached paper that studied this possibility shows some initial indications that this may indeed be true but much more analysis is needed to provide this conclusively. This table of clusters represents well over 50% of the total derelict mass in LEO (low earth orbit). However, **no one is** currently **monitoring** these potential events.

#### Collisions renders the orbit unusable – cascades cause nuclear war, mass starvation, and economic destruction.

Les Johnson 13, Deputy Manager for NASA's Advanced Concepts Office at the Marshall Space Flight Center, Co-Investigator for the JAXA T-Rex Space Tether Experiment and PI of NASA's ProSEDS Experiment, Master's Degree in Physics from Vanderbilt University, Popular Science Writer, and NASA Technologist, Frequent Contributor to the Journal of the British Interplanetary Sodety and Member of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, National Space Society, the World Future Society, and MENSA, Sky Alert!: When Satellites Fail, p. 9-12 [language modified]

Whatever the initial cause, the result may be the same. A satellite destroyed in orbit will break apart into thousands of pieces, each traveling at over 8 km/sec. This virtual shotgun blast, with pellets traveling 20 times faster than a bullet, will quickly spread out, with each pellet now following its own orbit around the Earth. With over 300,000 other pieces of junk already there, the tipping point is crossed and a runaway series of collisions begins. A few orbits later, two of the new debris pieces strike other satellites, causing them to explode into thousands more pieces of debris. The rate of collisions increases, now with more spacecraft being destroyed. Called the "Kessler Effect", after the NASA scientist who first warned of its dangers, these debris objects, now numbering in the millions, cascade around the Earth, destroying every satellite in low Earth orbit. Without an atmosphere to slow them down, thus allowing debris pieces to bum up, most debris (perhaps numbering in the millions) will remain in space for hundreds or thousands of years. Any new satellite will be threatened by destruction as soon as it enters space, effectively rendering many Earth orbits unusable. But what about us on the ground? How will this affect us? Imagine a world that suddenly loses all of its space technology. If you are like most people, then you would probably have a few fleeting thoughts about the Apollo-era missions to the Moon, perhaps a vision of the Space Shuttle launching astronauts into space for a visit to the International Space Station (ISS), or you might fondly recall the "wow" images taken by the orbiting Hubble Space Telescope. In short, you would know that things important to science would be lost, but you would likely not assume that their loss would have any impact on your daily life. Now imagine a world that suddenly loses network and cable television, accurate weather forecasts, Global Positioning System (GPS) navigation, some cellular phone networks, on-time delivery of food and medical supplies via truck and train to stores and hospitals in virtually every community in America, as well as science useful in monitoring such things as climate change and agricultural sustainability. Add to this the [disabling] ~~crippling~~ of the US military who now depend upon spy satellites, space-based communications systems, and GPS to know where their troops and supplies are located at all times and anywhere in the world. The result is a nightmarish world, one step away from nuclear war, economic disaster, and potential mass starvation. This is the world in which we are now perilously close to living. Space satellites now touch our lives in many ways. And, unfortunately, these satellites are extremely vulnerable to risks arising from a half-century of carelessness regarding protecting the space environment around the Earth as well as from potential adversaries such as China, North Korea, and Iran. No government policy has put us at risk. It has not been the result of a conspiracy. No, we are dependent upon them simply because they offer capabilities that are simply unavailable any other way. Individuals, corporations, and governments found ways to use the unique environment of space to provide services, make money, and better defend the country. In fact, only a few space visionaries and futurists could have foreseen where the advent of rocketry and space technology would take us a mere 50 years since those first satellites orbited the Earth. It was the slow progression of capability followed by dependence that puts us at risk. The exploration and use of space began in 1957 with the launch of Sputnik 1 by the Soviet Union. The United States soon followed with Explorer 1. Since then, the nations of the world have launched over 8,000 spacecraft. Of these, several hundred are still providing information and services to the global economy and the world's governments. Over time, nations, corporations, and individuals have grown accustomed to the services these spacecraft provide and many are dependent upon them. Commercial aviation, shipping, emergency services, vehicle fleet tracking, financial transactions, and agriculture are areas of the economy that are increasingly reliant on space. Telestar 1, launched into space in the year of my birth, 1962, relayed the world's first live transatlantic news feed and showed that space satellites can be used to relay television signals, telephone calls, and data. The modern telecommunications age was born. We've come a long way since Telstar; most television networks now distribute most, if not ali, of their programming via satellite. Cable television signals are received by local providers from satellite relays before being sent to our homes and businesses using cables. With 65% of US households relying on cable television and a growing percentage using satellite dishes to receive signals from direct-to-home satellite television providers, a large number of people would be cut off from vital information in an emergency should these satellites be destroyed. And communications satellites relay more than television signals. They serve as hosts to corporate video conferences and convey business, banking, and other commercial information to and from all areas of the planet. The first successful weather satellite was TIROS. Launched in 1960, TIROS operated for only 78 days but it served as the precursor for today's much more long-lived weather satellites, which provide continuous monitoring of weather conditions around the world. Without them, providing accurate weather forecasts for virtually any place on the globe more than a day in advance would be nearly impossible. Figure !.1 shows a satellite image of Hurricane Ivan approaching the Alabama Gulf coast in 2004. Without this type of information, evacuation warnings would have to be given more generally, resulting in needless evacuations and lost economic activity (from areas that avoid landfall) and potentially increasing loss of life in areas that may be unexpectedly hit. The formerly top-secret Corona spy satellites began operation in 1959 and provided critical information about the Soviet Union's military and industrial capabilities to a nervous West in a time of unprecedented paranoia and nuclear risk. With these satellites, US military planners were able to understand and assess the real military threat posed by the Soviet Union. They used information provided by spy satellites to help avert potential military confrontations on numerous occasions. Conversely, the Soviet Union's spy satellites were able to observe the United States and its allies, with similar results. It is nearly impossible to move an army and hide it from multiple eyes in the sky. Satellite information is critical to all aspects of US intelligence and military planning. Spy satellites are used to monitor compliance with international arms treaties and to assess the military activities of countries such asChina**,** Russia**,** Iran**,** andNorth Korea**.** Figure 1.2 shows the capability of modem unclassified space-based imaging. The capability of the classified systems is presumed to be significantly better, providing much more detail. Losing these satellites would place global militaries on high alert and have them operating, literally, in the blind. Our military would suddenly become vulnerable in other areas as well. GPS, a network of 24-32 satellites in medium-Earth orbit, was developed to provide precise position information to the military, and it is now in common use by individuals and industry. The network, which became fully operational in 1993, allows our armed forces to know their exact locations anywhere in the world. It is used to guide bombs to their targets with unprecedented accuracy, requiring that only one bomb be used to destroy a target that would have previously required perhaps hundreds of bombs to destroy in the pre-GPS world (which, incidentally, has resulted in us reducing our stockpile of non-GPS-guided munitions dramatically). It allows soldiers to navigate in the dark or in adverse weather or sandstorms. Without GPS, our military advantage over potential adversaries would be dramatically reduced or eliminated.

### Advantage 2: Heritage

#### Without restrictions and regulations on property rights in space, conflicts over resources is inevitable- governments get dragged in the race

Funnell 18 – Anthony, Writer for Future Tense News Citing Dean of Law at University of Adelaide, “War in space 'inevitable' because there's so much money to be made, expert warns”, ABC News, 8/23/2018, https://www.abc.net.au/news/2018-08-24/conflict-in-space-is-inevitable-expert-warns/10146314

**A** leading Australian space law experthas warned conflict over space assets is "inevitable", and more needs to be done now to avert the potential for hostility. Professor Melissa de Zwart, the Dean of Law at the University of Adelaide, says growing commercial interest in the mining of precious minerals on asteroids and planets has heightened the danger. "I think you have to be a realist about that," she said. "Where you have resources, where you have competition for those resources**,** where you have investment of money in the extraction of those resources ... there will be an expectation of security around that investment." While full-scale mining is yet to be tried, there is significant international interest. Japanese aerospace agency Jaxa has already successfully landed a robotic craft on an asteroid and taken samples. It currently has another probe hovering over an asteroid named Ryugu. Artist's impression of Hayabusa 2 PHOTO: Artist's impression of Jaxa's robotic craft flying above Ryugu. (Source: JAXA) Two American companies — Deep Space Industries and Planetary Resources — are thought to be the leaders in the field, but in May this year a UK firm called Asteroid Mining Corporation also entered the race. "Those corporations will be looking to the nation-state to say, well, are you going to protect our investment in this business?" Professor de Zwart said. A very crowded space The US Government and American firms continue to play a dominant role in more traditional space technology development and deployment. SpaceX, for example, is a major private supplier of rockets, while the US Air Force currently coordinates international satellite traffic, providing advanced warnings about potentially dangerous space debris. Listen to the episode Are we moving away from the notion that space is for all humankind? And is conflict in space inevitable? But the number of players is rapidly increasing. The OECD's Space Forum says more than 80 countries now have some form of space program, mostly concentrated on rockets, satellites and satellite-related services and technology. They estimate the global industry is worth somewhere around $US400 billionand growing quickly. And that figure could skyrocket if, and when, asteroid mining kicks off. Eric Stallmer, the president of the US-based Commercial Spaceflight Federation, a consortium of 85 space-related organisations and businesses, believes that moment is fast approaching. "I think we are looking at a five to 10-yeartimetable for developing that technology. It makes for an exciting time," he said

#### As tensions continue to increase, a space war is approaching – companies are testing out their ASAT capabilities

**Impey 21’** Chris Impey, opinion contributor. (2021, October 8). Is conflict in space inevitable? TheHill. Retrieved January 2, 2022, from https://thehill.com/opinion/international/575903-is-conflict-in-space-inevitable?rl=1

Four years ago, China [destroyed one of its weather satellites](https://www.space.com/3415-china-anti-satellite-test-worrisome-debris-cloud-circles-earth.html) with a missile, creating tens of thousands of pieces of shrapnel, all large enough and traveling fast enough to destroy another satellite or pose a threat to the International Space Station. Two years later, [India joined the list of nations capable of space warfare](https://www.newscientist.com/article/2197903-india-tests-anti-satellite-missile-by-destroying-one-of-its-satellites/) by destroying one of its own satellites. Just last year, [Russia conducted an anti-satellite missile test](https://www.defensenews.com/battlefield-tech/space/2020/04/15/russia-conducted-anti-satellite-missile-test-says-us-space-command/), and the United States activated two command centers for the [Space Force](https://www.spaceforce.mil/About-Us/About-Space-Force/), the branch of the military designed to conduct its operations in outer space. Is this crescendo of activity a harbinger of international space warfare? For now, **we are witnessing nations testing their space technology**. There has never been an armed conflict in space — but it is the next arena for combat. Space junk is a headache, but space weapons are a nightmare. China is a rapidly rising space power, with ambitious plans for a space station, a Moon base and a Mars base. Unlike the United States, where NASA is a civilian agency with plans available for scrutiny, China’s space program is blended with its military and operates under a veil of secrecy. A [recent report](https://www.defensenews.com/congress/2021/04/14/china-aims-to-weaponize-space-says-intel-community-report/) from the Office of the Director of National Intelligence said China is working on an array of capabilities to weaponize space, and it plans to “match or exceed U.S. capabilities in space to gain the military, economic, and prestige benefits that Washington has accrued from space leadership.” Expanding our footprint beyond Earth risks replaying the colonial and acquisitive history of the Western world in a new arena. With few laws and regulations in space, companies will face no ethical constraints on their behavior. If **companies out-muscling countries** sounds implausible, consider this: In big tech, it has already happened. Apple’s market cap is [larger than the GDPs](https://www.visualcapitalist.com/the-tech-giants-worth-compared-economies-countries/) of all but seven countries. Amazon, which fuels the space enterprise of [Jeff Bezos](https://thehill.com/people/jeffrey-jeff-bezos), has a market cap similar to that of Russia or Brazil. But even these tech giants were [dwarfed by the Dutch East India Company](https://www.fool.com/investing/general/2012/08/22/a-history-of-ridiculously-big-companies.aspx). Four hundred years ago, this megacorporation controlled [half the world’s trade](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17518350.2003.11428634) and enforced its grip on power with 40 warships and 10,000 soldiers. We’ll need to take action to ensure that history doesn’t repeat itself.

#### Space war escalates into nuclear war

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

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

#### Only regulation that decouples commercial mining from research solves conflicts and makes room for sustainable mining.

Ramin Skibba 16, Formerly Assistant Project Scientist and Lecturer at the Center for Astrophysics and Space Sciences at the University of California, San Diego, Journalist, 4-19-2016, Mining in Space Could Lead to Conflicts on Earth, Nautilus, <http://nautil.us/blog/mining-in-space-could-lead-to-conflicts-on-earth>

For one thing, it appears to violate international law, according to Congressional testimony by Joanne Gabrynowicz, a space law expert at the University of Mississippi. Before NASA’s moon landing, the United States—along with other United Nations Security Council members and many other countries—signed the 1967 Outer Space Treaty. “Outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies,” it states, “is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means.” The 1979 Moon Agreement went further, declaring outer space to be the “common heritage of mankind” and explicitly forbidding any state or organization from annexing (non-Earth) natural resources in the solar system. Major space-faring nations are not among the 16 countries party to the treaty, but they should arguably come to some equitable agreement, since international competition **over** natural resources **in space may** very well transform into conflict. Take platinum-group metals. Mining companies have found about 100,000 metric tons of the stuff in deposits worldwide, mostly in South Africa and Russia, amounting to $10 billion worth of production per year, according to the U.S. Geological Survey. These supplies should last several decades if demand for them doesn’t rise dramatically. (According to Bloomberg, supply for platinum-group metals is constrained while demand is increasing.) Palladium, for example, valued for its conductive properties and chemical stability, is used in hundreds of millions of electronic devices sold annually for electrodes and connector platings, but it’s relatively scarce on Earth. A single giant, platinum-rich asteroid could contain as much platinum-group metals as all reserves on Earth, the Google-backed Planetary Resources claims. That’s a massive bounty. As Planetary Resources and other U.S. and foreign companies scramble for control over these valuable space minerals, competing “land grabs” by armed satellites may come next. Platinum-group metals in space may serve the same role as oil has on Earth, threatening to extend geopolitical struggles into astropolitical ones. NASA’s increasing collaboration with space mining companies could distort and divert efforts previously focused on space exploration. Moreover, the technology that might enable this free-for-all—versatile “nanosatellites,” no larger than a loaf of bread—is relatively inexpensive. In December, while reporting for a story about these tiny satellites, also known as CubeSats, I came across some missions applicable to mining asteroids. In mid-2018, NASA will launch a satellite for a mission called Near-Earth Asteroid Scout, for example. It will deploy a solar sail, propel itself with sunlight, and journey to the asteroid belt, where it will scope out a particular asteroid and analyze its properties. Last June, NASA also awarded grants to Planetary Resources to advance the designs of spectral imagers and propulsion systems for CubeSats, and other missions will develop the satellites’ abilities to communicate and network with each other. NASA also awarded Deep Space Industries contracts to assess commercial approaches for NASA’s asteroid goals, which may involve hosting DSI’s asteroid-prospecting equipment on its missions. Like all forms of mining, it will be dangerous. If space-mining activities break up asteroids, the resulting debris could be hazardous for satellites, other spacecraft, and astronauts nearby. On the other hand, in a best-case scenario, space mining could be environmentally safe, capture only necessary minerals and water, and, in the more distant future even lead to the construction of a far-flung space station led by NASA and other space agencies, orbiting 200 million miles from Earth and serving as both a mining depot and a pit-stop for passing spacecraft. But it’s not clear that a pact between the commercial space mining industry and NASA would align with the public’s interest. NASA’s increasing collaboration with space mining companies could distort and divert efforts previously focused on space exploration and basic research and discourage public interest and engagement in astronomy. Last October, for example, Seager advocated for space mining at a science writing conference I attended. She’s part of a motley group of advisors for Planetary Resources, including the movie director James Cameron, a lawyer for a prominent Washington D.C. firm, and Dante Lauretta, another astronomer whom I respect. Seager seems to believe that encouraging private space mining will lead to more investments and technological innovation that would enable more scientific research. In a 2012 interview with The Atlantic, for instance, she said, “The bottom line is that NASA is not working the best that it could for space science right now, and so in order for people like me to succeed with my own research goals, the commercial space industry needs to be able to succeed independently of government contracts.” But if the U.S. and U.S.-based companies lay claim to the richest and most easily accessible prospecting sites, not allowing other companies and nations to share in the wealth, economic and political relations could be damaged. That’s why this seems to be a dangerous path for space explorers. Once you’re on board with the commercial space industry, then you as a researcher must accept, if not support, everything that comes with it. Seager and a few other researchers may be willing to take this risk, but what about the rest of the space science community? Moreover, to succeed, these businesses will seek profitable missions, while science, exploration, and discovery—goals that stimulate public interest—will inevitably have lower priority. (Other commercial spaceflight companies, like Elon Musk’s SpaceX, do generate public interest, but they’re not directly involved in mining asteroids.) NASA may have its shortcomings, but at least its missions and research goals answer to the public. It’s not exactly a welcome thought to imagine more and more of our presence and activity in space being ceded, with NASA’s help, to private industry. What should happen instead? Commercial space mining and science would both be served well by decoupling from each other. We should treat outer space like we do Antarctica. That icy landscape is humankind’s common heritage, where we encourage scientific investigations and conservation and forbid territorial claims. If some organizations want to mine asteroids, then we should take the time to develop and establish an international framework to regulate it properly. Space-mining is an exciting opportunity to articulate our species’ role in our little galactic fragment. But it’s not just about sustainably managing limited or dwindling resources. It’s about our interactions with the nature beyond our humble world. We should explore the solar system as its steward without repeating our economically rapacious past.

#### Space mining solves rare earth mineral shortages and resource conflicts, regulation is key to resolve conflict and promote investigation

**Steffen 21’** Steffen, O. (2021, December 2). *Explore to exploit: A data-centred approach to Space Mining Regulation*. Space Policy. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964621000515

In light of recent technological advancements in the launch industry and the accelerating development of a private space economy, the regulation of space mining is becoming an increasingly pressing matter. A regulatory regime for space mining must not only provide legal clarity on how to acquire mining rights for certain [celestial bodies](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/astronomical-systems) but must also do this in a way that does not hinder investment in companies in this sector. To encourage a progressive development and prevent the formation of market [monopolies](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/monopolies), the regime's mechanism for acquiring mining rights must be designed to promote continued investment in new space mining companies, even after first movers have proven the concept. With a strong emphasis on the proliferation of space mining and the establishment of a spacefaring civilisation, this article proposes a regulatory regime and mechanism to acquire rights for the mining of celestial bodies while preserving the information and knowledge contained within these bodies as heritage for future generations of mankind and for science to capitalise on an emerging economy's momentum.

The prospect of space mining has been a part of the scientific, legal and cultural domain for a long period. The general accessibility of asteroids and [comets](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/meteorites) alike has been demonstrated by science missions to orbits around 67P/Churyumov-Gerasimenko by ESA's Rosetta mission, Itokawa by JAXA's Hayabusa, Ryugu by JAXA's Hayabusa 2 and Bennu by OSIRIS-REx, with samples having been returned to earth by Hayabusa and Hayabusa 2 and, as of writing of this article, currently being returned by OSIRIS-REx.

Complementing the proven ability to access asteroids from earth, Sanchez and McInnes have shown that there is ‘ample material that could potentially be exploited at a relatively low energy’. Genta considers asteroid mining to be a necessary foundation for establishing humanity as a spacefaring civilization. Companies with the goal to realise space mining, for example, Planetary Resources and Deep Space Industries (now acquired by Consensus Space and Bradford Space), have been in existence for many years. Other companies, such as Momentus Space or Honeybee Robotics, have a technological profile or dedicated roadmap set on the goal of space mining. Together with technical, legal and environmental views on the matter, some authors are also critical of space development and how it will evolve.

Space mining will undoubtedly be necessary to sustain a spacefaring civilization and may be the very key to establishing one. Careful consideration must be given to the design of a regulatory regime that governs such activities, as it will define what kind of society mankind will become.

#### The lack of earth minerals prevents the transition to clean energy necessary to solve warming.

Nafeez Ahmed 18, DPhil in international relations from the School of Global Studies at Sussex University, an investigative journalist and international security scholar, Dec 12 2018, "We Don't Mine Enough Rare Earth Metals to Replace Fossil Fuels With Renewable Energy", Vice, https://www.vice.com/en\_us/article/a3mavb/we-dont-mine-enough-rare-earth-metals-to-replace-fossil-fuels-with-renewable-energy

A new scientific study supported by the Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure warns that the renewable energy industry could be about to face a fundamental obstacle: shortages in the supply of rare metals. To meet greenhouse gas emission reduction targets under the Paris Agreement, renewable energy production has to scale up fast. This means that global production of several rare earth minerals used in solar panels and wind turbines—especially neodymium, terbium, indium, dysprosium, and praseodymium—must grow twelvefold by 2050.But according to the new study by Dutch energy systems company Metabolic, the “current global supply of several critical metals is insufficient to transition to a renewable energy system.” The study focuses on demand for rare metals in the Netherlands and extrapolates this to develop a picture of how global trends are likely to develop.“If the rest of the world would develop renewable electricity capacity at a comparable pace with the Netherlands, a considerable shortage would arise,” the study finds. This doesn’t include other applications of rare earth metals in other electronics industries (rare earth metals are widely used in smartphones, for example). “When other applications (such as electric vehicles) are also taken into consideration, the required amount of certain metals would further increase.”Demand for rare metals is pitched to rise exponentially across the world, and not just due to renewables. Demand is most evident in “consumer electronics, military applications, and other technical equipment in industrial applications. The growth of the global middle class from 1 billion to 3 billion people will only further accelerate this growth.”But the study did not account for those other industries. This means the actual problem could be far more intractable. In 2017, a study in Nature found that a range of minerals essential for smartphones, laptops, electric cars and even copper wiring could face supply shortages in coming decades.

#### Warming – extinction

**Krosofsky 21’** (2021, March 11). “How global warming May eventually lead to global extinction.” Green Matters. Retrieved January 3, 2022, from https://www.greenmatters.com/p/will-global-warming-cause-extinction//westridge-ky/

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](https://www.biologicaldiversity.org/programs/climate_law_institute/global_warming_and_life_on_earth/index.html) 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](https://www.greenmatters.com/p/arctic-ice-melting), increasing [sea levels](https://www.greenmatters.com/news/2019/01/15/bPhgWvMpZ/oceans-warming-climate-change) and temperatures. Eventually, these effects will create a perfect storm of extinction conditions. We won’t try and sugarcoat things, humanity’s own prospects aren’t looking that great either. According to [The Conversation](https://theconversation.com/will-climate-change-cause-humans-to-go-extinct-117691), 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](https://www.greenmatters.com/p/global-temperature-rise-predictions) 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](https://www.greenmatters.com/p/climate-crisis-leads-to-pandemics), devastating storms, and uncontrollable wildfires.

#### Conflicts over water—extinction

**Milne 21’** BBC. (n.d.). “How water shortages are brewing wars.” BBC Future. Retrieved January 4, 2022, from https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20210816-how-water-shortages-are-brewing-wars

Over the course of the 20th Century, global water use grew at more than twice the rate of population increase. Today, this dissonance is leading many cities – from [Rome](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-41081066) to [Cape Town](https://www.wri.org/insights/3-things-cities-can-learn-cape-towns-impending-day-zero-water-shut), [Chennai](https://www.npr.org/sections/goatsandsoda/2019/06/25/734534821/no-drips-no-drops-a-city-of-10-million-is-running-out-of-water?t=1626365858497) to [Lima](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/3697647.stm) – to ration water. Water crises have been ranked in the top five of the World Economic Forum's [Global Risks by Impact](http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_The_Global_Risks_Report_2021.pdf) list nearly every year since 2012. In 2017, severe droughts contributed to the [worst humanitarian crisis since World War Two](https://www.un.org/press/en/2017/sc12748.doc.htm), when 20 million people across Africa and the Middle East were forced to leave their homes due to the accompanying food shortages and conflicts that erupted. Peter Gleick, head of the Oakland-based Pacific Institute, has spent the last three decades studying the link between water scarcity, conflict and migration and believes that water conflict is on the rise. "With very rare exceptions, no one dies of literal thirst," he says. "But more and more people are dying from contaminated water or conflicts over access to water." "The latest research on the subject does indeed [show water-related violence increasing over time](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3076402/)," says Charles Iceland, global director for water at the World Resources Institute. "Population growth and economic development are driving increasing water demand worldwide. Meanwhile, **climate change is decreasing water supply** and/or making rainfall increasingly erratic in many places." Nowhere is the dual effect of water stress and climate change more evident than the wider Tigris-Euphrates Basin – comprising Turkey, Syria, Iraq and western Iran. According to satellite imagery, the region is [losing groundwater faster than almost anywhere else in the world](https://www.stimson.org/2021/joint-working-group-on-international-and-eu-water-diplomacy-in-focus-the-euphrates-tigris-river-basin/). And as some countries make desperate attempts to secure their water supplies, their actions are affecting their neighbours. India's Northern Plains, for example, are one of the most fertile farming areas in the world, yet today,  [villagers regularly clash over water scarcity](https://www.thekashmirmonitor.net/2-haryana-villages-clash-over-water-8-bikes-set-on-fire-12-injured/). The underlying data reveals that population growth and high levels of irrigation have outstripped available groundwater supplies. Despite the area's lush-looking cropland, the WPS map ranks nearly every district in Northern India as "extremely high" in terms of baseline water stress. Several key rivers which feed the area – the Indus, Ganges and Sutlej – all originate on the Tibetan side of the border yet are vital for water supplies in both India and Pakistan. compounds the problem. Several border skirmishes have broken out recently between India and China, which lays claim to upstream areas. A violent clash in May last year in the Galwan Valley, through which a tributary to the Indus flows, left 20 Indian soldiers dead. Less than a month later there were reports that China was building "structures" that might dam the river and so restrict its flow into India. Around the world, there's plenty of examples where tensions are high though – the Aral Sea conflict comprising Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan; the Jordan River conflict amongst the Levantine states; the Mekong River dispute between China and its neighbours in Southeast Asia. None have yet boiled over into conflict. But Schmeier also points towards one dispute that is showing signs it might. Egypt, Sudan, and Ethiopia all depend on inflow from the Blue Nile and have long exchanged political blows over the upstream Great Ethiopian Renaissance Dam (GERD) project – a dam built at $5bn (£3.6bn), and three times the size of the country's Lake Tana. When the Ethiopian government announced plans to press ahead regardless, Egypt and Sudan held a joint war exercise in May this year, pointedly called "Guardians of the Nile." It has perhaps the highest risk of spilling into a water war of all the disputes in today's political landscape, but there are several other hotspots around the world. Pakistani officials, for example, have previously referred to India's upstream usage strategy as "fifth-generation warfare", whilst Uzbek President Islam Karimov has warned that [regional disputes over water could lead to war](https://www.reuters.com/article/centralasia-water-idUSL6E8K793I20120907).

### Solvency

#### Thus, the plan: States ought to apply the Public Trust Doctrine to reduce the appropriation of outer space by private entities.

#### There is an urgency for global regulation and management in space, only the PTD ensures sustainable mining and limits appropriation.

Babcock 19 “The public trust doctrine, outer space ... - georgetown law.” (n.d.). Retrieved January 4, 2022, from https://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3219&context=facpub

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

#### Sustainable development solves debris, resource wars, and a laundry list of impacts.

Aganaba-Jeanty 16 (, T., 2016. Space Sustainability and the Freedom of Outer Space. [online] Taylor & Francis. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14777622.2016.1148463>

Definitions of space sustainability The Secure World Foundation defines **space** **sustainability** as “ensuring that all humanity can continue to use outer space for peaceful purposes and socioeconomic benefit.”39 It is also described as “the ability of all humanity to continue to use outer space for peaceful purposes and socioeconomic benefit over the **long** **term**.” It is proposed that, read together, these broad definitions take as their premise that: (1) all humanity thus far is using space for peaceful purposes and for socioeconomic benefit; (2) this use is threatened; (3) measures must be taken to protect it; and (4) all humanity currently possesses the ability, in the sense of having a skill or the **capacity, to ensure space sustainability** for peaceful purposes. Under this conceptualization, the negative effect of not using space sustainably is primarily economic.40 Bearing in mind the governmental origins of space exploitation, where market economics did not play a primary role in decision making, the growing focus on the economic perspective in space affairs acknowledges Carolyn Deere’s opinion that problems emerge in the international domain from an absence of powerful economic interests.41 Of course, as more space applications are developed, economic interests become more prevalent in that market protectionism then underlies the rationales for many positions taken. Space sustainability is also conceptualized as defining good behavior, its boundaries, and disincentives for negative behavior in space.42 Space sustainability then becomes a much more limited political concept calling for specific measures to strengthen norms.43 Some notable examples follow: An International Code of Conduct—the European Union proposed a non-binding voluntary code whose purpose is “security, safety, sustainability” for all space activities providing for general measures on space operations and space debris.44 The Scientific and Technical Subcommittee of UNCOPUOS working group objective of establishing guidelines for the long-term sustainability of outer space activities. Proposed International Civil Aviation Organization for Space—the establishment of an international organization focused on space safety and the establishment of binding safety standards similar to the International Civil Aviation Organization.45 Industry efforts for a global space situational awareness database Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Transparency and Confidence Building Measures. Depending on the forum for discussion and in line with the previously mentioned initiatives, the concept of space sustainability is also used interchangeably with the following: (1) space security, which entails access to space and freedom from threats;46 (2) space stability addressing space situational awareness;47 (3) space **safety**, which is **protection** **from** all unreasonable levels of **risk** (primarily protection of humans or human activities);48 and (4) responsible uses of space.49 These all reflect the two components of space sustainability as described by the founder of Secure World Foundation: “the first is the physical environment, which includes management of space debris, electromagnetic and physical crowding and congestion, and space weather.... The second component is the political environment, and includes promoting stability and preventing conflict between nations.”50 Bearing this in mind and notwithstanding the potential confusion caused by the interchangeability of terms used, at the core of all proposals conceptualizing space sustainability or related concepts are the notions that: (1) space assets are kept safe and secure, and that the assets are not harmed or interfered with; (2) peaceful space activities continue as free from purposeful/intentional or unintentional harmful interference; (3) the space environment is preserved for peaceful uses; and (4) international cooperative efforts are required. These four points are understood to be the current core conditions for and of space sustainability. It must be acknowledged that space sustainability, in this context, is severed from the ecological roots of sustainable development. Rationale for space sustainability The proposed baseline conditions for the current conception for space sustainability coincide with Gallagher’s analysis of the logic for space cooperation as “Space Governance for Global Security” where all space actors seek “to secure the space domain for peaceful use; to protect space assets from all hazards; and to derive maximum value from space for security, economic, civil, and environmental ends.”51 Based on this understanding, the current conception of and rationale for space sustainability ties more clearly to global security than to sustainable development. This logic emphasizes that “the more different countries, companies, and individuals depend on space for a growing array of purposes, the more they need equitable rules, shared decision-making procedures, and effective compliance mechanisms to **maximize** the **benefits** that they all can gain from space, while **minimizing** **risks** **from irresponsible space behaviors or deliberate interference** with legitimate space activities.”52 While it is acknowledged that such a need exists, the difficulty in reaching agreement on how to bring it about is one reason why some states are more focused on producing a dialogue on long-term sustainability. This is seen in the proliferation of reports outlining best practices and options that enhance sustainability through increased information sharing, as well as a focus on technical issues rather than on the creation of any new legal regimes. To minimize some of the risks of non-sustainable space use, Weeden53 proposes a three-pillar technical approach to space sustainability: (1) debris mitigation; (2) debris removal; and (3) space traffic management. This is conjoined with an immediate need for data in support of conjunction assessment and collision avoidance. This emphasis on data sharing/collection includes enabling research into potential solutions to the problem of space debris, and enhancing transparency and cooperation among states. Weeden also suggests that this narrow approach to space sustainability serves both to educate space actors about the severity of the space debris problem and to provide stability to reduce the likelihood of conflict. A common approach to data also serves as verification for a potential code of conduct in space, setting the stage for future space governance models. These proposals follow the logic of sustainability for global security**.** While this logic is in line with the dominant conceptualization of benefit sharing and freedom of outer space, the position taken in this article is that it does not adequately speak to sustainabilityfrom the perspective ofaspirant space states**.** To do so requires a significantly broader discussion and solutions aimed towards aligning space law and policy with the sustainable development paradigm, if understood as being an inclusive paradigm and not focused on the individualistic/self-interested nature of the current conception of sustainable development. A systemic, sustainable development law approach calls for a conscious engagement with the web of overlapping social, environmental, cultural, and legal frameworks, as well as cultural considerations, economic policies, expectations, players, and interests.54 Bearing in mind current U.S. space policy,55 such a broad overarching objective may not be achievable as part of the dialogue on the “Long Term Sustainability of Outer Space Activities,” but U.S. policy regarding preservation of the space environment nevertheless offers insights because international initiatives congruent with it are likely to garner the most support. Schrogl56 proposed that sustainability is rendered to threats and risks to satellite operations. This approach acknowledges the intersection of multiple issue areas: environment, security, mobility, knowledge, resources, and energy. This intersection of issue areas is more akin to the wider discourse of sustainability development of and on the Earth, and prompts a discussion of value to emerging and aspirant space actors.

### Framing

**The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing**

**Pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable-- everything else regresses**

**Moen 16** [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer)] Retrieved January 5, 2022

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

**Moreover, *only* pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable. All other values can be explained with reference to pleasure.**

**Moen 16** [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] Retrieved january 5, 2022

I think several things should be said in response to Moore’s challenge to hedonists. First, I do not think the burden of proof lies on hedonists to explain why the additional values are not intrinsic values. If someone claims that X is intrinsically valuable, this is a substantive, positive claim, and it lies on him or her to explain whywe should believe that X is in fact intrinsically valuable. Possibly, this could be done through thought experiments analogous to those employed in the previous section. Second, there is something peculiar about the list of **additional** intrinsic **values** that counts in hedonism’s favor: the listed values **have a strong tendency to be well explained as things that help promote pleasure and avert pain.** To go through Frankena’s list, life and consciousness are necessary presuppositions for pleasure; activity, health, and strength bring about pleasure; and happiness, beatitude, and contentment are regarded by Frankena himself as “pleasures and satisfactions.” The same is arguably true of beauty, harmony, and “proportion in objects contemplated,” and also of affection, friendship, harmony, and proportion in life, experiences of achievement, adventure and novelty, self-expression, good reputation, honor and esteem. Other things on Frankena’s list, such as understanding, wisdom, freedom, peace, and security, although they are perhaps not themselves pleasurable, are important means to achieve a happy life, and as such, they are things that hedonists would value highly. **Morally good dispositions** and virtues, cooperation, and just distribution of goods and evils, moreover, are things that, on a collective level, **contribute a happy society**, and thus the traits that would be promoted and cultivated if this were something sought after. To a very large extent, the intrinsic values suggested by pluralists tend to be hedonic instrumental values. Indeed, pluralists’ suggested intrinsic values all point toward pleasure, for while the other values are reasonably explainable as a means toward pleasure, pleasure itself is not reasonably explainable as a means toward the other values. Some have noticed this. Moore himself, for example, writes that though his pluralistic theory of intrinsic value is opposed to hedonism, its application would, in practice, look very much like hedonism’s: “Hedonists,” he writes “do, in general, recommend a course of conduct which is very similar to that which I should recommend.”24 Ross writes that “[i]t is quite certain that by promoting virtue and knowledge we shall inevitably produce much more pleasant consciousness. These are, by general agreement, among the surest sources of happiness for their possessors.”25 Roger Crisp observes that “those goods cited by non-hedonists are goods we often, indeed usually, enjoy.”26 What Moore and Ross do not seem to notice is that their observations give rise to two reasons to reject pluralism and endorse hedonism. The first reason is that if **the suggested** non-hedonic **intrinsic values are** potentially **explainable by appeal to just pleasure and pain** (which, following my argument in the previous chapter, we should accept as intrinsically valuable and disvaluable), then—by appeal to Occam’s razor—**we have** at least a pro tanto **reason to resist** the introduction of **any further intrinsic values** and disvalues. It is ontologically more costly to posit a plurality of intrinsic values and disvalues, so in case **all values admit of explanation by reference to a single intrinsic value** and a single intrinsic disvalue, we have reason to reject more complicated accounts. The fact that suggested non-hedonic intrinsic values tend to be hedonistic instrumental values does not, however, count in favor of hedonism solely in virtue of being most elegantly explained by hedonism; it also does so in virtue of creating an explanatory challenge for pluralists. The challenge can be phrased as the following question: If the non-hedonic values suggested by pluralists are truly intrinsic values in their own right, then why do they tend to point toward pleasure and away from pain?

**Priority number one should always be reducing extinction risk.  
Bostrom 12** [Faculty of Philosophy and Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford.], Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority. <http://www.existenti...org/concept.pdf>. Retrieved January 5, 2022Even if we use the most conservative of these estimates, which entirely ignores the   possibility of space colonization and software minds, we find that **the** expected **loss of an existential catastrophe is greater than the value of 10^16 human lives**.  This implies that the expected value of reducing existential risk by a mere one millionth of one percentage point is at least a hundred times the value of a million human lives.  The more technologically comprehensive estimate of 10  54 humanbrain-emulation subjective life-years (or 10  52  lives of ordinary length) makes the same point even more starkly.  Even if we give this allegedly lower bound on the cumulative output potential of a technologically mature civilization a mere 1% chance of being correct, we find that the expected value of reducing existential risk by a mere one billionth of one billionth of one percentage point is worth a hundred billion times as much as a billion human lives. One might consequently argue that **even the tiniest reduction of existential risk has a**n  expected **value greater than** that of the definite provision of any ordinary good, such as the direct benefit of **saving 1 billion lives.**  And, further, that the absolute value of the indirect effect of saving 1  billion lives on the total cumulative amount of existential riskâ€”positive or negativeâ€”is almost certainly larger than the positive value of the direct benefit of such an action.