UAA UNIVERSITY AVIATION ASSOCIATION

Collegiate Aviation Review International

Volume 43 | Issue 2 Position Papers #1

07-23-2025

An Examination of the Implications of Space Exploration Through the Lens of Five Ethical Philosophies

Sean R. Crouse
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

Samuil Nikolov
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

Megan Harris
University of Toronto

Joseph P. O'Brien
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

Ryan Wallace
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

Stephen Rice
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

Scott R. Winter
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

In the early 21st century, the rapid advance of space exploration has resulted in both significant scientific and economic prospects and profound ethical challenges. This paper examines the ethics of modern space exploration through five relevant principal ethical philosophies: Utilitarianism, Deontological Ethics, Virtue Ethics, Environmental Ethics, and Feminist Ethics. Utilitarianism evaluates actions based on outcomes, advocating for those that maximize overall well-being, while Deontological Ethics emphasizes adherence to moral duties and principles. Virtue Ethics focuses on the character and virtues of individuals and organizations, while Environmental Ethics highlights the intrinsic value of non-human environments and advocates for their preservation. Feminist Ethics stresses inclusivity, equity, and social justice. The paper develops a comprehensive ethical framework to guide humanity's ventures into space by integrating these different perspectives.

Recommended Citation:
Crouse, S. R., Nikolov, S., Harris, M., O'Brien, J. P., Wallace, R., Winter, S. R., & Rice, S. (2025). An Examination of the Implications of Space Exploration Through the Lens of Five Ethical Philosophies. *Collegiate Aviation Review International*, *43*(2), pending. Retrieved from https://ojs.library.okstate.edu/osu/index.php/CARI/article/view/10256/9105

Introduction

The stakes of venturing into outer space—from satellite deployments and crewed lunar bases to interplanetary travel and asteroid mining—have never been higher, both in terms of potential scientific and economic benefits and inherent risks. As humanity extends its reach beyond Earth, we must ask: What ethical frameworks should guide our actions in space? How do we ensure that our pursuits reflect justice, sustainability, and inclusivity, not just technical or economic feasibility? The paper explores ethical frameworks through the evaluation of space exploration activities through five philosophical lenses. The primary research question addressed in this paper is: What ethical framework(s) best address the multifaceted dilemmas of space exploration in a way that promotes justice, sustainability, and inclusivity.

Space exploration represents a technical challenge and a profound ethical and philosophical problem (Jaehnichen, 2020). Our actions in exploring outer space could have long-lasting implications for future generations of both human and potentially alien life forms (Madhavan Nair et al., 2008; Santomartino et al., 2023). Therefore, to ensure our cosmic endeavors are successful, just, and responsible, it is imperative that we analyze these activities through various ethical lenses. This paper examines the ethics of space exploration from five principal ethical philosophies' perspectives: Utilitarianism (Bentham, 1789; Bentham et al., 1807), Deontological Ethics (Kant 1785; 1788), Virtue Ethics (Aristotle; Darwall, 2003; Devetter, 2002; Gardiner, 2005; Hursthouse & Pettigrove, 2018; Russell, 2013; Swanton, 2003; Taylor, 2002), Environmental Ethics (Chua, 2022; Di Paola, 2024; Hourdequin, 2021; Palmer et al., 2014; Valera et al., 2021), and Feminist Ethics (Brabeck, 2000; Brennan, 1999; Card, 1991; Superson, 2024; Tong, 1993.

Each of these philosophical frameworks offers unique insights into the moral dimensions of space exploration. For example, *Utilitarianism* asks us to weigh the benefits against the harms, promoting actions that maximize overall well-being. This approach might justify significant risks in space exploration if the potential gains (e.g., knowledge, resources, or even species' survival) are substantial (Munévar, 2014). *Deontological Ethics* shifts the focus from outcomes to adherence to moral duties, rules, or categorical imperatives—such as the duty not to harm others or the environment—which might oppose the exploitation of space irrespective of the potential benefits (Martínez-Frías et al., 2011). *Virtue Ethics* emphasizes the character and virtues of the individuals and organizations involved, advocating for space exploration that promotes virtues such as bravery, prudence, and humility (Reiman, 2009). And to further complicate the ethical landscape, *Environmental Ethics* raises questions about our moral obligations toward non-Earth environments. This perspective challenges the anthropocentric view by considering the intrinsic value of space and the potential life forms it might host (Daly & Frodeman, 2008). Finally, *Feminist Ethics* offers a viewpoint that stresses inclusivity, equity, and social justice (Riley, 2013).

The importance of these ethical considerations becomes especially pronounced in light of space exploration's international and multi-generational impacts. As we stand on the precipice of becoming an interplanetary species, the decisions made now will shape the future of humanity and other potential forms of life across the cosmos. This paper aims not only to delineate these ethical dimensions, but also to outline a path toward an ethical framework that can universally

guide how nations and private entities behave in space. As such, this paper aims to contribute to dialogues among policymakers, scientists, and the global community to help ensure that our ventures into the great unknown are taken with wisdom, foresight, and ethical integrity.

Literature Review

The ethical considerations of space exploration have garnered considerable attention in recent years as humanity expands its presence in space, driven by the advent of private space travel and the discussion of crewed missions beyond the Moon. As we expand our footprint throughout the solar system, humanity faces multifaceted ethical dilemmas inherent in the exploration of outer space. These concerns range from planetary protection to the health and well-being of the crew.

A primary ethical concern in space exploration is planetary protection, which is the set of measures designed to prevent the contamination of other celestial bodies and Earth's biosphere during space missions. Coustenis et al. (2023) state that as access to space becomes more democratized through traditional and non-traditional actors, robust international frameworks, such as those proposed by the Committee on Space Research (COSPAR, 2024), are necessary to ensure that environmental stewardship remains a priority. This is crucial to ensure that extraterrestrial ecosystems remain pristine and to maintain the integrity of planetary science, as contamination could significantly alter our understanding of other worlds.

Moreover, the ethical implications of human spaceflight must be examined, considering the dramatic health challenges that crew members will face due to prolonged exposure to space environments. Rutter et al. (2020) indicate that missions to Mars or other celestial bodies will involve a diverse cohort of astronauts who will face significant physical and psychological stressors. They highlight the establishment of international standards for space omics to address health risks related to factors such as microgravity. The obligation to ensure the safety and well-being of astronauts includes mental health considerations, which have been less addressed (Rutter et al., 2020).

The intersection of technological advancement and ethical considerations presents opportunities and challenges. With the growth of commercial spaceflight activities, ethical responsibilities towards diverse stakeholders have become prominent. The discourse on responsible research and innovation (RRI) emphasizes inclusion and responsiveness, enabling stakeholders to participate meaningfully in discussions about ethical implications (Giulio et al., 2016). As space exploration evolves, the ethical frameworks governing these enterprises must ensure that various perspectives are considered in decision-making processes.

Finally, the ethical landscape of space exploration must also consider broader societal implications, including issues of justice and environmental ethics. Barnett (2016) argues that moral concerns should extend beyond anthropocentrism, raising questions about obligations to non-human entities and ecosystems in space (Bernthal et al., 2016). As humanity enters an era of interplanetary exploration, these ethical considerations will need continuous reassessment to align with evolving technological capabilities and societal values.

The ethical dimensions of space exploration include planetary protection, health considerations for astronauts, inclusivity in decision-making processes, and broader ethical obligations towards non-human entities. Addressing these challenges will be essential as humanity continues to explore beyond our planet, ensuring that new frontiers are approached with responsibility and foresight.

Methodology

This paper employs a comparative ethical analysis to examine space exploration through five philosophical frameworks: Utilitarianism, Deontological Ethics, Virtue Ethics, Environmental Ethics, and Feminist Ethics. Rather than testing hypotheses or collecting empirical data, the goal is to analyze how each framework interprets moral dilemmas associated with space activities. This approach is grounded in normative ethics, using case-based reasoning to explore the implications of different ethical lenses. To ensure consistency and comparability across philosophies, we apply each ethical theory to a shared set of representative case studies, including:

- Mars colonization efforts (e.g., SpaceX's Mars program),
- Asteroid mining and resource extraction,
- Planetary protection protocols,
- Crew decision-making under high-risk conditions, and
- Equity and access in space exploration initiatives (e.g., the Artemis program).

These case studies were selected for their diversity, relevance, and presence in public, governmental, and academic discourse. They illustrate key tensions in space ethics, such as risk vs. reward, autonomy vs. oversight, preservation vs. progress, and inclusion vs. tradition. By analyzing how each ethical theory interprets these scenarios, we assess the strengths and limitations of each framework. This analysis will lead to the development of an integrative ethical framework, designed to synthesize the most compelling elements of each philosophy into a coherent guide for space policy and practice. The integrative conclusion emerges from identifying overlapping values, contrasting priorities, and unaddressed ethical gaps. This structured comparison allows for a more robust understanding of how diverse moral theories can inform decision-making in an environment as complex, novel, and high-stakes as outer space.

Utilitarianism and Space Exploration

Utilitarianism, a normative ethical theory, advocates actions that maximize happiness and minimize suffering (Bentham, 1789; Bentham et al., 1807). This principle focuses on the consequences of our actions. In the context of space exploration, *utilitarianism* encourages us to weigh the potential benefits against the inherent risks. According to utilitarianism, the central question when considering space exploration is: Do the positive outcomes of space ventures outweigh their financial costs and the risks to human safety?

Application for Space Exploration

Applied to space exploration, *utilitarianism* assesses decisions based on their outcomes, including scientific knowledge, economic gains, and humanity's long-term survival. This philosophy supports activities that promise significant benefits—such as finding solutions to Earth's resource limitations, advancing technology and biology, and protecting humanity from existential threats like asteroid impacts or planetary catastrophes (International Space Exploration Coordination Group, 2013).

Case Study 1: Establishment of a Human Presence on Mars

The endeavor to colonize Mars, led by organizations like SpaceX, presents a compelling case for *utilitarian* analysis. Establishing a human settlement on Mars offers profound potential benefits. First, it could serve as a "plan B" for humanity, providing a backup in the event of catastrophic disasters on Earth and potentially securing our future (Levchenko et al., 2019). Second, exploring Mars could lead to groundbreaking scientific discoveries and technologies that may turn out to be essential for humanity's long-term survival in space (Seedhouse, 2009, p. 8). From a utilitarian perspective, we must find ways of quantifying the significant costs and the long-term benefits. If we can ensure that the benefits significantly outweigh the costs, then utilitarianism would suggest that this is a justifiable endeavor. The ethical challenge lies in quantifying these benefits and ensuring they are attainable without causing undue harm.

Case Study 2: Asteroid Mining

Asteroid mining is another area of space exploration with significant implications according to *utilitarian* ethics. Asteroid mining involves extracting resources like water, minerals, and metals from near-Earth asteroids. Companies such as Planetary Resources and Bradford Space (formerly Deep Space Industries) propose that asteroid mining could supply essential materials to sustain space exploration and potentially bring valuable resources back to Earth (Skauge, 2020; Yarlagadda, 2022). The *utilitarian* benefits include the immense economic value of metals like platinum and gold, and reducing environmental strains on Earth by shifting resource extraction into space. Peter Diamandis, founder of Planetary Resources, has noted that a small asteroid about 100 feet in length could contain between $25 and $50 billion worth of platinum (Klotz, 2012). Additionally, the technology developed for asteroid mining could advance our capabilities in space travel and enable permanent space habitation. However, according to *utilitarianism*, the financial costs, technological challenges, and risks to human life involved in such missions must be carefully weighed against these anticipated benefits.

Critical Analysis: Strengths and Limitations

Utilitarianism provides a straightforward way to evaluate space exploration initiatives: actions are justified if they lead to a net positive effect, (defined by the principle of utility, often interpreted as the “greatest happiness” principle). This clear-cut approach appeals to policymakers and stakeholders because it focuses on tangible outcomes. However, this method has its limitations: Predicting the consequences of complex, long-term space missions is very difficult, as outcomes are uncertain. The risks and rewards, which may unfold over decades, are

challenging to quantify accurately. Moreover, *utilitarianism* might not fully address the rights and well-being of individuals involved—like astronauts facing extreme danger or people on Earth who could be exposed to alien diseases or toxins brought back from space missions. Additionally, *utilitarian* ethics could unintentionally justify harmful actions if the benefits are deemed to outweigh the costs. For instance, aggressive mining on celestial bodies might be considered acceptable due to substantial material gains, even if it violates planetary protection protocols or causes long-term ecological harm.

While utilitarianism offers a strong framework for assessing the ethics of space exploration, it needs to be applied with care and a well-rounded understanding of the possible outcomes. It also needs to be determined who will be making the decisions. For example, due to communication limits imposed by Einstein's Theory of Special Relativity (Einstein, 1905), the mission's commander might be the only one making real-time decisions. This scenario could hinder ethical oversight of their choices unless an AI-based system is implemented to guide the decision-making process.

Deontological Ethics in Space Exploration

Deontological ethics, rooted in Immanuel Kant and others' philosophy, holds that an action's morality is determined by whether it follows a set of rules or duties, rather than by its consequences (Kant 1785; 1788; 1991; Wick, 1995). This ethical approach holds that certain principles—such as the duty to act properly, and the inherent value of human dignity—are fundamental and must be maintained, regardless of the outcome. In the context of space exploration, deontological ethics stresses the importance of adhering to these ethical standards and obligations, ensuring that all actions taken in space are inherently moral and just.

Application to Space Exploration

Deontological ethics asserts that space exploration must follow universal moral principles, such as respecting the autonomy and inherent worth of every individual involved and ensuring that no being—human or otherwise—is used merely as a tool to achieve objectives. This approach scrutinizes the morality of potentially harmful activities by focusing on their intrinsic rightness, regardless of any beneficial outcomes they might generate.

Case Study 1: The Preservation of Planetary Environments

In the current discussion surrounding planetary protection's focus on preventing biological contamination during space missions, *deontological* ethics are being enacted. As a result of this way of reasoning, NASA and other international space agencies have implemented strict planetary protection protocols both to ensure that Earth-based life does not contaminate other celestial bodies and to avoid bringing any potentially harmful extraterrestrial organisms back to Earth (Rummel & Pugel, 2019).

From a *deontological* standpoint, the duty to prevent contamination is crucial because it honors the perceived inherent value of celestial bodies, ensuring that they are neither harmed nor exploited. Historically, NASA missions have worked to avoid contaminating planets that might

support life. For instance, during the final phase of the Cassini mission, scientists intentionally directed the spacecraft to crash into Saturn instead of one of its moons, as moons like Enceladus and Titan are believed to have the potential to harbor life. Therefore, crashing Cassini into Saturn helped to protect these potentially life-supporting environments from possible contamination (Bolles, 2023).

Case Study 2: The Use of Autonomous Robots in Exploration

Deontological ethics is also crucial in the deployment of autonomous robots for space exploration, such as rovers on Mars or drones on Titan (Coeckelbergh, 2014; Owe et al., 2022). The ethical issues here center on these robots' autonomy and safety, particularly as relate to their programming and the tasks that they are designed to perform. From a deontological perspective, these robots deserve respect, considering their roles and the resources invested in their development. While *utilitarian* ethics might emphasize the scientific and economic benefits of missions that use these robots, even if they are risky or destructive, *deontological* ethics focuses on the inherent need to respect the robots' operational limits and intended purposes. This means not overloading their systems or pushing them beyond their functional capacities just to collect more data, as doing so would disregard the craftsmanship and the purpose their creators designed them for.

Critical Analysis: Strengths and Limitations

A *deontological* ethical perspective does not waver in its assessment of a situation, even when ignoring them could lead to significant scientific advancements. For example, directly exploring the subsurface waters of Europa—a moon of Jupiter that is believed to potentially harbor life—without taking proper precautions could result in contamination. Under *deontological* ethics, this action would be inherently wrong, regardless of any scientific knowledge that might be gained.

In the context of space exploration, *deontological* ethics' focus on moral absolutes and the inherent rightness of actions is beneficial, as this provides clear and consistent ethical guidelines regardless of changing circumstances or outcomes. This is especially important in space, where actions' consequences can be highly uncertain or take a long time to manifest. However, the limitations of this approach become evident in complex situations where strictly following rules might lead to questionable outcomes. For example, always adhering to non-interference policies could prevent beneficial actions like terraforming Mars to make it livable for humans. While *deontological* ethics offers a strong foundation for ensuring that space is explored with strong moral integrity, such a perspective needs to be balanced with practical considerations in light of actions' broader consequences. This balance is essential for ethical decision-making in space exploration, where both the inherent rightness of actions and their potential outcomes play critical roles.

Virtue Ethics: Character and Space Exploration

Virtue Ethics focuses on the importance of character and virtues in moral philosophy, rather than on rules (deontology) or outcomes (utilitarianism) (Aristotle; Darwall, 2003;

Devetter, 2002; Gardiner, 2005; Hursthouse & Pettigrove, 2018; Russell, 2013; Swanton, 2003; Taylor, 2002). It suggests that ethical behavior arises from developing good character traits—or virtues—which lead to moral actions. In the context of space exploration, this approach highlights the virtues of the people and organizations involved, such as integrity, courage, and responsibility.

Application for Space Exploration

Virtue ethics encourages us to look closely at the motivations and character traits of everyone involved in space exploration, including astronauts, scientists, and corporate and governmental organizations. This approach evaluates how having—or lacking—certain virtues can affect the decisions made during space missions. Virtue ethics is especially important in the high-stakes and high-risk world of space exploration, where the moral character of individuals making decisions can greatly influence both how missions are carried out and their ultimate success. This focus on character is crucial for future deep space missions, too, where communication delays can span hours, depending on the distance from Earth. For example, Table 1 illustrates the distances in Astronomical Units (the distance from the Sun to the Earth) and the corresponding time it takes for a round-trip message to travel.

Table 1

Communication Round-Trip Times in Deep Space

Location	Distance from Earth in AUs	Round-Trip Time
Mars	1.5	25 minutes
Ceres	2.77	46 minutes
Jupiter	5.2	1 hour, 27 minutes
Saturn	9.58	2 hours, 40 minutes
Uranus	19.22	4 hours, 20 minutes
Neptune	30.06	8 hours, 5 minutes
Pluto	39.48	11 hours
Makemake	45.81	12 hours, 40 minutes
Alpha Centauri	268,770	8.9 years

Note: AUs = Astronomical unit (1 AU is about 150 million km)

Case Study 1: Astronauts and Decision-Making Under Pressure

One relevant case study highlights astronaut behavior and decision-making under the extreme conditions of space travel. For example, consider the actions of astronauts aboard the International Space Station (ISS) during emergencies, such as the Nuka module mishap in July 2021. After successfully launching and docking the new science module, Nauka, to the ISS, the module accidentally fired its thrusters. This misfire caused the ISS to spin approximately 540 degrees and come to a stop upside down (Bartles, 2021; De La Cruz, 2021; Gorman & Ivanova, 2021). This situation required the crew to initiate emergency procedures and regain control of the spacecraft's orientation. In such moments, astronauts and cosmonauts needed prudence to accurately assess the problem, courage to take necessary risks to resolve it, and temperance to manage their fears and anxieties to maintain operational effectiveness (Dole, 1967). From a

virtue ethics perspective, these qualities are not just beneficial, they are essential for the mission's success and the crew's safety.

Case Study 2: Ethical Leadership in Space Agencies

Another example of *virtue* ethics in action is seen in how the leadership of space agencies and their approach to mission planning and risk management has historically been evaluated. Consider NASA's decisions during the Space Shuttle era, particularly the Challenger and Columbia disasters. Analyses of these tragedies have highlighted failures in leadership and organizational culture, where virtues like honesty and responsibility were compromised due to political pressures and tight schedules. Despite engineers' warnings about the O-ring seals' performance in cold temperatures, NASA management decided to proceed with the launch due to increased government pressure (Bowman, 2024; Rogers et al., 1986). This breakdown in communication and proper risk management, combined with heightened media scrutiny and governmental demands, led to the unethical decision to launch despite the known risks.

Virtue ethics would critique these scenarios by highlighting the lack of ethical leadership and the abandonment of virtues for expediency or external approval. This ethical framework suggests that cultivating virtues such as honesty, justice, and humility within organizational cultures is essential for preventing such tragedies. Promoting ethical leadership would involve individual virtue and developing institutional practices that encourage transparency, accountability, and ethical deliberation in decision-making processes.

Critical Analysis: Strengths and Limitations

One of the primary strengths of virtue ethics in space exploration is its emphasis on individual moral development. This view promotes a holistic approach to ethics that integrates personal character and professional actions. This focus on character virtues makes individuals more likely to navigate ethical dilemmas in space exploration thoughtfully and morally.

However, virtue ethics' limitations lie in its relative subjectivity and difficulty in defining and measuring virtues across different cultural and organizational contexts. What one culture or organization deems a virtue, another might not. This tends to result in inconsistent ethical standards and practices across contexts. Moreover, the emphasis on individual character does not always address systemic or organizational issues that can lead to ethical failures, as seen in the case of the Space Shuttle disasters. Therefore, while virtue ethics offers profound insight into a character's role in conducting ethical space exploration, it should be applied alongside other ethical frameworks to address the personal and systemic dimensions of ethics in space activities. This balanced approach can help ensure that space exploration is pursued with technological and scientific excellence and moral integrity.

Environmental Ethics and Extraterrestrial Environments

Environmental ethics, a branch of philosophy that studies the moral relationship between humans and the environment (Chua, 2022; Di Paola, 2024; Hourdequin, 2021; Palmer et al., 2014; Valera et al., 2021). This perspective challenges anthropocentric views by emphasizing

that non-human elements of the environment are intrinsically valuable and deserve our consideration. When applied to space exploration, *environmental* ethics urges us to consider the ethical implications of our actions in non-Earth environments (Daly & Frodeman, 2008; Randolph & McKay, 2014).

Application for Space Exploration

Environmental ethics in the context of space exploration advocates a cautious and respectful approach to interacting with extraterrestrial environments. This includes minimizing contamination, preserving the natural state of celestial bodies, and preventing the exploitation of space resources in ways that could cause irreversible harm—views that deontological ethics share. By extending the principles of environmental stewardship beyond Earth, *environmental* ethics urges us to act as responsible caretakers of space by ensuring that our exploratory pursuits do not come at the expense of extraterrestrial integrity.

Case Study 1: Protecting Martian Ecosystems

With its potential to harbor microbial life, Mars presents a significant ethical dilemma in space exploration. The discovery of liquid water on Mars intensifies concerns about the contamination of Martian environments by Earth-originating life forms (Mason, 2021). The principles of *environmental* ethics compel us to consider the intrinsic value of Martian ecosystems. As such, these *environmental* ethics advocate strict planetary protection measures to prevent biological contamination.

The Committee on Space Research (COSPAR, 2024) and NASA's Planetary Protection group (Keith, 2024) have established guidelines to minimize the risk of contaminating Mars and other celestial bodies with terrestrial microbes. These protocols include sterilizing spacecraft and limiting landings to areas with low probability of life. The ethical rationale is that introducing Earth life to Mars could irreversibly alter its environment, potentially destroy native life forms or disrupt the planet's natural state.

From an *environmental* ethics perspective, the duty to protect Mars comes from a moral obligation to respect and preserve planets' natural environments, as this perspective recognizes these environments' intrinsic values, irrespective of their utility for humans. This approach calls for us to act based on precautionary principles, according to which we give the benefit of doubt to the unknown potential for life and ecological balance on Mars. This guides us to prioritize preservation over exploration.

Case Study 2: Ethical Considerations in Asteroid Mining

As discussed above, asteroid mining, which is seen by some as a solution to Earth's resource limitations, poses significant ethical challenges according, also, to *environmental* ethics (Xu, 2020). The extraction of minerals and water from asteroids involves altering these celestial bodies in potentially harmful ways (New Space Economy, 2023). Environmental ethics questions the moral justification for exploiting these extraterrestrial resources while urging us to consider the broader ecological impacts.

According to *environmental* ethics, the potential for ecological disruption is a primary ethical concern in asteroid mining. Mining activities could cause debris and alter their orbits, posing risks to Earth and other planets (New Space Economy, 2023). NASA's Double Asteroid Redirection Test (DART) mission proved that a kinetic impact on an asteroid could vastly alter its course (Bardan, 2022). This highlights the importance of understanding celestial mechanics to prevent an asteroid from being changed to impact Earth. Mining activities could alter the trajectory of an asteroid, causing untold cascading effects. Moreover, the aggressive pursuit of asteroid mining could lead to a "space rush," where entities race to exploit resources with little regard for environmental consequences (Heins, 2021).

Companies like Planetary Resources and Bradford Space argue that asteroid mining could alleviate resource shortages on Earth and drive technological advancement (Skauge, 2020). However, environmental ethics advocates for a balanced approach, where the potential benefits are weighed against the moral obligation to preserve the natural state of space environments. This perspective suggests that asteroid mining should be conducted with caution and transparency, and that strict regulations are needed to minimize ecological disruption and ensure that the exploitation of space resources does not lead to unforeseen and potentially catastrophic consequences.

Critical Analysis: Strengths and Limitations

Environmental ethics provides a robust framework for evaluating space exploration's moral implications, emphasizing extraterrestrial environments' intrinsic value. This perspective promotes a cautious approach that prioritizes the preservation of astronomical objects and the prevention of ecological harm. By challenging anthropocentric views, environmental ethics expands our moral considerations to include non-Earth environments, fostering a sense of stewardship.

However, environmental ethics also has the potential to hinder the scientific progress and economic development of space exploration. For example, adhering too strictly to principles of preservation may restrict exploratory activities and resource utilization, which could delay technological advancements and solutions to Earth's pressing issues. Additionally, the intrinsic value of lifeless space is contentious, with some arguing that ethical considerations should focus on the potential benefits to humanity. Environmental ethics does provide essential guidance for ways to explore space responsibly, but these approaches must be balanced with practical considerations and the potential benefits of space activities. By integrating environmental ethics and other ethical frameworks into a more balanced approach, we can ensure that our endeavors in space respect the natural world.

Feminist Ethics and Space Exploration

Feminist ethics, which emphasize relationships, care, and empathy, challenge traditional ethical frameworks that often prioritize abstract principles over individuals' lived experiences (Brabeck, 2000; Brennan, 1999; Card, 1991; Superson, 2024; Tong, 1993). This perspective highlights the significance of inclusivity, equity, and social justice in ethical decision-making. In

the context of space exploration, feminist ethics calls for a thorough assessment of how space policies and practices affect various groups and marginalized communities (Szocik, 2021). It promotes an inclusive approach that is designed to ensure equitable participation and benefits for all involved (Kittay, 2001).

Application for Space Exploration

Within space exploration, feminist ethics centers on advancing gender equity, inclusivity, and social justice. This perspective involves addressing gender gaps in space programs, ensuring diverse representation in decision-making, and considering the wider social and ethical effects of space activities on different communities. By focusing on care and relational ethics, feminist ethics urges the creation of space policies that respond to the needs and experiences of individuals who have historically been excluded from space-related ventures.

Yet feminist ethics argues for more than mere representation. It emphasizes cultivating supportive, inclusive workplaces that tackle the distinct hurdles that women face in these environments—such as gender bias, challenges with work-life balance, and unequal access to resources or opportunities. Enacting comprehensive policies that uphold gender equity and inclusivity at every level of space programs is critical to ensuring fair distribution of space exploration's benefits.

Case Study 1: Gender Equity in Space Programs

A key challenge in space exploration is the underrepresentation of women and members of other marginalized groups (National Academies of Sciences, 2022). Historically, 12 white men have set foot on the Moon, reflecting the longstanding dominance of men in space exploration. In this field, women have often faced systemic barriers to entry and advancement (National Academies of Sciences, 2022; West, 2023). In response, feminist ethics advocates for proactive efforts to achieve gender equity across every aspect of space exploration, from recruiting and training to mission assignments and leadership positions (West, 2023).

In fact, in response to the gender and racial imbalance of the Apollo missions, NASA's Artemis program aims to land the first woman (and the first person of color) on the Moon by 2026 (Creech et al., 2022; NASA, 2023). By prioritizing gender diversity, the Artemis program strives to foster a more inclusive and equitable environment in space exploration (NASA, 2023) and it aims to inspire future generations of women to pursue careers in STEM fields. Space exploration endeavors—particularly those involving resource extraction and satellite deployment—can significantly affect marginalized communities, both socially and environmentally (Dick & Launius, 2007). Feminist ethics encourages us to evaluate these effects and guarantee that space activities do not heighten existing inequalities or produce new injustices (Szocik, 2024).

Case Study 2: The Impact of Space Activities on Marginalized Communities

Major satellite constellations launched by companies like SpaceX and Amazon to provide worldwide internet coverage have sparked worries about space debris and its impact on

vulnerable communities (DiBenedetto, 2022). These satellites can overcrowd low Earth orbit, increasing the collision risk, potentially triggering the Kessler Syndrome and creating debris that endangers future space operations (Undseth et al., 2020). Additionally, the resulting light pollution can hinder astronomical research and disrupt cultural practices of Indigenous communities who depend on dark skies for traditional knowledge (Safronova, 2023).

From a feminist ethics standpoint, an inclusive decision-making process—one that actively involves the voices and concerns of marginalized groups—is vital. This requires comprehensive impact assessments and direct engagement with the communities affected to fully understand their perspectives and reduce any negative outcomes. Moreover, it is crucial to ensure that satellite technology benefits everyone.

Critical Analysis: Strengths and Limitations

Feminist ethics offers a valuable framework for addressing inclusivity, equity, and social justice in space exploration. By prioritizing care, empathy, and relational ethics, it supports a more holistic, responsive stance on ethical decision-making. This approach promotes policies and practices that uplift and include diverse groups, and this helps policymakers, organizations, and leader to build a fairer space exploration arena.

However, feminist ethics may be criticized for focusing too heavily on gender and social issues at the expense of other important ethical considerations. There is also [often unjustified] concern that emphasizing diversity could overshadow merit-based selection, potentially creating a crew less prepared for emergencies. Striking the right balance among different ethical priorities can be complex, but interweaving feminist ethics with other ethical frameworks can yield a more comprehensive and precise approach to ethical issues in space. By stressing gender equity and accounting for the broader social effects of space endeavors, feminist ethics not only enriches efforts to make humanity's expansion into space more inclusive and ethically sound, but it could improve performance given that research often shows that diversity improves team performance.

Comparative Analysis of Ethical Philosophies in Space Exploration

Space exploration encompasses numerous ethical challenges, and these can be interpreted according to diverse philosophical lenses. Utilitarianism, Deontological Ethics, Virtue Ethics, Environmental Ethics, and Feminist Ethics each offer distinct insights. Therefore, comparing them sharpens our understanding of the ethical factors surrounding humanity's push beyond Earth. Although these five philosophies diverge in their priorities—ranging from maximizing benefits, upholding moral duties, and nurturing moral character to valuing non-human environments and championing social justice, they all underscore the importance of ethics in space exploration. They also address space exploration's long-term implications, although they differ in which issues they emphasize and how they approach them. Utilitarianism and Deontological Ethics clearly contrast evaluating outcomes with following moral principles. Utilitarianism supports making decisions based on their results, whereas Deontological Ethics insists on adhering to ethical duties, regardless of their consequences. Virtue Ethics focuses on cultivating moral character and virtues in individuals and organizations, whereas Environmental Ethics highlights the innate worth of non-human realms and calls for humans to act carefully as

their stewards. Feminist Ethics focus on inclusivity, equity, and social justice, especially on gender equity and the interests of marginalized communities. While Utilitarianism offers a practical framework centered on maximizing collective benefits, Deontological Ethics stresses our unwavering moral duties. Virtue Ethics underscores the importance of moral character in decision-making, while Environmental Ethics broadens our perspective to respect and safeguard extraterrestrial environments. Feminist Ethics ensures that inclusivity, equity, and social justice remain front-and-center, so that space exploration's benefits and impacts are shared. Integrating these five distinct viewpoints can lead to a thorough and adaptable ethical guide for humanity's ventures into space, combining each philosophy's strengths for a more conscientious approach.

Potential Limitations of Ethical Philosophies and Integrative Approach

Since each philosophical approach has inherent limitations, integrating these frameworks enables us to fill the gaps and develop a more comprehensive and robust ethical approach to guide humanity's ventures into space. While Utilitarianism provides a pragmatic focus on outcomes and maximizing overall well-being, accurately predicting and quantifying long-term consequences can be challenging (Mulgan, 2017). This approach may also overlook individual rights and welfare, potentially justifying harmful or exploitative actions if they are seen to yield significant benefits. By emphasizing aggregate happiness, Utilitarianism can lead to ethical oversights, particularly when the interests of minorities or marginalized groups are sacrificed for the perceived greater good. Deontological Ethics stresses moral duties and adherence to ethical principles regardless of outcomes. However, this strict observance of rules can result in undesirable consequences in complex situations where ethical duties conflict (Cheville & Heywood, 2020; Rice et al., 2024). The rigidity of this framework can make it difficult to address nuanced scenarios that demand a balance between duties and outcomes. Moreover, Deontological Ethics may not sufficiently consider the broader impacts of actions on future generations or non-human entities. Virtue Ethics emphasizes the moral character and virtues of individuals and organizations, promoting ethical behavior through personal development. Although this perspective encourages thoughtful engagement with ethical dilemmas, it can be subjective when defining and measuring virtues across different contexts (Molina, 2022). By focusing on individual character, Virtue Ethics may overlook systemic or organizational challenges, and it often lacks explicit guidelines for decision-making in specific situations, relying instead on the discernment of virtuous individuals. Environmental Ethics prioritizes the intrinsic value of non-human environments, advocating for their preservation and respectful treatment. While this view confronts anthropocentrism and encourages environmental safekeeping, it may also impede scientific advancements and economic progress (Rose, 2002). Emphasizing preservation can lead to restrictive policies that limit exploration and resource utilization. Additionally, the idea that lifeless celestial bodies possess inherent worth remains contentious and is not universally accepted. Feminist Ethics has its focus centered on inclusivity, equity, and social justice, emphasizing the experiences and needs of marginalized communities. Although this framework provides a comprehensive and responsive approach to ethical decision-making, it can be perceived as overly focused on gender and social issues (Pullen & Vachhani, 2021). Balancing diverse ethical priorities is challenging, and Feminist Ethics may not fully address other critical considerations, such as environmental sustainability or technological innovation.

Integrative Approach: Filling in the Gaps

By assesing and integrating all five ethical philosophies, we can address their individual limitations and develop a more comprehensive and nuanced ethical framework for space exploration.

Balancing Consequences and Principles: Merging Utilitarianism and Deontological Ethics reconciles a results-based outlook with a principled stance, ensuring respect for human rights while also aiming for the greatest good. This approach would guarantee the justification of harmful actions solely based on their outcomes.

Incorporating Character and Systemic Considerations: Blending Virtue Ethics with these other frameworks covers both personal moral development and broader systemic factors. Virtue Ethics encourages ethical conduct through character formation, while Utilitarianism, Deontological Ethics, Environmental Ethics, and Feminist Ethics provide structural and rule-based guidance.

Environmental and Human-Centered Concerns: Integrating Environmental Ethics ensures that the inherent value of extraterrestrial environments is factored in, alongside concerns for human well-being found in the other frameworks. This promotes a balanced perspective that preserves non-human realms while meeting human needs.

Inclusivity and Equity: Including Feminist Ethics underscores the importance of sharing space exploration's rewards and challenges equitably. By merging feminist ideals with other ethical approaches, decision-makers can better address the interests of marginalized groups and uphold social justice.

Addressing Complex Ethical Dilemmas: Employing all five philosophies together offers a well-rounded approach to dissecting and resolving ethical dilemmas in space exploration. As each philosophy supplies a unique lens, combining them can offer more comprehensive and well-considered answers that encompass the multifaceted, interconnected nature of space activities. While each of these frameworks has shortcomings on their own, merging them allows us to mitigate their respective weaknesses and establish a more reliable, wide-ranging ethical strategy for space exploration. Balancing outcomes with principles, uniting character development with systemic norms, harmonizing environmental care with human welfare, encouraging inclusivity, and tackling inherent moral challenges collectively can lead to a responsible way forward in our cosmic pursuits.

Conclusion

Exploring and potentially establishing a human presence in space presents unparalleled opportunities, combined with novel challenges. Examining various ethical philosophies provides valuable insights into this complex moral landscape. To this end, Utilitarianism centers on maximizing benefits and minimizing harm, while Deontological Ethics underscores the importance of adhering to moral duties and principles, ensuring that our actions in space remain inherently right and just. Virtue Ethics highlights the character and virtues of individuals and

organizations, encouraging moral development and ethical behavior. Meanwhile, Environmental Ethics questions our human-centered perspective, urging us to recognize the intrinsic value of non-human environments and to safeguard them. Finally, Feminist Ethics emphasizes inclusivity, equity, and social justice, drawing attention to gender disparities, ensuring diverse representation in decision-making, and considering the broader social and ethical impacts on marginalized communities. Each of these ethical philosophies has distinct strengths and addresses specific aspects of the moral dilemmas posed by space exploration. However, their limitations highlight the need for an integrative approach. By combining these varied perspectives, we can forge a more comprehensive and nuanced ethical framework that can address the multifaceted nature of space exploration. We contend that embracing this more holistic approach will allow us all to pursue space endeavors successfully, while remaining true to high moral values.

References

Aristotle. *Politics*.

Bardan, R. (2022, October 11). *NASA confirms DART mission impact changed asteroid's motion in space.* NASA. https://www.nasa.gov/news-release/nasa-confirms-dart-mission-impact-changed-asteroids-motion-in-space/

Bartles M. (2021, August 3). *Russia's Nauka module briefly tilts space station with unplanned thruster fire*. Space.com. https://www.space.com/nauka-module-thruster-fire-tilts-space-station

Bentham, J. [1789] 2009. *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (*Dover Philosophical Classics*). Dover Publications Inc. ISBN 978-0-486-45452-8.

Bentham, J, Dumont, E. [1807] 2005. *Theory of Legislation: Translated from the French of Etienne Dumont*, translated by R. Hildreth. Adamant Media Corporation. ISBN 978-1-4021-7034-8.

Bernthal, E., Draper, H., Henning, J., & Kelly, J. (2016). 'A band of brothers'—An exploration of the range of medical ethical issues faced by British senior military clinicians on deployment to Afghanistan: A qualitative study. Journal of the Royal Army Medical Corps, 163(3), 199-205. https://doi.org/10.1136/jramc-2016-000701

Bolles, D. (2023). *Cassini Grand Finale*. NASA. https://science.nasa.gov/mission/cassini/grand-finale/overview/

Bolles, D. (2024). Asteroids. NASA. https://science.nasa.gov/solar-system/asteroids/facts/

Bowman, A. (2024, June 18). *The Challenger STS-51L Accident*. NASA. https://www.nasa.gov/challenger-sts-51l-accident/

Brabeck, M. M. (2000). *Practicing feminist ethics in psychology*. American Psychological Associaton. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/10343-000

Brennan, S. (1999). Recent work in feminist ethics. *Ethics*, *109*(4), 858-893. https://doi.org/10.1086/233951

Card, C. (1991). *Feminist Ethics*. University Press of Kansas.

Cheville, R. A., & Heywood, J. (2020). Complexity, right action, and the engineering curriculum. *American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference and Exhibition*. https://doi.org/10.18260/1-2--34317

Chua, Y. J. (2022). Harmonising with heaven and Earth: Reciprocal harmony and Xunzi's environmental ethics. *Environmental Values*, *31*(5), 555-574. https://doi.org/10.3197/096327122X16386102423985

Coeckelbergh, M. (2014). The moral standing of machines: Towards a relational and non-cartesian moral hermeneutics. *Philosophy & Technology*, *27*(1), 61-77. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-013-0133-8

Cole, E. B., & Coultrap-McQuin, S. M. (1992). *Explorations in feminist ethics: Theory and practice*. Indiana University Press.

COSPAR. (2024). *Committee on Space Research*. https://cosparhq.cnes.fr/

Coustenis, A., Hedman, N., Doran, P., Shehhi, O., Ammannito, E., Fujimoto, M., … & Зайцев, M. (2023). Planetary protection: An international concern and responsibility. *Frontiers in Astronomy and Space Sciences, 10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fspas.2023.1172546

Creech, S. Guidi, J., & Elburn, D. (2022, March 5-12). *Artemis: An overview of NASA's activities to return humans to the Moon* [Paper presentation]. 2022 IEEE Aerospace Conference, Big Sky, Montana, United States. https://doi.org/10.1109/AERO53065.2022.9843277

Daly, E. M., & Frodeman, R. (2008). Separated at birth, signs of rapprochement: Environmental ethics and space exploration. *Ethics and the Environment*, *13*(1), 135-151. https://doi.org/10.2979/ETE.2008.13.1.135

Darwall, S. (2003). *Virtue ethics*. Oxford: B. Blackwell.

De La Cruz, L. (2021, August 4). *The Nauka module mishap that sent ISS tumbling*. EarthSky. https://earthsky.org/space/nauka-module-mishap-that-sent-iss-tumbling-more-severe-than-reported/

Devettere, R. J. (2002). *Introduction to virtue ethics*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

DiBenedetto, C. (2022, August 14). *Space junk is unregulated, harmful, and putting people at risk*. Mashable. https://mashable.com/article/space-junk-unregulated-global-south

Dick, S. J., & Launius, R. D. (Eds.) (2007). *Societal impact of spaceflight*. NASA. https://www.nasa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/sp-4801.pdf

Di Paola, M. (2024). Virtue, environmental ethics, non-human values, and anthropocentrism. *Philosophies*, *9*(1), Article 15. https://doi.org/10.3390/philosophies9010015

Dole, S. H. (1967, October 23-27). *Contingency planning for space-flight emergencies* [Paper presentation]. AIAA 4th Annual Meeting and Technical Display, Anaheim, California, United State. https://doi.org/10.2514/6.1967-825

Gardiner, S. M. (2005). *Virtue ethics, old and new*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Einstein, A. (1905). On the electrodynamics of moving bodies. *Annalen der physik*, *17*(10), 891-921.

Gorman, S. & Ivanova, P. (2021, July 30). *International Space Station thrown out of control by misfire of Russian module -NASA*. Reuters. https://www.reuters.com/lifestyle/science/russias-nauka-space-module-experiences-problem-after-docking-with-iss-ria-2021-07-29/

Giulio, G., Groves, C., Monteiro, M., & Taddei, R. (2016). Communicating through vulnerability: knowledge politics, inclusion and responsiveness in responsible research and innovation. Journal of Responsible Innovation, 3(2), 92-109. https://doi.org/10.1080/23299460.2016.1166036

Heins, R. (2021). Shoot for the Moon, if you miss you'll land among valuable asteroids: An analysis of the legal ramifications of asteroid mining. *Jurimetrics*, *61*(2), 219-243. https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/shoot-moon-if-you-miss-youll-land-among-valuable/docview/2532201121/se-2

Hourdequin, M. (2021). Environmental ethics: The state of the question. *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, *59*(3), 270-308. https://doi.org/10.1111/sjp.12436

Hursthouse, R. & Pettigrove, G. (2018). "*Virtue Ethics*". In Zalta, Edward N. (ed.). Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2018 ed.). Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. Retrieved 2021-02-19.

International Space Exploration Coordination Group. (2013). *Benefits stemming from space exploration*. https://www.nasa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/benefits-stemming-from-space-exploration-2013-tagged.pdf?emrc=ca90d1

Jaehnichen, T. (2020). The dynamics of economic action and the problems of its social embedding – Ethical challenges in view of the nascent. *Hervormde Teologiese Studies*, *76*(1), Article 5996. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v76i1.5996

Kant, I. (1785). *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*.

Kant, I. (1788). *Critique of Practical Reason*.

Kant, I. (1991). *The Moral Law: Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals*. Translated by Paton, Herbert James. Psychology Press. ISBN 978-0-415-07843-6.

Keith, S. (2024, May 16). *Planetary protection*. NASA. https://sma.nasa.gov/sma-disciplines/planetary-protection

Kittay, E. F. (2001). A feminist public ethic of care meets the new communitarian family policy. *Ethics*, *111*(13), 523-547. https://doi.org/10.1086/233525

Klotz, I. (2012, April 30). *Tech billionaires bankroll gold rush to mine asteroids*. Reuters. https://www.reuters.com/article/2012/04/24/us-space-asteroid-mining-idUSBRE83N06U20120424/

Levchenko, I., Xu, S., Mazouffre, S., Keidar, M., & Bazaka, K. (2019). Mars colonization: Beyond getting there. *Global Challenges*, *3*(1), Article 1800062. https://doi.org/10.1002/gch2.201800062

Madhavan Nair, G., Sridhara Murthi, K. R., & Prasad, M. Y. S. (2008). Strategic, technological and ethical aspects of establishing colonies on Moon and Mars. *Acta Astronautica*, *63*(11), 1337-1342. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actaastro.2008.05.012

Martínez-Frías, J., González, J. L., & Pérez, F. R. (2011). Geoethics and deontology: From fundamentals to applications in planetary protection. *Episodes*, *34*(4), 257-262. https://doi.org/10.18814/epiiugs/2011/v34i4/004

Mason, C. (2021, May 10). *Could humans have contaminated Mars with life?* BBC. https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20210510-could-the-perseverance-rover-have-carried-life-to-mars

Molina, A. D. (2022). Value Congruence. *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governa*ncve. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-66252-3

Mulgan, T. (2017). How should utilitarians think about the future? *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, *47*(2-3), 290-312. https://doi.org/10.1080/00455091.2017.1279517

Munevar, G. (2014). Space exploration and human survival. *Space Policy*, *30*(4), 197-201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spacepol.2014.10.002

NASA. (2023). NASA's efforts to increase diversity in its workforce. https://oig.nasa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/IG-23-011.pdf

National Academies of Sciences. (2022). *Advancing diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility in leadership of competed space missions*. The National Academies Press. https://nap.nationalacademies.org/read/26385

New Space Economy (2023, October 26). *Environmental impacts of space mining vs. terrestrial mining.*https://newspaceeconomy.ca/2023/10/26/environmental-impacts-of-space-mining-vs-terrestrial-mining/

Owe, A., Baum, S. D., & Coeckelbergh, M. (2022). Non-human value: A survey of the intrinsic valuation of natural and artificial non-human entities. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, *28*(5), Article 38. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-022-00388-z

Palmer, C., McShane, K., & Sandler, R. (2014). Environmental ethics. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, *36*(1), 419-442. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-121112-094434

Pullen, A., & Vachhani, S. J. (2021). Feminist ethics and women leaders: From difference to intercorporeality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *173*(2), 233-243. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04526-0

Randolph, R. O., & McKay, C. P. (2014). Protecting and expanding the richness and diversity of life, an ethic for astrobiology research and space exploration. *International Journal of Astrobiology*, *13*(1), 28-34. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1473550413000311

Reiman, S. (2009). Is space an environment? *Space Policy*, *25*(2), 81-87). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spacepol.2009.03.005

Rice, S., Rosales, D., O'Brien, J., Cross, D., & Winter, S. (2024). Examining moral conduct in aviators through the lens of Immanuel Kant's perfect and imperfect duties. *Collegiate Aviation Review International*, *42*(1), Position paper 2. https://ojs.library.okstate.edu/osu/index.php/CARI/article/view/9768/8616

Riley, D. (2013). Hidden in plain view: Feminists doing engineering ethics, engineers doing feminist ethics. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, *19*(1), 189-206. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-011-9320-0

Rogers, W. P., Armstrong, N. A., Acheson, D. C., Covert, E. E., Feynman, R. P., Hotz, R. B., Kutyna, D. J., Ride, S. K., Rummel, R. W., & Sutter, J. F. (1986). *Report of the Presidential Commission on the Space Shuttle Challenger Accident, Volume 1* (No. AD-A171402). ntrs.nasa.gov. https://ntrs.nasa.gov/citations/19860015255

Rose, C. M. (2002). Scientific innovation and environmental protection: Some ethical considerations. *Environmental Law*, *32*(4), 755-772. https://openyls.law.yale.edu/bitstream/handle/20.500.13051/1019

Rummel, J. D., & Pugel, D. E. (2019). Planetary protection technologies for planetary science instruments, spacecraft, and missions: Report of the NASA Planetary Protection Technology Definition Team (PPTDT). *Life Sciences in Space Research*, *23*, 60-68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lssr.2019.06.003

Russell, D. C. (2013). *The Cambridge Companion to Virtue Ethics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rutter, L., Barker, R., Bezdan, D., Cope, H., Costes, S., Degoricija, L., … & Muratani, M. (2020). A new era for space life science: International standards for space omics processing. Patterns, 1(9), 100148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2020.100148

Safronova, V. (2023, October 3). *Good heavens: How light pollution is threatening our sky*. The Parliament. https://www.theparliamentmagazine.eu/news/article/good-heavens

Santomartino, R., Averesch, N. J. H., Bhuiyan, M., Cockell, C. S., Colangelo, J., Gumulya, Y., Lehner, B., Lopez-Ayala, I., McMahon, S., Mohanty, A., Santa Maria, S. R., Urbaniak, C., Volger, R., Yang, J., & Zea, L. (2023). Toward sustainable space exploration: A roadmap for harnessing the power of microorganisms. *Nature Communications*, *14*(1), Article 1391. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-37070-2

Skauge, T. (2020). Space mining exploration: Facing a pivotal moment. *The Journal of Corporation Law*, *45*(3), 815-832. https://www.proquest.com/docview/2460799112

Superson, A. M. (2024). *Feminist Ethics* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://www.cambridge.org/core/elements/feminist-ethics/1BFC386C90226013AF1463938B9AA14A

Swanton, C. (2003). *Virtue ethics: A pluralistic view*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Szocik, K. (2021). Space bioethics: Why we need it and why it should be a feminist space bioethics. *Bioethics*, *35*(2), 187-191. https://doi.org/10.1111/bioe.12803

Szocik, K. (2024). *Feminist bioethics in space: Gender inequality in space exploration*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/9780197691076.001.0001

Taylor, R. (2002). *An introduction to virtue ethics*. Amherst: Prometheus Books.

Tong, R. (1993). *Feminine and Feminist Ethics*. Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Undseth, M., Jolly, C., & Olivari, M. (2020). Space sustainability: The economics of space debris in perspective. *IDEAS Working Paper Series from RePEc*. https://ideas.repec.org/p/oec/stiaac/87-en.html

Valera, L., Vidal, G., & Leal, Y. (2021). Beyond application: The case of environmental ethics. *Tópicos*, *60*, 437-460. https://doi.org/10.21555/top.v0i60.1122

West, J. L. (2023). Lost in space: feminist considerations of space security. *Zeitschrift Für Friedens- Und Konfliktforschung*, *12*(2), 307-323. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42597-023-00107-w

Wick, W. (1995). "*Introduction: Kant's Moral Philosophy*". Kant: Ethical Philosophy (2nd ed.). Indianapolis, Indiana: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc. pp. xii. ISBN 9780872203204.

Xu, F. (2020). Environmental protection in the exploration and use of space resources. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, *565*(1), Article 012003. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/565/1/012003

Yarlagadda, S. (Ed.) (2022, April 8). *Economics of the stars: The future of asteroid mining and the global economy*. Harvard International Review. https://hir.harvard.edu/economics-of-the-stars/