# **Journal of Special Topics**

## A4 1 Meteor nuking

Conlon, T.M.; Barker, J.F.; Coxon, J.C.

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Leicester, Leicester, LE1 7RH.

February 1st, 2011

#### Abstract

This article looks at the possibility of destroying a meteorite that would otherwise cause mass extinction on Earth by using nuclear missiles. The conclusion arrived at is that the amount of energy required to achieve this is far out of the range of any weapons available to humanity and so the approach is gravely flawed and could not realistically be used.

#### Introduction

different In many works of science content [2], so for the purposes of what fiction, a meteor is heading for Earth follows we shall consider a core made and humanity is eventually saved by up of silicon dioxide (sand, SiO<sub>2</sub>). deploying at least one nuclear weapon in order to destroy the object. This is here, let us assume that to destroy the normally achieved by either placing a nuclear warhead inside the meteor somehow and detonating it or firing a salvo of missiles in the hope of this? destroying it. This article will consider the possibility of destroying the meteor **How much energy?** using explosives.

#### Assumptions about the meteor

Celestial objects come in many different sizes, shapes compositions, but the assumption here that the meteor will have a is composition comparable to asteroids in the belt between Mars and Jupiter and it shall be large enough to cause mass extinction on Earth.

The Chicxulub crater is a 100 km wide crater [1] in Mexico that is thought by many to be the impact site of the meteor that is responsible for the K - T extinction (the event which led to the extinction of the dinosaurs among others). It has been estimated that the object which impacted at this site had a diameter of 15 km [1], so we shall assume this size for the meteor.

Looking at objects in the asteroid belt between Mars and Jupiter, the

most common compositions involve Celestial objects come in many either a high carbon, silicon or iron

For the purposes of the discussion asteroid, we wish to completely atomise it. The question to then ask is how much energy is required to do

We shall assume that our meteor is spherical and as such we need the formula given in (1) for the volume of a sphere, where V is the volume and r the and radius of the sphere.

$$V = \frac{4}{3}\pi r^{3} .$$
 (1)

This means that the volume of the meteor is about 1.77x10<sup>12</sup> m<sup>3</sup>. The density of silicon dioxide is about 2.65 gcm<sup>-3</sup> [3] and it is thus possible to calculate the mass of the meteor, which turns out to be approximately  $4.69 \times 10^{15}$  kg. SiO<sub>2</sub> has a molar mass of 60 gmol<sup>-1</sup> and so the meteor represents 7.82x10<sup>16</sup> moles.

In order to calculate the total amount of energy required to destroy the meteor, we need to know the bond enthalpy (amount of energy required to break the bonds). For  $SiO_2$  it is 622 kImol<sup>-1</sup> [3]. Multiplying this number by

the 2 (there are two such bonds for References each molecule of SiO<sub>2</sub>) and then by the [1] Colline, G. S. et al, Hydrocode number of moles should generate the *simulations of Chicxulub crater collapse* final amount of energy required. This and peak-ring formation, Elsevier number turns out to be approximately Science USA 9.73x10<sup>22</sup> I.

### Discussion

amount of energy required to destroy a systems, ch2, Wiley-VCH (2003) meteor is perhaps better put into [4] context. The explosive yield of a structures by pyroclastic flows and nuclear bomb is often quoted in tons surges, inferred from nuclear weapons (or kilotons, megatons etc.) of TNT, effects, Journal of Volcanology and with a ton of TNT releasing 4.2x10<sup>9</sup> J of Geothermal Research 87 (1998), 117 energy [4]. Thus, it is possible to 140, Elsevier calculate that the required explosive yield would have to be  $2.3 \times 10^7$ megatons. The largest warhead ever tested was 50 megatons. This is a factor of 463000 smaller.

It should be noted at this point that the above calculation is a simplification that leaves many issues untouched. You would not need to completely destroy the meteor in order for it to cease being a threat. All you would need to do is reduce the object to chunks that were too small to survive entry into the Earth's atmosphere. This would reduce the explosive power required. It also ignores how the weapon(s) used for the venture would be deployed, but if anything this only complicates the issue, making it even more difficult.

### Conclusion

With the energy required to destroy an incoming meteor of the scale necessary to cause mass extinctions being hundreds of thousands of times greater than the largest nuclear device ever detonated on Earth, it can be seen that it would be unlikely that such an approach would ever be successful. This completely ianores other approaches involving explosives (such as diverting the meteor, but such discussion is beyond the remit of this article.

[2] www.spaceacademy.net.au 30/01/11

[3] Jutzi, P. and Schubert, U., Silicon The number quoted above as the chemistry: from the atom to extended

Valentine, G.A., Damage to