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## AT: FW

### 1NC

We agree with their framework – you should maximize wellbeing. BUT you shouldn’t auto prefer extinction impacts, because they are low probability logically and a high magnitude buzzword---evaluate probability and magnitude together along with other considerations to produce best policies.

## OFF

### 1NC---1

My sole contention is geosynchronous orbital paths. Geosynchronous orbital paths are orbital paths inhabited by several satellites and space entities, if they get too clogged, it could cause damage and death.

#### By voting neg, you solve this problem – property rights in space free up orbits.

**Scheraga 87** [Joel D. Scheraga, Visiting Assistant Professor of Economics at Princeton University & Assistant Professor of Economics at Rutgers University, Winter 1987, “Establishing Property Rights in Outer Space”, Cato Journal Vol. 6 No. 3, <https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/1987/1/cj6n3-10.pdf> ] // Triumph Debate

**Private property does not yet exist in outer space.** **In fact, steps have been taken on the international level to prevent its establishment.** In 1967 the U.N. Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, which is responsible for legislating all matters dealing with space, drafted an Outer SpaceTreaty.2 Ratified by 107member nations, the treaty provides the current framework for space law. **The central principle underlying the treaty is that outer space is not subject to appropriation by any one country; all nations have equal rights and access to the resources of space. Outer space is the “province of all humankind”** (Cowen 1985). **The** treaty’s **failure to establish property rights is critical. Congestion in geosynchronous orbits will worsen in the absence of property rights.** **The price of an orbital slot is zero, so that entry into synchronous orbit is free. The argument for establishing property rights in outer space is an application of** **what McCloskey (1985, p. 330) has called Adam Smith’s** **generalization**: **If transactions costs are low, the assignment and voluntary exchange of rights to scarce resources will result in an efficient allocation. Conversely, the failure to assign property rights to the scarce resources will inevitably lead to an inefficient use of the resources.** 3 **The problem is a common one in economics. Consider, for example, the overhunting of the buffalo on the Great Plains. The opportunity cost of hunting the buffalo, in terms of yet-to-be-born buffalo, was zero. They were overhunted and killed almost to the point of extinction because no one owned them. The few remaining buffalo survived only because laws that established property rights to the remaining buffalo and their unborn offspring finally protected them** (McCloskey 1985, pp. 330—31). **As applied to outer space,** Smith’s **generalization implies that an efficient use of scarce orbital slots will result once property rights are assigned unambiguously** to a particular country (or coalition of countries) **and free exchange is permitted so that the country can sell the property rights for whatever the market will offer.** A common counterargument is that the nations of the world, operating in their own self-interests, will conserve the orbital slots even in the absence of well-defined property rights. But this argument is mistaken: **if the price of an orbital slot is zero and the orbital paths are not owned by anyone, the opportunity cost to any one nation of occupying these locations is lower than if property rights were assigned. Orbital paths for geosynchronous satellites will be overused by individual countries and congestion problems will worsen. External costs to firms and nations that may want subsequently to occupy these orbits will not be fully taken into account. The problem is one of ownership.**

#### Private property solve for orbital congestion

**Scheraga 87** [Joel D. Scheraga, Visiting Assistant Professor of Economics at Princeton University & Assistant Professor of Economics at Rutgers University, Winter 1987, “Establishing Property Rights in Outer Space”, Cato Journal Vol. 6 No. 3, <https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/1987/1/cj6n3-10.pdf> ] // Triumph Debate

**Congestion of orbital slots is the result of an absence of ownership.** **Consider the case of a country that has decided to invest in a satellite communications system** rather than, say, a ground-based microwave transmission system. **When that country’s satellite is placed in geosynchronous orbit, it adds to the congestion problem and increases the possibility of transmission interference or collision with another satellite.** **Although the external effect on each individual satellite in the orbit is small, the total effect on all satellites is large. The country launching the new satellite, however, does not consider the total external effect on all satellites;** that is, it does not consider the social cost of one more satellite being placed in orbit. **It only considers the** average cost (or **cost per satellite launched**) it faces—that is, the private cost of the satellite system. **Each individual country acting alone, in its own self-interest, will not make socially correct decisions when the orbital slots are not owned by anyone.** This misallocation due to the lack of well-defined property rights is illustrated in Figure 1 Under the status quo, orbital slots are not owned by anyone and the price of a slot is zero.5 A country that is contemplating placing a communications satellite into a geosynchronous orbit will only consider the average cost of the system. It will choose the satellite system over the alternative ground-based systems until the average cost of placing satellites in orbit is equal to the marginal cost of the alternative systems.° Satellites will be placed in orbit up to the point where the average cost of the satellite system (the private cost) is equal to the marginal cost of alternative, uncongested systems. **Although this is an optimal private decision, it is inefficient for society. The social optimum is obtained when investment by different countries in satellite systems is allocated so that the marginal cost of the earth-based systems is just equal to the marginal cost of the satellite system**. **The social optimum, of course, is unknown** ex ante; rather, **it will** tend to **emerge once private property rights to orbital slots are assigned and enforced. By assigning property rights, a market is established in which the rights to the orbital slots may be bought and sold. Selfish maximization of the profit from property rights will lead to a socially efficient outcome.** The negative externalities will be eliminated. **The owner of a right to an orbital slot will charge a positive price for the slot that maximizes his net revenue. This price will be the one that induces countries to recognize the costs they impose on others by adding to the congestion of satellites.** If all orbital paths are owned and transactions costs are low, an efficient outcome will prevail. It does not matter which country initially obtains the right to a particular orbit. If exchange is costless, the right will eventually be owned by the country that values it the most. As Cheung (1970, p. 64) noted: If the market is allowed to operate, then an efficient (although not necessarily equitable) outcome will prevail. **A classic example of the importance of private property for achieving a socially efficient use of resources is the distribution of property rights** in the United States **to radio and television frequencies** (Coase 1959). **In the 1920s there were no restrictions on who could broadcast on arty frequency. Chaos ensued. Consequently, the courts adopted a first-come, first-served method of allocating frequencies. The first user of a frequency had ownership claims to it.** In general, this type of allocation scheme did not result in frequencies being owned by those users that valued them the most. Nevertheless**, if the rights to the frequencies could have been traded, an efficient outcome would have prevailed**. A redistribution of wealth would have occurred in favor of the initial owners of the frequencies, but **the final allocation would have been efficient.** The U.S. government, however, chose to allocate the frequencies according to its own criteria.

#### 1---The current system of allocating orbital paths has failed and poses a unique danger – risks high concentrations of debris and satellite collisions

**Blodger 16** [Ian Blodger, JD Candidate at University of Minnesota Law School, 2016, “Reclassifying Geostationary Earth Orbit as Private Property: Why Natural Law and Utilitarian Theories of Property Demand Privatization”, The Minnesota Journal of Law, Science, and Technology Vol 17, Issue 1, <https://scholarship.law.umn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1006&context=mjlst> ] // Triumph Debate

**The impending catastrophic destruction of satellite communications necessitates an immediate reexamination of the underlying assumptions made about private property in outer space.**1 Recent **advances in technology have reduced barriers to space exploration and utilization, leading to increased investment in space in the form of satellites.**2 This increased investment has brought about numerous scientific discoveries,3 military applications,4 and may one day lead to a dispersal of the population across the solar system.5 **This increased saturation of Earth’s orbits has created a problem with debris that threatens to grow until it cuts off access to space.**6 To further complicate the issue, **some corporations are reluctant to commit large quantities of resources to space because of the current disposition of international law,**7 **even with the economic benefits gained from utilizing outer space as a resource.**8 **Rather than allowing for the private appropriation of space, the** Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, also known as the **Outer Space Treaty**, which governs actions taken in space, essentially **requires that all property remain communal.**9 **The communal approach to this area of space has affected the method of distributing geostationary Earth orbit (GEO) zones.**10 The International Telecommunications Union (ITU), an agency created during the 1860’s to help facilitate telegraph communications, now works to help companies find orbital zones and frequencies that are not currently in use by other GEO satellites, but **the ITU does not confer upon such companies a property right in either the frequencies or orbital zones.**11 **The current method of GEO allocation has created a number of problems including the increasing number of nonoperational satellites, and debris resulting from satellite collisions.**12 The current orbital zone surrounding Earth contains over 20,000 pieces of debris.13 While much of this debris remains in low Earth orbit (LEO), **the unique utility of the geostationary orbit has resulted in high concentrations of debris being located [in geostationary orbit].**14 **Orbital debris poses a severe threat to U.S. national security, and will present problems to future space operations.**15 While different programs have been offered to solve the orbital debris problem, none of these solutions focuses on whether GEO should be considered private or public property.16 In order to choose an effective and just solution to the problems facing GEO, it is important to understand whether GEO exhibits the same kinds of qualities found in areas capable of private ownership or whether GEO exhibits the kinds of qualities found in areas foreclosed to privatization.17

## AT: C1

### 1NC---AT: Global Security

1---They need to prove that private companies will put in nuclear weapons on space, look to their Sterns 3 card, it literally says if countries were to liscence “nationals to place nuclear weapons”.

#### 2--- Commercial space industry key to sustainable program development – governments change goals frequently, and cannot sustain

**Martin & Olson 09** [Mr. Gary Martin and Dr. John Olson, NASA, “COMMERCIALIZATION IS REQUIRED FOR SUSTAINABLE SPACE EXPLORATION AND DEVELOPMENT”, 10/2009, https://ntrs.nasa.gov/api/citations/20100027548/downloads/20100027548.pdf] /Triumph Debate

The U.S. Space Exploration policy outlines an exciting new direction in space for human and robotic exploration and development beyond low Earth orbit. Pressed by this new visionary guidance, human civilization will be able to methodically build capabilities to move off Earth and into the solar system in a step-by-step manner, gradually increasing the capability for humans to stay longer in space and move further away from Earth**. The new plans call for an implementation that would create an affordable and sustainable program in order to span over generations of explorers**, each new generation pushing back the boundaries and building on the foundations laid by the earlier. **To create a sustainable program it is important to enable and encourage the development of a self supporting commercial space industry** leveraging both traditional and non-traditional segments of the industrial base**. Governments will not be able to open the space frontier on their own because their goals change over relatively short timescales and because the large costs associated with human spaceflight cannot be sustained.** A strong space development industrial sector is needed that can one day support the needs of commercial space enterprises as well as provide capabilities that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and other national space agencies can buy to achieve their exploration goals**. This new industrial space sector will someday provide fundamental capabilities like communications, power, logistics, and even cargo and human space transportation, just as commercial companies are able to provide these services on Earth today**. To help develop and bolster this new space industrial sector, NASA and other national space agencies can enable and facilitate it in many ways, including reducing risk by developing important technologies necessary for commercialization of space, and as a paying customer, partner, or anchor tenant. **This transition from all or mostly government developed and operated facilities and services to commercial supplied facilities and services should be considered from the very earliest stages of planning.** This paper will first discuss the importance of space commercialization to fulfilling national goals and the associated policy and strategic objectives that will enable space exploration and development. Then the paper will offer insights into how government can provide leadership to promote the nascent commercial space industry. In addition, the paper describes programs and policies already in place at NASA and offers five important principles government can use to strengthen space industry

## AT: C2

### 1NC---AT: Debris

#### 1---The current system of allocating orbital paths has failed and poses a unique danger – risks high concentrations of debris and satellite collisions

**Blodger 16** [Ian Blodger, JD Candidate at University of Minnesota Law School, 2016, “Reclassifying Geostationary Earth Orbit as Private Property: Why Natural Law and Utilitarian Theories of Property Demand Privatization”, The Minnesota Journal of Law, Science, and Technology Vol 17, Issue 1, <https://scholarship.law.umn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1006&context=mjlst> ] // Triumph Debate

**The impending catastrophic destruction of satellite communications necessitates an immediate reexamination of the underlying assumptions made about private property in outer space.**1 Recent **advances in technology have reduced barriers to space exploration and utilization, leading to increased investment in space in the form of satellites.**2 This increased investment has brought about numerous scientific discoveries,3 military applications,4 and may one day lead to a dispersal of the population across the solar system.5 **This increased saturation of Earth’s orbits has created a problem with debris that threatens to grow until it cuts off access to space.**6 To further complicate the issue, **some corporations are reluctant to commit large quantities of resources to space because of the current disposition of international law,**7 **even with the economic benefits gained from utilizing outer space as a resource.**8 **Rather than allowing for the private appropriation of space, the** Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, also known as the **Outer Space Treaty**, which governs actions taken in space, essentially **requires that all property remain communal.**9 **The communal approach to this area of space has affected the method of distributing geostationary Earth orbit (GEO) zones.**10 The International Telecommunications Union (ITU), an agency created during the 1860’s to help facilitate telegraph communications, now works to help companies find orbital zones and frequencies that are not currently in use by other GEO satellites, but **the ITU does not confer upon such companies a property right in either the frequencies or orbital zones.**11 **The current method of GEO allocation has created a number of problems including the increasing number of nonoperational satellites, and debris resulting from satellite collisions.**12 The current orbital zone surrounding Earth contains over 20,000 pieces of debris.13 While much of this debris remains in low Earth orbit (LEO), **the unique utility of the geostationary orbit has resulted in high concentrations of debris being located [in geostationary orbit].**14 **Orbital debris poses a severe threat to U.S. national security, and will present problems to future space operations.**15 While different programs have been offered to solve the orbital debris problem, none of these solutions focuses on whether GEO should be considered private or public property.16 In order to choose an effective and just solution to the problems facing GEO, it is important to understand whether GEO exhibits the same kinds of qualities found in areas capable of private ownership or whether GEO exhibits the kinds of qualities found in areas foreclosed to privatization.17

This solves for their contention 2 as well since we access space debris and a bunch of other impacts.

2---We can clean up debris.

### AT: Warming

#### Space innovation leads to life saving technologies – commercialization is key

**Raghavan 21** [Seetha Raghavan, Seetha Raghavan is a professor in UCF’s Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, “The Impact of Innovation in the New Era of Space Exploration?”, 08/04/2021, UCF Today, <https://www.ucf.edu/news/the-impact-of-innovation-in-the-new-era-of-space-exploration/>] /Triumph Debate

Every once in a while, a confluence of discoveries, events and initiatives results in a breakthrough so significant that it propels the entire world to a higher level, redefining what is possible in so many different fields. **This breakthrough is taking centerstage now, as the new era of space exploration — catalyzed by increasing launch access — dawns upon us.** **The surge of innovation that comes with this will create new opportunities and inspire the next generation of doers.** When this happens, boundaries between scientific and social impact are blurred. Innovation leading to scientific discovery can benefit society in the same way that social innovation can diversify and support scientific innovators, who can contribute to global progress. **To ride this wave of progress, we must all participate and innovate in the new era of space exploration.** **The intersection of space exploration, innovation and impact isn’t a new phenomenon. In the past, technology developments and spin-offs from space research have consistently found their way into communities worldwide sometimes with lifesaving benefits. The International Space Station supports experiments that have led to discoveries and inventions in communication, water purification, and remote guidance for health procedures and robotic surgeries.** **Satellite-enabled Earth observation capabilities that monitor natural disasters, climate and crops often support early warnings for threats and mitigation strategies.** Space exploration has always been relevant to everyone no matter the discipline or interest. **Commercialization of space has been key in many ways to the current boost in “firsts” over the last few years. It has spurred innovation in launch vehicles and related technologies that led to firsts in vertical-takeoff-vertical landing rocket technology, reusability of rocket boosters and privately developed crewed missions to orbit.** Concurrently, NASA has continued to captivate our imagination with the first flight of a helicopter in another world, a mission to return an asteroid sample to Earth and sending a probe to make the closest ever approach to the sun. While we celebrate the scientific progress, there is a vastly important question that we all need to focus on: How can we drive the surge in innovation offered by increased access to space, to benefit humankind? Access to low-Earth orbit, and eventually human exploration of space, is a portal to achieve many impactful outcomes. The numbers and completion rate of microgravity experiments conducted by scientists will be greatly increased as a range of offerings in suborbital flights provide more opportunities to advance critical research in health, agriculture, energy, and more. Lunar, planetary, and even asteroid exploration may lead to discoveries of new materials — busting the limitations now imposed on capabilities for energy, transportation, and infrastructure or creating new sensors and devices that enhance safety on Earth. **Space tourism —one can hope — has the power to potentially create an awareness of our oneness that may lead to social change.** But much like all scientific endeavors, we cannot ignore the importance of pre-emptively identifying and mitigating negative impacts of new ventures some of which may have already taken shape. We need to consider space debris that threatens the very access that facilitates it, safety and rescue readiness to support increased crewed missions and space tourism, national security, and effects of light pollution on astronomy. Much of these can be approached and mitigated with new concepts and ideas that have already been set in motion. One thing is for certain, space has always been the inspiration for the next generation of innovators and creative thinkers. Architects of new ideas in this era will inspire many more. Ingenuity must also come from academic and research institutions building a new space-ready generation through innovative curriculum, scholarships, and research opportunities for key fields at all levels. Most of all, engaging participation is a responsibility anyone can take by steering the conversation and gathering ideas on how we can make this era one of positive benefit for all, while making opportunities inclusive to all.

#### Technological innovation is driving environmental change – such as MethaneSAT tackling climate change

**EDF 21** [Environmental Defense Fund, “This space technology can cut climate pollution on Earth, 11/23/2021, https://www.edf.org/climate/space-technology-can-cut-climate-pollution-earth] /Triumph Debate

**The latest science warns that the window for preventing the most catastrophic global warming is closing fast. But we have a crucial opportunity to slow the rate of warming right now, even as we continue the transition to clean energy as quickly as possible. Deep reductions in carbon dioxide emissions remain critical over the long term.** But it turns out that methane emissions from fossil fuel operations, livestock production and other industries is responsible for more than 25% of current temperature rise**. Cutting these emissions is the fastest way to put the brakes on climate change.** But tracking these invisible emissions can be hard. That’s the reason for **MethaneSAT, a compact new satellite being built by a specially created new arm of EDF. MethaneSAT is specifically designed to locate, measure and track reductions in methane emissions virtually anywhere on Earth with greater precision than any other satellite.** First-of-its-kind satellite gets key data The oil and gas industry is a leading source of methane emissions. From remote wellheads to gas utility lines, companies release at least 75 million metric tons a year — enough gas to produce electricity for all of Africa twice over. Extensive research led by EDF suggests that oil and gas methane emissions in the U.S. are 60% higher than official EPA estimates. To fully understand the problem — and drive the solutions — we need more and better data about: How large methane emissions are. Where they're coming from. The biggest potential reductions. Progress of those reductions over time. **MethaneSAT will provide high-precision global coverage, measuring not just methane concentrations but the rate it’s escaping, from where and who is responsible. It will fill gaps left by other satellite systems, measuring large emission sources as well as those too small for other satellites to see. Because it will focus only on methane, MethaneSAT will be quicker and less expensive to launch than the complex, multi-function satellites built by government space agencies, so we can get data sooner.** 8 **EDF’s efforts using technological innovation to drive environmental change**, **the MethaneSAT mission is about turning data into action**. Video: Watch as EDF's president shares the vision of MethaneSAT in this TED Talk. **That data will be available to the public free of charge, so that stakeholders and the public can see and compare methane emissions by country or company. This unprecedented transparency will both enable and motivate faster reductions. And it will give the public objective assurance that both industry and government are delivering reductions**. Fred Krupp, EDF's president, unveiled the idea for MethaneSAT in a 2018 TED Talk at TED’s flagship event, as part of The Audacious Project, successor to the TED Prize. The purpose of MethaneSAT is to serve as a critical resource for realizing our goal of reducing methane emissions from a diversity of sources, especially global oil and gas. **A 45 percent reduction in oil and gas methane emissions by 2025 would deliver the same 20-year climate benefit as closing one-third of the world’s coal-fired power plants**. Cutting these emissions is the fastest, cheapest thing we can do to slow the rate of warming today, even as we continue to attack carbon dioxide emissions. Drawing from expertise and research MethaneSAT is due to launch in 2022. **The team responsible for getting it off the ground includes Tom Ingersoll, a successful satellite entrepreneur with three decades of experience, and a long list of experts in spaceflight, remote sensing and atmospheric sciences.** Steven Hamburg and Tom Ingersoll Steven Hamburg, left, EDF's chief scientist, and Tom Ingersoll, MethaneSAT project director, pictured at Harvard University And the MethaneSAT team has partnered with Harvard University and the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory to develop the science required for the mission. We’ve learned that emissions are much higher than either industry or government previously recognized, and occur across the supply chain. The challenge is, the sources are intermittent, unpredictable and widespread, making it hard to predict where they’ll occur. That means ongoing monitoring and measurement are essential. By providing reliable, fully transparent data on a worldwide scale, MethaneSAT will help transform a serious climate threat into a crucial opportunity.

## AT: C3

### 1NC---AT: Democratic Distribution

1---Property rights is more fair because people pay for what they get for

#### 2--- Private companies lead to more efficiency in production

**Tillman 19** [Nola Taylor Tillman, Graduate of Agnes Scott College and astronomy author , “Will Private Companies Beat NASA to the Moon?”, 07/31/2019, Space.com, <https://www.space.com/nasa-private-companies-moon-race.html>] /Triumph Debate

But private industry isn't solely focused on helping NASA make it to the moon. Companies like SpaceX and Blue Origin have stated their intentions to design their own lunar exploration programs. **Elon Musk's SpaceX is currently working on a 100-passenger vehicle called Starship, which the company envisions carrying people to the moon and Mars.** Starship will be lofted off Earth's surface by a huge rocket called Super Heavy. **SpaceX already has one Starship-Super Heavy passenger flight planned for 2023.** The company hopes to begin commercial operations of the pair as early as 2021, most likely with commercial satellite launches. Blue Origin, operated by Amazon founder Jeff Bezos, is working on a big lander called Blue Moon, which will deliver science instruments, lunar rovers and, eventually, astronauts to the lunar surface. Bezos sees many potential customers for Blue Moon other than NASA. "People are very excited about this capability to soft-land their cargo, their rovers, their science experiments on the surface of the moon in a precise way," Bezos said at the lander's unveiling in May 2019. "There is no capability to do that today." Then there's Florida-based company Moon Express, which is working to become the first private enterprise to reach the moon with robotic spacecraft systems. In 2016, it became the first company to receive U.S. government approval to send a robotic spacecraft to the lunar surface. "Our vision is really to expand Earth's economic and social sphere to include the moon," Alain Berinstain, Moon Express' vice president of global development, said last year at a lunar-science workshop at NASA's Ames Research Center in California. "We see the moon as the Earth's eighth continent to explore and to also mine for resources, like we have with every other continent on Earth." Pittsburgh-based Astrobotic planned to launch its Peregrine lander to the moon in 2019, but that date has since been since pushed back to 2020 or 2021. "We're really, at Astrobotic, trying to do this the right way, meaning that we're trying to be as technically rigorous as possible," Dan Hendrickson, vice president of business development at Astrobotic, said at a Washington Space Business Roundtable in February. "We're trying to be very upfront with the entire community about our current status." As with NASA, private industry has sufficient access to the technology to get to the moon, Whitman Cobb said. "**They also have to demonstrate that their systems are fundamentally safe and reliable in order to attract paying customers — they are a business, after all**," she said. **Private companies also tend to have a leaner leadership structure than NASA**

**'s 60-year-old legacy brings with it. "NASA's bureaucracy has stagnated since the 1960s,"** Whitman Cobb said**. That makes it "more difficult for NASA to contract, make changes and adapt to new circumstances." On the other hand, private companies have demonstrated the ability to move through technology development at a rapid rate, incorporating design and technology changes "almost immediately," she said. That brings its own advantages.**

On the existential risk argument –

#### Expansion to space is necessary to avoid extinction because of energy shortages and climate change.

Ursul & Ursul 20 [Arkady Ursul, Ecology @ Academy of Sciences of Moldova, Tatiana Ursul, Philosophy @ National Research Technical University, “On the Path to Space Mining and a Cosmic Sustainable Way of Socio-Natural Interaction,” Philosophy and Cosmology, http://ispcjournal.org/journals/2020/02/PhC\_25\_UrsulUrsul.pdf]

**In the near space future, mankind will have to massively ship the production of energy and materials outside the planet**, instead of deploying this industry in undeveloped territories, for example, in deserts, the Arctic, the Antarctic or in the oceans and seas. **The main reason for the relocation of the energy and some other industries outside the Earth is related to** the transition to SD and especially with a number of environmental issues, such as **global warming and depletion of the world’s fossil fuel and energy resources** with the increase of energy consumption. Therefore, **the development of any new terrestrial territories, for example, the ocean, is economically inefficient and environmentally impractical**. In the case of the development of space bodies, a new anthropogenically-space method and a method of preserving the terrestrial biosphere, as well as the creation of it of the most favorable conditions for the existence of mankind and other forms of life, appear. Therefore, those projects that in the acceptable future can be implemented in space are hardly worthwhile to implement on the planet. **A fundamental conclusion about the need for the future to “split” production into terrestrial, mainly agricultural and space, mainly industrial**, between which the products of activity can and will be exchanged **has already been made** on the basis of an analysis of current trends in the environmentalization of economic and other anthropogenic **activities in the context of achieving global sustainability. Agricultural production in the perspective of the transition to SD should fit into the biosphere**, using intensively-ecologized methods of economy management (Bazaluk et al., 2020). **The strategic perspective of the global-space production split is the most natural and effective one and is understandable in terms of ensuring eco-and geo-security of the civilization’s existence** (Zhuchenko & Ursul, 1983)