## FW – Hypothetical Enactment

#### Interpretation: the affirmative may only garner offense from the hypothetical enactment of the resolution.

#### Definition of standardized test

GSP 15 [(Great Schools Partnership, ) "Standardized Test Definition", Glossary of Education Reform, 11-12-2015] IC https://www.edglossary.org/standardized-test/

A standardized test is any form of test that (1) requires all test takers to answer the same questions, or a selection of questions from common bank of questions, in the same way, and that (2) is scored in a “standard” or consistent manner, which makes it possible to compare the relative performance of individual students or groups of students.

#### Violation: THEY DON’T MEET B/C THEY SAY IN CROSS THAT THEY DONT

#### TVA : Our interp is compatible with them reading a ban on private appropriation which solves their climate and war offense and our offense bc if you ban appropriation the impact of the aff doesnt happen, and vice versa

#### B. Our Offense

#### They destroy engagement – predictable stasis ensures research accessibility and negative ground. Even if public policy isn’t the best focus for activism, it’s crucial for dialogue because it’s grounded in consistent reporting and academic work.

#### Two impacts -

#### 1) Changing the topic post facto structurally favors the aff by manipulating balance of prep – vote neg because debate is a competitive game that’s meaningless without substantive constraints.

#### 2) Also key to have well-prepared opponents. Exclusionary rule: They transform debate into a monologue which means their arguments are presumptively false because they haven’t been subjected to well researched scrutiny.

#### Their model creates a structural disincentive to substantial research. Failure to defend the actor and mechanism of the resolution allows them to shift their advocacy to the terms most favorable to them – causes dogmatism and forces the neg into generics at the margins of the literature – destroys good scholarship.

#### C. Drop the debater on T, we’ve proven in-round abuse – the round is already skewed from the beginning because their advocacy excluded my ability to generate NC offense– letting them sever doesn’t solve any of the abuse

#### Theory is an issue of competing interpretations because reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters will exploit a judge’s tolerance for questionable argumentation

## Laser Cannon PIC

### Shell (50)

#### CP –

#### [the aff] except for the development of single-use debris-limiting laser cannons and gossamer sails

#### the US and Japan ought to divert funds to build a laser cannon for the International Space Station and require gossamer sails on all future satellites

#### No laser cannon or gossamer sail r&d now due to cost, but it’s possible with the proper funding and the profit motive from private entities like RIKEN – solves extinction and future space junk permanently

Powell 15

Corey S Powell (science journalist and editor in chief at discover magazine, wrote 3 books with Bill Nye!!), May 20 2015, "Space Junk is a Problem. Is a Laser Cannon the Solution?," https://www.discovermagazine.com/the-sciences/space-junk-is-a-problem-is-a-laser-cannon-the-solution#.VV4ENGRViko, // HW AW, bracketed cause I don’t like reading big numbers

There’s a general rule in media reporting called Betteridge’s Law: Whenever a headline poses a question--especially a sensational one--the answer is “no.” I’m going to break the law this time. **An orbiting laser cannon is not only an intriguing technology but, yes, it’s one of the most promising ways to clean up the ever-thickening cloud of dangerous debris surrounding the Earth**. And just to be clear, space junk is a danger. There are about 25,000 human-made objects larger than your fist flying around in orbit, and about half a million pieces bigger than a dime. If you include millimeter-scale shrapnel, the number of rogue bits reaches deep into the millions. Typical speeds in low-Earth orbit are about 30,000 kilometers per hour (18,000 miles per hour), ten times the velocity of a rifle bullet. You see the problem: A little impact can pack a big wallop. So far, there have not been any space-junk catastrophes remotely resembling the sensationalized events in the movie Gravity, but the reality is still disconcerting. In 2009, a $50 million Iridium communications satellite was destroyed by a collision with a defunct Russian satellite. Three years later, the [Fermi space observatory](https://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/GLAST/news/bullet-dodge.html) had a near miss with another Soviet-era satellite. NASA had to clad the International Space Station in shielding to protect it from repeated small impacts, and the agency sometimes moves the whole station to dodge larger pieces of junk. Orbiting debris adds cost and risk to the space business.The proposed space-station laser cannon (upper left) would work in conjunction with a telescope called EUSO to track and destroy space debris. (Credit: RIKEN) The amount of junk in orbit is increasing rapidly, meaning that those costs and risks are increasing, too. Once junk gets up there, it takes a long time to come back down: years to centuries in low orbits, and essentially forever in geosynchronous orbit (40,000 kilometers up, where many communications satellites are located). Most disconcerting, collisions in orbit create more junk, which leads to more collisions. Potentially this could lead to a runaway process called [Kessler Syndrome](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kessler_syndrome). **This is where the laser cannon comes in**. Toshikazu Ebisuzaki and a team of researchers at the RIKEN lab in Japan have [formulated a plan](http://www.riken.jp/en/pr/press/2015/20150421_2/) to clear out near-Earth space by zapping pieces of space junk with a high-power blast of focused radiation. The laser doesn’t need to be able to destroy the whole piece of debris. All it has to do is vaporize enough of the object to slow its orbit and send it spiraling into Earth’s atmosphere, **where it will burn up harmlessly before reaching the ground. It’s an ingenious solution**. Ebisuzaki’s concept was inspired by a science project called the Extreme Universe Space Observatory, currently under development for the International Space Station. [EUSO](http://jemeuso.riken.jp/en/), which will be installed on the station in 2017, is a fascinating instrument in its own right; it will study extremely high-cosmic rays by watching the light they create when they collide with air molecules. But EUSO’s sensitive, wide-field optics also make it well suited to spotting and tracking small bits of space debris, which are hard to locate from the ground. Finding targets is the crucial first step toward getting rid of them. The next step, of course, is the laser. RIKEN’s concept (which is not yet funded) would start with a 10-watt laser prototype, mounted on the International Space Station, capable of firing 100 laser pulses a second. That would pave the way for a larger system powerful enough to blast away any pieces of space junk within a 100-kilometer range, and eventually lead to a dedicated garbage-cleanup satellite equipped with a [five-hundred-thousand]500,000-watt laser that can fire [fifty-thousand]50,000 times per second. Such a satellite could remove 100,000 pieces of junk a year, the Japanese researchers claim, **fast enough to bring the whole orbital debris problem under control.** The fast-growing population of space debris. "LEO" refers to low-Earth orbit. (Credit: Surrey Space Centre) There are significant technical hurdles to overcome, including the data-processing capacity needed to spot the bits of debris and the considerable energy supply needed to keep such a powerful laser operating for years. Building a giant laser-cannon satellite would not be cheap, either. But this is exactly the kind of ambitious thinking needed to tackle the space-junk mess. Several additional cleanup technologies are also under development. A separate Japanese-led team has proposed trapping and eliminating space debris with a huge [electromagnetic tether](http://www.academia.edu/1265073/Space_Demonstration_of_Bare_Electrodynamic_Tape-Tether_Technology_on_the_Sounding_Rocket_S520-25http:/). A European project called [e.DeOrbit](http://www.esa.int/Our_Activities/Space_Engineering_Technology/Clean_Space/How_to_catch_a_satellite) would snare big pieces of space junk using a net or harpoon and dispatch them Earthward. Other concepts under study would use puffs of [pressurized gas](http://www.nasa.gov/directorates/spacetech/niac/gregory_space_debris_elimination.html), large [magnetized nets](http://www.spacesafetymagazine.com/space-debris/debris-removal/electrodynamic-debris-eliminator-receives-funding/), or a [slingshot-style satellite](http://aero.tamu.edu/news/removing-space-debris-tamu-sweeper-sling-sat). The laser cannon has some obvious advantages over all of these options, however. It could tackle the small fry, not just the big pieces, and it could deal with far more targets than would be possible for any spacecraft that is going after them one by one. If all of these ideas sound a little wacky, there's a good reason: Getting rid of space junk is a really, really hard problem. There is a lot of space to scour for debris. The individual pieces are mostly small and nearly invisible, and they each follow a unique orbit. Hard problems call for creative (and sometimes wacky) solutions. Further complicating things, nobody has devoted much money to cleanup, and any mission that can remove space junk could potentially remove active satellites as well--a delicate political issue. **If the RIKEN laser cannon never happens, it will more likely be due to budget** and political **obstacles than to technical ones**. In the long run, the best way to deal with space junk is never to create it in the first place. One of the most important principles here is what is called [design for demise](http://www.esa.int/Our_Activities/Space_Engineering_Technology/Clean_Space/Space_debris_mitigation)--that is, engineering satellites so that they will automatically de-orbit and remove themselves from the trash pile within, say, 25 years of the end of their mission. A simple way to do this is to equip a satellite with a small sail that would pop open when it is no longer needed. The so-called [gossamer sail](https://theconversation.com/cleaning-up-space-debris-with-sailing-satellites-20384) would act like a space parachute, using the pressure of sunlight and the extremely thin traces of atmosphere in orbit to create drag. The drag would then pull the satellite down to a fiery demise. Simulated view of Earth from the Planetary Society's new LightSail, launched on May 20. Space sails could be used to clear away satellite debris--or to take humanity on great ventures of exploration. (Credit: Josh Spradling/Planetary Society) A gossamer sail is very similar in function to a solar sail--like the prototype [LightSail](http://sail.planetary.org/) launched today by the Planetary Society. That creates a neat kind of symmetry to the story. Powerful space lasers may be useful for clearing debris, but they could also be used to launch high-speed spacecraft. Solar sails could be used to de-orbit satellites, but they could also provide new ways to navigate to new worlds. In short, the kinds of technological solutions needed to clear a path through our local garbage dump could be the exact same ones needed to blaze a path to the stars.

### No AC junk impact

#### No laser cannon means nuclear war via the Kessler syndrome

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

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

### CASE

#### Technology developed from space exploration is K2 solving climate DiCicco ‘21

{Mike DiCicco, April 21, 2021, DiCicco is a senior science write at NASA, “NASA Technologies Spin off to Fight Climate Change”, <https://climate.nasa.gov/ask-nasa-climate/3075/nasa-technologies-spin-off-to-fight-climate-change/>, //NL}

Trapping Greenhouse Gases Carbon dioxide, a greenhouse gas, is the most prominent driver of climate change on Earth. On Mars, however, where most of the atmosphere is CO2, the gas could come in handy. Under **NASA** contracts, one **engineer helped develop technology to capture Martian carbon dioxide** and break it into carbon and oxygen **for** other uses, from **life support** to fuel for a journey home. Although it never flew, Perseverance will test out a similar idea, using an experimental system called MOXIE (Mars Oxygen In-Situ Resource Utilization Experiment). Meanwhile, **the** earlier **tech**nology **led to a system that now captures natural gases at oil wells, instead of wastefully burning them off and dumping the resulting CO2 into the atmosphere.** And another version of the system helps beer breweries go “greener” by capturing carbon dioxide from the brewing process, rather than venting it, and using it for carbonation instead of buying more. Conserving Energy Conserving energy is a crucial consideration for space travel, and many innovations NASA has come up with in that arena are now widespread in improving energy efficiency on Earth. For example**, NASA helped create** a type of **reflective insulation** to efficiently maintain a comfortable temperature within spacecraft and spacesuits. In the decades since, this insulation has been **adapted and used in homes and buildings** around the world. **Another material** pioneered **to insulate cryogenic rocket fuel** against the balmy weather around the launch pad at Cape Canaveral, Florida, **now saves energy by preserving temperatures at industrial facilities.** And a coating invented to protect spacecraft during the extreme heat of atmospheric entry **improves the efficiency of incinerators, boilers, and refractories, ovens, and more.** Shrinking Air Travel’s Carbon Footprint Air travel is a major contributor to human-made greenhouse gases. **Designing aircraft to fly more efficiently reduces** the amount of fuel they burn, and in turn, their resulting **emissions.** And many of the improvements that make modern aircraft more efficient come straight from NASA. In fact, some of the agency’s most significant contributions to aeronautic fuel efficiency can be traced back to the work of a single NASA engineer in the 1960s and ’70s. Richard Whitcomb designed and tested an entirely new wing shape – the supercritical wing – that significantly increased efficiency at high speeds and eliminated weight. He then designed upturned wingtips that make use of air vortices that would otherwise create drag. Now incorporated into nearly all commercial planes**, these advances combined save billions of dollars’ worth of fuel, along with associated CO2 emissions, every year.** In the decades since, NASA has continued to work with industry partners to improve airplane efficiency, and the agency is now supporting the cutting edge of all-electric flight. Advancing Renewable Energy Because there are no fossil fuels on Mars, **NASA** became interested in wind energy to power future Martian operations. So, the space agency **helped** a company **develop a wind turbine that could operate in** a similarly **harsh environment – the South Pole**. Rugged and designed for easy maintenance and efficiency at extremely low temperatures**, more than 800 of the resulting turbines are now generating power on Earth.** Unexpectedly, software NASA supported for **improved aircraft** design and maintenance has **also led to more efficient, long-lasting wind turbines.** And several solar panel manufacturers have benefited from the agency’s long reliance on the sun for energy.

#### Space exploration is k2 ending climate change

**Derr 21** (Digital Communications Manager at Nuclear Energy Institute creative communicator, eagle-eyed researcher, and content strategist with a passion for community-building and human rights. Has experience developing communications campaigns, editing and writing short and long-form content, and leading social media published scholarly writer in the fields of art history and public policy deeply invested in social justice and devotes her free time to causes working towards alleviating hunger and povertyhttps://www.nei.org/news/2021/space-is-crucial-to-understanding-climate-change)//HWLND

Space developments in the last two decades have greatly contributed to our understanding of our planet’s climate. Satellite imaging, space exploration, and new technologies give us an idea of the big picture and how we can adapt to address climate change. For example, satellites in space have played a critical role in our understanding of the causes of global warming by providing us with a large body of data to examine the variations in the Earth’s orbit. Data from these capabilities were essential inputs into the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s (IPCC) recent report that focused on how the physical science of climate change informs likely impacts under five different emissions scenarios. The report also found that climate change is happening quicker than we thought, making the need to reduce emissions imminent. To address this, space infrastructure such as positioning, navigation, and timing (PNT) can help identify efficient transportation routes and sources of emissions, ultimately aiding mitigation efforts.

### Generic

#### Private space appropriation will solve extinction – presume neg

Ginsberg 17

Leah Ginsberg (senior editor covering entrepreneurs, this article is just a summary of a musk interview), June 16 2017, “Elon Musk thinks life on earth will go extinct, and is putting most of his fortune toward colonizing Mars,” CNBC, https://www.cnbc.com/2017/06/16/elon-musk-colonize-mars-before-extinction-event-on-earth.html, // HW AW

If we stay on earth forever, “there will be some eventual extinction event,” says Elon Musk in an article published in academic [journal New Space](http://online.liebertpub.com/doi/full/10.1089/space.2017.29009.emu). In it, Musk says the alternative to this doomsday is for humans to become a multi-planetary species. He says Mars is the place to do it. Venus is a “hot acid bath,” says Musk in the article, which summarizes a speech he gave in Sept. of 2016. Mercury is too close to the sun. The moon is too small, has no atmosphere and not as “resource-rich.” Speaking like the entrepreneur he is, Musk says, Mars is better-suited “to scale up” to be a self-sustaining civilization. ″[I]f we could warm Mars up,” says Musk, which he believes is doable, “we would once again have a thick atmosphere and liquid oceans.” Mars also has enough sunlight and an atmosphere in which, with some tweaking, it would be possible to grow plants. 1:29 SpaceX’s Elon Musk’s bold ambition to colonize Mars Musk also says, “It would be quite fun to be on Mars because you would have gravity that is about 37 percent of that of Earth, so you would be able to lift heavy things and bound around.” The key, says Musk is his company SpaceX creating systems that make the move to Mars affordable – comparable to the median house price in the U.S. is the goal. Currently, Musk estimates trips to Mars would cost about $140,000 per ton (taking into account transporting things like luggage, food and life support). But he believes the cost could potentially drop to below $100,000 a ton. Musk sees a future where people would save up for a move to Mars like they do a home. “People could also get sponsorship. It gets to the point where almost anyone, if they saved up and this was their goal, could buy a ticket and move to Mars — and given that Mars would have a labor shortage for a long time, jobs would not be in short supply,” he says. Ultimately, says Musk, funding this will be a joint effort between private and government resources. “As we show that this is possible and that this dream is real—it is not just a dream, it is something that can be made real—the support will snowball over time,” says Musk. “I should also add that the main reason I am personally accumulating assets is in order to fund this,” says Musk of his wealth. “I really do not have any other motivation for personally accumulating assets except to be able to make the biggest contribution I can to making life multi-planetary.” Just 15 years ago, “SpaceX basically consisted of carpet and a mariachi band,” says Musk. “We were basically clueless.” Now, he believes SpaceX will have a spaceship by about 2020, with which it can start doing suborbital flights. That would also enable the transport of cargo “to anywhere on Earth in 45 minutes at the most,” he says. “Most places on Earth would be 20–25 minutes away. If we had a floating platform off the coast of New York, 20–30 miles out, you could go from New York to Tokyo in 25 minutes and across the Atlantic in 10 minutes,” he says. “If things go super-well, it might be in the 10-year time frame,” to Mars, says Musk. “But I do not want to say that is when it will occur. There is a huge amount of risk. It is going to cost a lot. There is a good chance we will not succeed, but we are going to do our best and try to make as much progress as possible.”

#### Commercialization is inevitable, and the benefits of space exploration outweigh any defects that it doesn’t already solve for Sharma 9/07/21

(Maanas Sharma, September 7, 2021, Sharma is a journalist for the Journal of Interdisciplinary Public Policy, “The privatized frontier: the ethical implications and role of private companies in space exploration”, [https://www.thespacereview.com/article/4238/1 //](https://www.stltoday.com/opinion/columnists/unions-ignore-long-history-of-excluding-minorities-from-jobs/article_ef58bccd-f04a-5172-8dbd-18b8ee5eb9e2.html%20/)NL)

Another key matter to note is restricted capitalism in space “could also be our salvation.”[11] Private space **exploration could** reap **increas**ed **access to resources and other benefits that can be used to solve the very problems on Earth that critics of capitalism identify**. Since governments offset some of their projects to private companies, **government agencies can focus on altruistic projects that** otherwise would not fit in the budget before and do **not have the immediate commercial use that private companies look for**. Scott Hubbard, an adjunct professor of aeronautics and astronautics at Stanford University, discusses how “this strategy allows the space agency to continue ‘exploring the fringe where there really is no business case’” but still has important impacts on people down on Earth.[12] Indeed, this idea is a particularly powerful one when considering the ideal future of private companies in space exploration. Though there is no one set way **governments** will interact with companies, the consensus is that they **must radically reimagine their main purpose as the role of private space exploration continues to grow.** As governments utilize services from private space companies, “[i]nstead of being bogged down by the routine application of old research, **NASA can prioritize** their limited budget to **work** more **on research** of other unknowns **and development of new** long-term space travel **tech**nologies.”[13] According to the Council on Foreign Relations**, such technologies have far-reaching benefits on Earth as well.** Past developments obviously include communications satellites, by themselves a massive benefit to society, but also “refinements in artificial hearts; improved mammograms; and laser eye surgery… thermoelectric coolers for microchips; high-temperature lubricants; and a means for mass-producing carbon nanotubes, a material with significant engineering potential; [and h]ousehold products.”[2**] Agencies like NASA are the only actors able to pursue the next game-changing missions**, “where the profit motive is not as evident and where the barriers to entry are still too high for the private sector to really make a compelling business case.”[8] These technologies have revolutionized millions, if not billions, of lives, demonstrating the remarkable benefits of space exploration. It follows then that **it is net ethical to prioritize these benefits**.

#### The private sector fuels space exploration— most of the global space industry is already commercialized and demands are set on an upward trend Urrutia ‘18

(Doris Elin Urrutia, October 12, 2018, Urrutia is a journalist for Inverse that bridge archaeological and paleontological discoveries with modern life. She also writes about astronomy and spaceflight for Space.com and on marine life for Scientific American, “How Will Private Space Travel Transform NASA's Next 60 Years?”, [https://www.space.com/42113-nasa-future-private-spaceflight.html //](https://www.stltoday.com/opinion/columnists/unions-ignore-long-history-of-excluding-minorities-from-jobs/article_ef58bccd-f04a-5172-8dbd-18b8ee5eb9e2.html%20/)NL)

First, people should understand that about **75 percent of the worldwide space enterprise is already commercial**, said Scott Hubbard, an adjunct professor in the Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics at Stanford University. This includes the satellites belonging to DirecTV and Sirius XM radio. “What's new is the extension of that into the human realm," said Hubbard, who also previously directed NASA's Ames Research Center in Silicon Valley. He served as the agency's "Mars czar," restructuring NASA's robotic Red Planet-exploration program after it suffered several failures in the 1990s. And if private companies can get the price of a suborbital flight down to about $50,000, "you get a lot of interest," Hubbard told Space.com. The highest-profile program currently in the works between NASA and the private sector is the agency's Commercial Crew Program, said Eric Stallmer, president of the nonprofit Commercial Spaceflight Federation. Commercial Crew is encouraging the development of U.S. spacecraft that will carry astronauts to and from the International Space Station (ISS). Toward this end, NASA has awarded multibillion-dollar contracts to both SpaceX and Boeing, which are building capsules called Crew Dragon and CST-100 Starliner, respectively. These craft are currently scheduled to start flying astronauts sometime next year. There's also the maturing commercial cargo program, which has given contracts to SpaceX and Northrop Grumman Corp. to fly robotic cargo missions to the ISS. Both of these companies have already completed numerous such flights. Both Hubbard and Stallmer said that **NASA wins by relying on private industry to provide such services in low Earth orbit.** Hubbard argued that this strategy allows the space agency to continue "exploring the fringe where there really is no business case." NASA has a budget about five times larger than the next biggest national space agency out there, but the U.S. agency's ambitious goals are still costly, said Stallmer. **To get the most bang** for the buck, "you'd have to **leverage the innovation and technology that is in the private sector and let NASA do the exquisite" projects.** The "exquisite" projects, Stallmer explained, are the "push-the-envelope-type things on deeper space exploration." "I see it not only as a cooperation or a collaboration, but maybe even interdependence," Hubbard said. "Without a thriving spaceflight entrepreneurship sector, I don't think that deep-space exploration with [regular] people is sustainable," he added. "And I think using the way in which the private sector has demonstrated they can reduce costs, through more nearly assembly-line production techniques, is really critical to sustainable space exploration in the future." Phil McAlister, director of commercial spaceflight at NASA, also advocated these public-private partnerships. Private companies offer the advantages of "being quick, being nimble, being fast, making a decision maybe without perfect knowledge — then moving forward and adjusting as required," McAlister told Space.com. NASA officials, he said, "have a lot of meetings … a lot of discussions, and things tend to take longer" than in private industry. **"The private sector wanting to move fast and wanting to be cost-effective** and NASA having our 50 years of human spaceflight experience … you bring those two things together**, and they actually complement each other very effectively," McAlister said.**