## 1

#### Space regulation scares investors away and spills over to other space activities. Freeland 05:

Steven Freeland (BCom, LLB, LLM, University of New South Wales; Senior Lecturer in International Law, University of Western Sydney, Australia; and a member of the Paris-based International Institute of Space Law). “Up, Up and … Back: The Emergence of Space Tourism and Its Impact on the International Law of Outer Space.” Chicago Journal of International Law: Vol. 6: No. 1, Article 4. 2005. JDN. <https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1269&context=cjil>

V. THE NEED FOR CELESTIAL PROPERTY RIGHTS? ¶ The fundamental principle of "non-appropriation" upon which the international law of outer space is based stems from the desire of the international community to ensure that outer space remains an area beyond the jurisdiction of any state(s). Similar ideals emerge from UNCLOS (in relation to the High Seas) as well as the Antarctic Treaty, 42 although in the case of the latter treaty, it was finalised after a number of claims of sovereignty had already been made by various States and therefore was structured to "postpone" rather than prejudice or renounce those previously asserted claims.43 In the case of outer space, its exploitation and use is expressed in Article I of the Outer Space Treaty to be "the province of all mankind," a term whose meaning is not entirely clear but has been interpreted by most commentators as evincing the desire to ensure that any State is free to engage in space activities without reference to any sovereign claims of other States. This freedom is reinforced by other parts of the same Article and is repeated in the Moon Agreement (which also applies to "other celestial bodies within the solar system, other than the earth")." Even though both the scope for space activities and the number of private participants have expanded significantly since these treaties were finalised, it has still been suggested that the nonappropriation principle constitutes "an absolute barrier in the realization of every kind of space activity., 4 ' The amount of capital expenditure required to research, scope, trial, and implement a new space activity is significant. To bring this activity to the point where it can represent a viable "stand alone" commercial venture takes many years and almost limitless funding. From the perspective of a private enterprise contemplating such an activity, it would quite obviously be an important element in its decision to devote resources to this activity that it is able to secure the highest degree of legal rights in order to protect its investment. Security of patent and other intellectual property rights, for example, are vital prerequisites for private enterprise research activity on the ISS, and these rights are specifically addressed by the ISS Agreement between the partners to the project and were applicable to the experiments undertaken by Mark Shuttleworth when he was onboard the ISS.46

#### The private sector is essential for space exploration – competition is key and government development is not effective, efficient, or cheap enough. Thiessen 21:

Marc Thiessen, 6-1, 21, Washington Post, Opinion: SpaceX’s success is one small step for man, one giant leap for capitalism, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2020/06/01/spacexs-success-is-one-small-step-man-one-giant-leap-capitalism/

It was one small step for man, one giant leap for capitalism. Only three countries have ever launched human beings into orbit. This past weekend, SpaceX became the first private company ever to do so, when it sent its Crew Dragon capsule into space aboard its Falcon 9 rocket and docked with the International Space Station. This was accomplished by a company Elon Musk started in 2002 in a California strip mall warehouse with just a dozen employees and a mariachi band. At a time when our nation is debating the merits of socialism, SpaceX has given us an **incredible testament to the power of American free enterprise.** While the left is advocating unprecedented government intervention in almost every sector of the U.S. economy, from health care to energy, **today Americans are celebrating the successful privatization of space travel.** If you want to see the difference between what government and private enterprise can do, consider: It took a private company to give us the first space vehicle with touch-screen controls instead of antiquated knobs and buttons. It took a private company to give us a capsule that can fly entirely autonomously from launch to landing — including docking — without any participation by its human crew. It also took a private company to invent a reusable rocket that can not only take off but land as well. When the Apollo 11 crew reached the moon on July 20, 1969, Neil Armstrong declared “the Eagle has landed.” On Saturday, SpaceX was able to declare that the Falcon had landed when its rocket settled down on a barge in the Atlantic Ocean — ready to be used again. That last development will save the taxpayers incredible amounts of money. The cost to NASA for launching a man into space on the space shuttle orbiter was $170 million per seat, compared with just $60 million to $67 million on the Dragon capsule. The cost for the space shuttle to send a kilogram of cargo into to space was $54,500; with the Falcon rocket, the cost is just $2,720 — a decrease of 95 percent. And while the space shuttle cost $27.4 billion to develop, the Crew Dragon was designed and built for just $1.7 billion — making it the lowest-cost spacecraft developed in six decades. SpaceX did it in six years — far faster than the time it took to develop the space shuttle. ***The private sector does it better, cheaper, faster and more efficiently than government***. Why? Competition. Today, SpaceX has to compete with a constellation of private companies — including legacy aerospace firms such as Orbital ATK and United Launch Alliance and innovative start-ups such as Blue Origin (which is designing a Mars lander and whose owner, Jeff Bezos, also owns The Post) and Virgin Orbit (which is developing rockets than can launch satellites into space from the underside of a 747, avoiding the kinds of weather that delayed the Dragon launch). In the race to put the first privately launched man into orbit, upstart SpaceX had to beat aerospace behemoth Boeing and its Starliner capsule to the punch. It did so — for more than $1 billion less than its competitor. **That spirit of competition and innovation will revolutionize space travel in the years ahead.** Indeed, Musk has his sights set far beyond Earth orbit. Already, SpaceX is working on a much larger version of the Falcon 9 reusable rocket called Super Heavy that will carry a deep-space capsule named Starship capable of carrying up to 100 people to the moon and eventually to Mars. Musk’s goal — the reason he founded SpaceX — is to colonize Mars and make humanity a multiplanetary species. He has set a goal of founding a million-person city on Mars by 2050 complete with iron foundries and pizza joints. Can it be done? Who knows. But this much is certain: **Private-sector innovation is opening the door to a new era of space exploration**. Wouldn’t it be ironic if, just as capitalism is allowing us to explore the farthest reaches of our solar system, Americans decided to embrace socialism back here on Earth?

#### Continued private space development is the only way to make sustainable energy feasible – empirics prove. Autry 19:

Greg Autry {the director of the Southern California Commercial Spaceflight Initiative at the University of Southern California, vice president at the National Space Society, and chair of the International Space Development Conference, }, 19 - ("Space Research Can Save the Planet—Again," Foreign Policy, 7-20-2019, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/07/20/space-research-can-save-the-planet-again-climate-change-environment/)//marlborough-wr/>

Today conservationists and other critics are more likely to see space programs as militaristic splurges that squander billions of dollars better applied to solving problems on Earth. These well-meaning complaints are misguided, however. Earth’s problems—most urgently, climate change—can be solved only from space. That’s where the tools and data already being used to tackle these issues were forged and where the solutions of the future will be too. Space research has already been critical in averting one major environmental disaster. It was NASA satellite data that revealed a frightening and growing hole in the ozone layer over the South Pole, galvanizing public concern that, in 1987, produced the Montreal Protocol: the first international agreement addressing a global environmental problem. Since then, thanks to worldwide restrictions on damaging chlorofluorocarbons, the ozone situation has stabilized, and a full planetary recovery is expected. As this case showed, space can provide the vital information needed to understand a problem—and a surprising range of ways to solve it. Climate change is a poster child for the critical role of space data. Trekking across the globe to measure ice sheets with drills and gauge sea temperatures from the sides of ships is an expensive, slow, and insufficient way to assay the state of the planet. Satellites operated by NASA, the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and an increasing number of commercial firms provide a plethora of multispectral imaging and radar measurements of developments such as coral reef degradation, harmful plankton blooms, and polar bears negotiating thinning ice. Much of the technology involved in observing the Earth today was initially developed for probes sent to explore other planets in our solar system. Indeed, understanding the evolution of other planets’ climates is essential for modeling possible outcomes on Earth. NASA probes revealed how, roughly 4 billion years ago, a runaway greenhouse gas syndrome turned Venus into a hot, hellish, and uninhabitable planet of acid rain. Orbiters, landers, and rovers continue to unravel the processes that transformed a once warm and wet Mars into a frigid, dry dust ball—and scientists even to conceive of future scenarios that might terraform it back into a livable planet. Discovering other worlds’ history and imagining their future offers important visions for climate change mitigation strategies on Earth, such as mining helium from the moon itself for future clean energy. Spinoff technologies from space research, from GPS to semiconductor solar cells, are already helping to reduce emissions; the efficiency gains of GPS-guided navigation shrink fuel expenditures on sea, land, and air by between 15 and 21 percent—a greater reduction than better engines or fuel changes have so far provided. Modern solar photovoltaic power also owes its existence to space. The first real customer for solar energy was the U.S. space program; applications such as the giant solar wings that power the International Space Station have continually driven improvements in solar cell performance, and NASA first demonstrated the value of the sun for powering communities on Earth by using solar in its own facilities. Promisingly, space-based solar power stations could overcome the inconvenient truth that wind and solar will never get us anywhere near zero emissions because their output is inherently intermittent and there is, so far, no environmentally acceptable way to store their power at a global scale, even for one night. Orbital solar power stations, on the other hand, would continually face the sun, beaming clean power back through targeted radiation to Earth day or night, regardless of weather. They would also be free from clouds and atmospheric interference and therefore operate with many times the efficiency of current solar technology. Moving solar power generation away from Earth—already possible but held back by the current steep costs of lifting the materials into space—would preserve land and cultural resources from the blight of huge panel farms and save landfills from the growing problem of discarded old solar panels. Sustainable energy advocates in the U.S. military and the Chinese government are actively pursuing space-based solar power, but just making solar cells damages the environment due to the caustic chemicals employed. Space technology offers the possibility of freeing the Earth’s fragile biosphere and culturally important sites from the otherwise unavoidable damage caused by manufacturing and mining. The U.S. start-up Made in Space is currently taking the first steps toward manufacturing in orbit. The company’s fiber-optic cable, produced by machinery on the International Space Station, is orders of magnitude more efficient than anything made on Earth, where the heavy gravity creates tiny flaws in the material. Made in Space and others are eventually planning to build large structures, such as solar power stations, in space. As these technologies develop, they will augment each other, bringing costs down dramatically; space manufacturing, for instance, slashes the cost of solar installations in space. Eventually, firms will be able to supply endeavors in space with materials from the moon and asteroids, avoiding the cost and environmental impact of lifting them into orbit. Mining the solar system comes with its own potential impacts, but extracting resources from distant and lifeless worlds is clearly preferable to the continued degradation of the Earth.

#### Warming causes extinction – outweighs all aff impacts

Miller-McDonald, 18 – (Samuel, Master of Environmental Management at Yale University studying energy politics and grassroots innovations in the US. 5-2-2018. "Extinction vs. Collapse." Resilience. https://www.resilience.org/stories/2018-05-02/extinction-vs-collapse/)

Climate twitter – the most fun twitter – has recently been reigniting the debate between human extinction and mere civilizational collapse, between doom and gloom, despair and (kind of) hope. It was sparked by an interview in The Guardian with acclaimed scientist Mayer Hillman. He argues that we’re probably doomed, and confronting the likelihood that we’re rushing toward collective death may be necessary to save us. The headline alone provoked a lot of reactions, many angered by the ostensible defeatism embedded in Hillman’s comments. His stated view represents one defined camp that is mostly convinced of looming human extinction. It stands in contrast to another group that believes human extinction is highly unlikely, maybe impossible, and certainly will not occur due to climate change in our lifetimes. Collapse maybe, but not extinction. Who’s more right? Let’s take a closer look. First, the question of human extinction is totally bounded by uncertainty. There’s uncertainty in climate data, uncertainty in models and projections, and even more uncertainty in the behavior of human systems. We don’t know how we’ll respond to the myriad impacts climate change is beginning to spark, and we don’t know how sensitive industrial civilization will be to those impacts. We don’t really know if humans are like other apex predators highly sensitive to ecological collapse, or are among the most adaptable mammals to ever walk the earth. One may be inclined to lean toward the latter given that humans have colonized every ecological niche on the planet except Antarctica. That bands of people can survive in and around deserts as well as the Arctic as well as equatorial rainforests speaks to the resilience of small social groups. It’s why The Road is so disturbingly plausible; there could be a scenario in which basically everything is dead but people, lingering in the last grey waste of the world. On the other hand, we’ve never lived outside of the very favorable conditions of the Holocene, and past civilizational and population collapses suggest humans are in fact quite sensitive to climatic shifts. Famed climate scientist James Hansen has discussed the possibility of “Venus syndrome,” for instance, which sits at the far end of worst case scenarios. While a frightening thought experiment, it is easily dismissed as it’s based on so many uncertainties and doesn’t carry the weight of anything near consensus. What’s more frightening than potentially implausible uncertainties are the currently existing certainties. For example: Ecology + The atmosphere has proven more sensitive to GHG emissions than predicted by mainstream science, and we have a high chance of hitting 2oC of warming this century. Could hit 1.5C in the 2020s. Worst-case warming scenarios are probably the most likely. + Massive marine death is happening far faster than anyone predicted and we could be on the edge of an anoxic event. + Ice melt is happening far faster than mainstream predictions. Greenland’s ice sheet is threatening to collapse and already slowing ocean currents, which too could collapse. + Which also means predictions of sea level rise have doubled for this century. + Industrial agriculture is driving massive habitat loss and extinction. The insect collapse – population declines of 75% to 80% have been seen in some areas – is something no one predicted would happen so fast, and portends an ecological sensitivity beyond our fears. This is causing an unexpected and unprecedented bird collapse (1/8 of bird species are threatened) in Europe. + Forests, vital carbon sinks, are proving sensitive to climate impacts. + We’re living in the 6th mass extinction event, losing potentially dozens of species per day. We don’t know how this will impact us and our ability to feed ourselves. Energy + Energy transition is essential to mitigating 1.5+C warming. Energy is the single greatest contributor to anthro-GHG. And, by some estimates, transition is happening 400 years too slowly to avoid catastrophic warming. + Incumbent energy industries (that is, oil & gas) dominate governments all over the world. We live in an oil oligarchy – a petrostate, but for the globe. Every facet of the global economy is dependent on fossil fuels, and every sector – from construction to supply chains to transport to electricity to extraction to agriculture and on and on – is built around FF consumption. There’s good reason to believe FF will remain subsidized by governments beholden to their interests even if they become less economically viable than renewables, and so will maintain their dominance. + We are living in history’s largest oil & gas boom. + Kilocalorie to kilocalorie, FF is extremely dense and extremely cheap. Despite reports about solar getting cheaper than FF in some places, non-hydro/-carbon renewables are still a tiny minority (~2%) of global energy consumption and will simply always, by their nature, be less dense kcal to kcal than FF, and so will always be calorically more expensive. + Energy demand probably has to decrease globally to avoid 1.5C, and it’s projected to dramatically increase. Getting people to consume less is practically impossible, and efficiency measures have almost always resulted in increased consumption. + We’re still setting FF emissions records. Politics + Conditions today resemble those prior to the 20th century’s world wars: extreme wealth inequality, rampant economic insecurity, growing fascist parties/sentiment, and precarious geopolitical relations, and the Thucydides trap suggests war between Western hegemons and a rising China could be likely. These two factors could disrupt any kind of global cooperation on decarbonization and, to the contrary, will probably mean increased emissions (the US military is one of the world’s single largest consumers/emitters of FF). + Neoliberal ideology is so thoroughly embedded in our academic, political, and cultural institutions, and so endemic to discourse today, that the idea of degrowth – probably necessary to avoid collapse – and solidarity economics isn’t even close to discussion, much less realization, and, for self-evident reasons, probably never will be. + Living in a neoliberal culture also means we’ve all been trained not to sacrifice for the common good. But solving climate change, like paying more to achieve energy transition or voluntarily consuming less, will all entail sacrificing for the greater good. Humans sometimes are great at that; but the market fundamentalist ideology that pervades all social, commercial, and even self relations today stands against acting for the common good or in collective action. + There’s basically no government in the world today taking climate change seriously. There are many governments posturing and pretending to take it seriously, but none have substantially committed to a full decarbonization of their economies. (Iceland may be an exception, but Iceland is about 24 times smaller than NYC, so…) + Twenty-five years of governments knowing about climate change has resulted in essentially nothing being done about it, no emissions reductions, no substantive moves to decarbonize the economy. Politics have proven too strong for common sense, and there’s no good reason to suspect this will change anytime soon. + Wealth inequality is embedded in our economy so thoroughly – and so indigenously to FF economies – that it will probably continue either causing perpetual strife, as it has so far, or eventually cement a permanent underclass ruled by a small elite, similar to agrarian serfdom. There is a prominent view in left politics that greater wealth equality, some kind of ecosocialism, is a necessary ingredient in averting the kind of ecological collapse the economy is currently driving, given that global FF capitalism by its nature consumes beyond carrying capacities. At least according to one Nasa-funded study, the combination of inequality and ecological collapse is a likely cause for civilizational collapse. Even with this perfect storm of issues, it’s impossible to know how likely extinction is, and it’s impossible to judge how likely or extensive civilizational collapse may be. We just can’t predict how human beings and human systems will respond to the shocks that are already underway. We can make some good guesses based on history, but they’re no more than guesses. Maybe there’s a miracle energy source lurking in a hangar somewhere waiting to accelerate non-carbon transition. Maybe there’s a swelling political movement brewing under the surface that will soon build a more just, ecologically sane order into the world. Community energy programs are one reason to retain a shred of optimism; but also they’re still a tiny fraction of energy production and they are not growing fast, but they could accelerate any moment. We just don’t know how fast energy transition can happen, and we just don’t know how fast the world could descend into climate-driven chaos – either by human strife or physical storms. What we do know is that, given everything above, we are living through a confluence of events that will shake the foundations of civilization, and jeopardize our capacity to sustain large populations of humans. There is enough certainty around these issues to justify being existentially alarmed. At this point, whether we go extinct or all but a thousand of us go extinct (again), maybe that shouldn’t make much difference. Maybe the destruction of a few billion or 5 billion people is morally equivalent to the destruction of all 7 billion of us, and so should provoke equal degrees of urgency. Maybe this debate about whether we’ll go completely extinct rather than just mostly extinct is absurd. Or maybe not. I don’t know. What I do know is that, regardless of the answer, there’s no excuse to stop fighting for a world that sustains life.

## 2

#### Interpretation: Appropriation is permanently taking property for exclusive use. Gorove 69:

Stephen Gorove, Interpreting Article II of the Outer Space Treaty, 37 Fordham L. Rev. 349 (1969). Available at: https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr/vol37/iss3/2

With respect to the concept of appropriation the basic question is what constitutes "appropriation," as used in the Treaty, especially in contradistinction to casual or temporary use. The term "appropriation" is used most frequently to denote the taking of property for one's own or exclusive use with a sense of permanence. Under such interpretation the establishment of a permanent settlement or the carrying out of commercial activities by nationals of a country on a celestial body may constitute national appropriation if the activities take place under the supreme authority (sovereignty) of the state. Short of this, if the state wields no exclusive authority or jurisdiction in relation to the area in question, the answer would seem to be in the negative, unless, the nationals also use their individual appropriations as cover-ups for their state's activities.5 In this connection, it should be emphasized that the word "appropriation" indicates a taking which involves something more than just a casual use. Thus a temporary occupation of a landing site or other area, just like the temporary or nonexclusive use of property, would not constitute appropriation. By the same token, any use involving consumption or taking with intention of keeping for one's own exclusive use would amount to appropriation.

#### Violation: space tourism is not appropriation.

#### Merely entering outer space is not appropriation – legal precedent proves.

Freeland ND [Stephen Freeland teaches commercial space law . “FLY ME TO THE MOON: HOW WILL INTERNATIONAL LAW COPE WITH COMMERCIAL SPACE TOURISM?” University of Melbourne. https://law.unimelb.edu.au/\_\_data/assets/pdf\_file/0009/1686276/Freeland.pdf. Accessed 1-13-2022]

All of this discussion does, however, beg a fundamental question — ‘what is outer space?’ Rather surprisingly to some, from a strictly legal perspective, there is as yet no clear definition of outer space. Indeed, it is unclear where (and how) air space ends and outer space begins. While outer space activities have continued to develop notwithstanding this uncertainty, there are important practical reasons why a clear legal distinction between ‘commercial aviation flights’ and ‘commercial space flights’ should now be properly determined.42 There is now an even greater imperative for this given the impending advent of space tourism activities, particularly those involving suborbital flights.

The underlying principles upon which air law and outer space law are respectively based are diametrically opposed. The international law of outer space does not allow for claims of sovereignty. The Outer Space Treaty provides that ‘[o]uter space … is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means’.43 In general terms, this fundamental principle confirms that outer space (including the Moon and other celestial bodies) is not to be subject to ownership rights and prohibits, inter alia, any sovereign or territorial claims to outer space.44

In the period following the launch of Sputnik 1, there were no significant protests by states claiming that the orbiting trajectory of that space object encroached upon their respective sovereign territories. As indicated by their (in)action and/or acquiescence, states had acknowledged that the fundamental legal character of outer space differed from that of the air space beneath it, and that states have the right to engage in activities in outer space without seeking the prior permission of any other state.

As such, almost immediately after humankind had begun its quest to explore and use outer space, a number of foundational principles of the international law of outer space were born, in particular the so-called ‘common interest’, ‘freedom’ and ‘non-appropriation’ principles. These principles were later incorporated into the terms of arts I45 and II of the Outer Space Treaty and therefore constitute binding conventional rules, codifying what already amounted to principles of customary international law. In essence, the community of states, including both of the major space faring states of the time, had accepted that outer space was to be regarded as being similar to a res communis omnium,46 encompassing these fundamental principles. As Judge Lachs of the ICJ observed:

The first instruments that man sent into outer space traversed the airspace of States and circled above them in outer space, yet the launching States sought no permission, nor did the other States protest. This is how the freedom of movement into outer space, and in it, came to be established and recognized as law within a remarkably short period of time.47

In essence, outer space is ‘free’ for use — tourist activities that take place in outer space are not subject to prior consent on the part of any sovereign state, although they will remain subject to the obligation of the ‘appropriate’ state to authorise and continually supervise such private commercial ventures, as specified in art VI of the Outer Space Treaty. Of course, any space tourist activities requiring a launch from Earth (or an ‘air launch’ such as with SpaceShipOne) and a return to Earth will also involve a ‘use’ of air space. In this respect, the law of air space may be relevant to the legal position.

#### Vote neg – three impacts:

#### Limits. Expanding the topic to anything that involves merely launching something into the atmosphere expands the topic into numerous new tech areas which undermines core neg prep. Space tourism doesn’t count as appropriation because you don’t stay there – you come back down to Earth.

#### Topic literature. Our definition has intent to define and exclude in the context of the OST, which is the core of all topic research and the only predictable source.

1. Predictability – no unifying core neg generics and the resolution is the only stasis point which ensures class

#### Drop the debater to preserve fairness and education – use competing interps – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation. No RVIs – they don’t get to win for following the rules.

## 3

**CP: Apply the maritime law of salvage to space debris.**

**Salter ’16 -** Alexander William Salter [Assistant Professor of Economics, Rawls College of Business, Texas Tech University], “SPACE DEBRIS: A LAW AND ECONOMICS ANALYSIS OF THE ORBITAL COMMONS,” 19 STAN. TECH. L. REV. 221 (2016). <https://www-cdn.law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/19-2-2-salter-final\_0.pdf> AT

Assuming a nation-state, even under current international space law, wished to supervise a space debris removal mission, how would it do so? A crucial question concerns the division of responsibility between the private and public sectors. Some impetus would almost certainly fall on the public sector. At a minimum, the public sector’s role involves further clarification of the legal framework —the “rules of the game” —for space debris at the national level. Using the United States as an example, clarifying the framework may be as simple as announcing that the law of salvage, as it exists in current maritime law, will apply to its own space debris. In other words, any private party under the jurisdiction of the United States that wishes to remove US space debris may do so and is entitled to whatever value is recovered thereby.

Companies such as Deep Space Industries and Planetary Resources are planning long-term asteroid mining projects, which will probably require space infrastructure for in-situ manufacturing or, at least, repairs. Because much debris contains valuable material, the chance to access such material without bearing the costs ordinarily associated with bringing it into orbit can be a significant incentive. Building this infrastructure would involve moving existing debris to a parking orbit rather than destroying it, of course. Most important, those companies would be able to remove clearly identifiable US space debris only, and the US government would be liable for any accidents caused by removal operations that damage other nations’ space objects.

**The cp solves the aff WAY better and avoids the NB.**

David **Giordano, 21**- ("Space Debris: Another Frontier in the Commercialization of Space," Columbia Journal of Transnational Law, 11-31-2021, 1-1-2022https://www.jtl.columbia.edu/bulletin-blog/space-debris-another-frontier-in-the-commercialization-of-space)//AW

In the Summer of 2021, we got a glimpse of what some hope will be commonplace in the future: space tourism. While it might be billionaires and their associates for now, if this technology is to follow the arc of many other advancements previously reserved for the rich (cell phones and air travel, for example), eventually there may come a time in the future where space tourism is a realistic financial goal for those of more restricted means. As humanity broaches this great commercial frontier, it will have to clear the great and neglected hurdle of “space junk,” and current trends appear to indicate that industry will shape not only the technology designed to solve the problem, but the policy as well. As satellites and other projectiles blast into orbit, upon collision they can disintegrate into shards, sometimes just centimeters wide, that remain in orbit, risking further collision. Hollywood captured the potential perils of fairly large pieces of space debris in the opening minutes of the 2013 film Gravity, where space junk threatens the lives of astronauts on a mission. Outside the realms of fictional space-thrillers, even the smallest pieces of space junk can present real danger. In 2016, a tiny piece of space junk, believed to be a paint chip or a piece of metal no more than a few thousandths of a millimeter across, cracked the window of the International Space Station. In May 2021, a piece of space debris punctured the robotic arm of the International Space Station. This is seriously concerning, as, according to the European Space Agency, there are 670,000 pieces of space debris larger than 1cm and 170,000,000 between 1mm and 1cm in width. Unfortunately, public action and policy struggles to keep up with these risks. International law affords little clarity on the problem, as its control is a novel, emerging field with many technical tracking and removal challenges. None of the existing space treaties directly tackle the issue, rendering responsibility for it ambiguous. Absent such responsibility, legal incentives are non-existent. Guidelines are occasionally issued by international governing bodies, but provide little legal significance and are more targeted at the practicalities of tracking and removal. The nation best positioned to notify space actors of collision risks is the United States, and the burden of that task currently falls on the Department of Defense. However, the Trump administration issued a directive in 2018, shifting the responsibility from the DoD to the Department of Commerce, and the transition has yet to materialize, leaving DoD struggling to keep pace with increasing commercial activity. In the face of public paralysis, addressing the problem through industry looks more and more attractive. This has led some to call for a new legal order that still leaves room for government, but reframes who the rules exist to serve. Rather than our current, rudimentary treaty regime designed to prevent international conflict, commentators have called for an additional regime resembling maritime law that preserves the interests of a more diverse set of stakeholders, including those in the future that can bring technology and interests to space that may not yet exist. These commentators shun the common conception that space regulation should resemble air-traffic control, which is suited to a narrower set of uses (transport). Under such a “maritime” regime, the light touch of central regulatory bodies, and perhaps their non-existence, is preferred, just as it has been on the seas. This way, individual nations have a degree of flexibility in instituting controls they see fit while leaving room for industry to address problems and introduce new uses for space. Furthermore, governments seem ready and willing to construct the legal and incentive framework in concert with such private action. In a joint statement this summer, G7 members expressed openness to resolving the technical aspects of the debris problem with private institutions, and there is some promising progress. Apple co-founder Steve Wozniak signaled his plans to address the problem through a new company with a telling name: Privateer Space. Astroscale, a UK-based company, successfully launched a pair of satellites in the Spring of 2021 that will remove certain space debris from orbit. Astroscale also stated their desire to work with governments and international governing bodies to craft policy with private efforts to control the problem top of mind. In light of public policy’s silence on space debris, the initiative of actors like Astroscale involving themselves in policy may be advised, as it could promote further private investment in technology for space debris removal. A popular policy recommendation among experts is the establishment of public-private partnerships, and Astroscale has entered several such agreements including with Japan and the European Space Agency. Other actors include ClearSpace, OneWeb, and D-Orbit. Some may want to push back against further private involvement. The congestion of space is, in part, industry’s fault, and if we conceptualize orbital space as a common resource, it might be right to fear the effects of the Tragedy of the Commons. Critics may seek to bolster international treaties, give legal teeth to the guidelines occasionally issued by the UN, and preserve the public posture of the heavens. These may be welcome adjustments, but unlike a pond that industry overfishes or a well that industry dries up, here industry is working to add more fish and water. Moreover, governments stand to benefit from this private decluttering, as well, as they are expected to be major customers of some of these private actors. As for the public posture, space has long been a commercial place. Telecommunications companies and government contractors historically depend on space. As the number of commercial satellites set to launch skyrockets, it seems natural to craft policies that are responsive to their interests and provide incentives to remedy issues created in the course of spacefaring, such as space debris. In light of the long silence of international law on such issues and the demonstrated motivation by private actors, space debris represents the latest frontier in the abdication of space from the public concern to the private.

## 4

#### CP Text: All states except the US should ban space tourism.

#### Chinese investments are catching up and the US needs private companies to maintain space dominance – Chinese space dominance risks extinction. Autry and Kwast 19:

Greg Autry, Steve Kwast {Greg Autry is a clinical professor of space leadership, policy, and business at Arizona State University’s Thunderbird School of Global Management. He served on the 2016 NASA transition team and as the White House liaison at NASA in 2017. He is the chair of the Safety Working Group for the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration’s Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee. Steve Kwast is a Lieutenant General and commander of Recruiting, Training, Educating and Development for the Air Force. He is an astronautical engineer and Harvard Fellow in Public Policy., }, 19 - ("America Is Losing the Second Space Race to China," Foreign Policy, 8-22-2019, https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/08/22/america-is-losing-the-second-space-race-to-china/)//marlborough-wr/

The current U.S. space defense strategy is inadequate and on a path to failure. President Donald Trump’s vision for a Space Force is big enough. As he said on [June 18](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-meeting-national-space-council-signing-space-policy-directive-3/), “It is not enough to merely have an American presence in space. We must have American dominance in space.” But the Air Force is not matching this vision. Instead, the leadership is currently focused on incremental improvements to existing equipment and organizational structures. Dominating the vast and dynamic environment of space will require revolutionary capabilities and resources far deeper than traditional Department of Defense thinking can fund, manage, or even conceive of. Success depends on a much more active partnership with the commercial space industry— and its disruptive capabilities. U.S. military space planners are preparing to repeat a conflict they imagined back in the 1980s, which never actually occurred, against a vanished Soviet empire. Meanwhile, China is executing a winning strategy in the world of today. It is burning hard toward domination of the future space markets that will define the next century. They are planning infrastructure in space that will control 21st-century telecommunications, energy, transportation, and manufacturing. In doing so, they will acquire trillion-dollar revenues as well as the deep capabilities that come from continuous operational experience in space. This will deliver space dominance and global hegemony to China’s authoritarian rulers. Despite the fact that many in the policy and intelligence communities understand exactly what China is doing and have been trying to alert leadership, Air Force leadership has convinced the White House to fund only a slightly better satellite command with the same leadership, while sticking a new label onto their outmoded thinking. A U.S. Space Force or Corps with a satellite command will never fulfill Trump’s call to dominate space. Air Force leadership is demonstrating the same hubris that Gen. George Custer used in convincing Congress, over President Ulysses S. Grant’s better experience intuition, that he could overtake the Black Hills with repeating rifles and artillery. That strategy of technological overconfidence inflamed conflict rather than subduing it, and the 7th Cavalry were wiped out at the Battle of the Little Bighorn. The West was actually won by the settlers, ranchers, miners, and railroad barons who were able to convert the wealth of the territory itself into the means of holding it. They laid the groundwork that made the 20th century the American Century and delivered freedom to millions of people in Europe and Asia. Of course, they also trampled the indigenous people of the American West in their wake—but empty space comes with no such bloody cost. The very emptiness and wealth of this new, if not quite final, frontier, however, means that competition for resources and strategic locations in cislunar space (between the Earth and moon) will be intense over the next two decades. The outcome of this competition will determine the fate of humanity in the next century. China’s impending dominance will neutralize U.S. geopolitical power by allowing Beijing to control global information flows from the high ground of space. Imagine a school in Bolivia or a farmer in Kenya choosing between paying for a U.S. satellite internet or image provider or receiving those services for free as a “gift of the Chinese people.” It will be of little concern to global consumers that the news they receive is slanted or that searches for “free speech” link to articles about corruption in Western democracies. Nor will they care if concentration camps in Tibet and the Uighur areas of western China are obscured, or if U.S. military action is presented as tyranny and Chinese expansion is described as peacekeeping or liberation. China’s aggressive investment in space solar power will allow it to provide cheap, clean power to the world, displacing U.S. energy firms while placing a second yoke around the developing world. Significantly, such orbital power stations have dual use potential and, if properly designed, could serve as powerful offensive weapons platforms. China’s first step in this process is to conquer the growing small space launch market. Beijing is providing nominally commercial firms with government-manufactured, mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles they can use to dump launch services on the market below cost. These start-ups are already [undercutting](https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/04/02/beijing-is-taking-the-final-frontier-space-china/) U.S. pricing by 80 percent. Based on its previous success in using dumping to take out U.S. developed industries such as solar power modules and drones, China will quickly move upstream to attack the leading U.S. launch providers and secure a global commercial monopoly. Owning the launch market will give them an unsurmountable advantage against U.S. competitors in satellite internet, imaging, and power. The United States can still build a strategy to win. At this moment, it holds the competitive advantage in every critical space technology and has the finest set of commercial space firms in the world. It has pockets of innovative military thinkers within groups like the [Defense Innovation Unit](https://www.diu.mil/news-events), under Mike Griffin, the Pentagon’s top research and development official. If the United States simply protects the intellectual property its creative minds unleash and defend its truly free markets from strategic mercantilist attack, it will not lose this new space race. The United States has done this before. It beat Germany to the nuclear bomb, it beat the Soviet Union to the nuclear triad, and it won the first space race. None of those victories was achieved by embracing the existing bureaucracy. Each of them depended on the president of the day following the only proven path to victory in a technological domain: establish a small team with a positively disruptive mindset and empower that team to investigate a wide range of new concepts, work with emerging technologies, and test innovative strategies. Today that means giving a dedicated Space Force the freedom to easily partner with commercial firms and leverage the private capital in building sustainable infrastructure that actually reduces the likelihood of conflict while securing a better economic future for the nation and the world.

## Case

#### Plan flaw – companies will just say that they’re appropriating for the sake of mining or something that isn’t space tourism

#### You don’t need to appropriate anything to engage in space tourism which is why people are doing it now

1. Their Cooper card repeatedly says space tourism violates the spirit but not the letter of the treaty – proves space tourism isn’t appropriation.
2. Right now, this costs an exorbitant amount of money but their ev predicts 13000 flights a year by 2021 – last year, there were three.
3. Climate innov is the biggest internal link to all their impacts which is prohibitively expensive
4. Private companies non UQs the advantage bc they lower the cost of space launches ocer time. **c/a thiessen**
5. **NOTHING they said is unique to space tourism – they solve nothing, they’re just talking about rocket launches in general**
6. **Regulations solve for thousands of space tourism flights**

#### On ozone

You don’t solve – you only ban for the sake of space tourism, not other forms of appropriation – climate innovation is the internal link

#### On space debris

#### Actual space weapons thump

Wolverton 19 [Mark Wolverton is a science journalist, author, and 2016-17 Knight-MIT Science Journalism Fellow. He writes for various national and international publications including WIRED, Nature, Undark, Scientific American, and Air & Space Smithsonian. He has also worked with the NASA Ames History Project, Argonne National Laboratory, the Franklin Institute, and the NASA ISS Science Office. 7/9. "The Race for Space Weapons Speeds Up." https://www.asme.org/topics-resources/content/the-race-for-space-weapons-speeds-up]

Both antiballistic missiles and co-orbiting antisatellite weapons use kinetic attacks that apply physical force to disable or destroy a satellite. They are far from the only options in the counter-space arsenal. Nonkinetic approaches were studied intensively since the early 1960’s and then revived during President Ronald Reagan’s Strategic Defense Initiative in the 1980s. They seek to disable or destroy vital components or sensors with lasers, particle beams, or high-powered microwaves, either from space or ground stations. Such methods are difficult, expensive, and require great amounts of power, but the United States and other nations have tested them. A more subtle—and perhaps more deniable—nonkinetic approach might involve electronic warfare. This might range from such time-honored techniques as jamming or spoofing an adversary’s satellite communications to cyberwarfare that targets computer systems that control satellites or process their data.

#### No debris cascades—This ev answers all aff warrants

Fange 2017 (Daniel Von Fange, Web Application Engineer, Founder and Owner of LeanCoder, Full Stack, Polyglot Web Developer, “Kessler Syndrome is Over Hyped”, 5/21/2017, http://braino.org/essays/kessler\_syndrome\_is\_over\_hyped/)

Kessler Syndrome is overhyped. A chorus of online commenters great any news of upcoming low earth orbit satellites with worry that humanity will to lose access to space. I now think they are wrong.

What is Kessler Syndrome?

Here’s the popular view on Kessler Syndrome. Every once in a while, a piece of junk in space hits a satellite. This single impact destroys the satellite, and breaks off several thousand additional pieces. These new pieces now fly around space looking for other satellites to hit, and so exponentially multiply themselves over time, like a nuclear reaction, until a sphere of man-made debris surrounds the earth, and humanity no longer has access to space nor the benefits of satellites.

It is a dark picture.

Is Kessler Syndrome likely to happen?

I had to stop everything and spend an afternoon doing back-of-the-napkin math to know how big the threat is. To estimate, we need to know where the stuff in space is, how much mass is there, and how long it would take to deorbit.

The orbital area around earth can be broken down into four regions.

Low LEO - Up to about 400km. Things that orbit here burn up in the earth’s atmosphere quickly - between a few months to two years. The space station operates at the high end of this range. It loses about a kilometer of altitude a month and if not pushed higher every few months, would soon burn up. For all practical purposes, Low LEO doesn’t matter for Kessler Syndrome. If Low LEO was ever full of space junk, we’d just wait a year and a half, and the problem would be over.

High LEO - 400km to 2000km. This where most heavy satellites and most space junk orbits. The air is thin enough here that satellites only go down slowly, and they have a much farther distance to fall. It can take 50 years for stuff here to get down. This is where Kessler Syndrome could be an issue.

Mid Orbit - GPS satellites and other navigation satellites travel here in lonely, long lives. The volume of space is so huge, and the number of satellites so few, that we don’t need to worry about Kessler here.

GEO - If you put a satellite far enough out from earth, the speed that the satellite travels around the earth will match the speed of the surface of the earth rotating under it. From the ground, the satellite will appear to hang motionless. Usually the geostationary orbit is used by big weather satellites and big TV broadcasting satellites. (This apparent motionlessness is why satellite TV dishes can be mounted pointing in a fixed direction. You can find approximate south just by looking around at the dishes in your northern hemisphere neighborhood.) For Kessler purposes, GEO orbit is roughly a ring 384,400 km around. However, all the satellites here are moving the same direction at the same speed - debris doesn’t get free velocity from the speed of the satellites. Also, it’s quite expensive to get a satellite here, and so there aren’t many, only about one satellite per 1000km of the ring. Kessler is not a problem here.

How bad could Kessler Syndrome in High LEO be?

Let’s imagine a worst case scenario.

An evil alien intelligence chops up everything in High LEO, turning it into 1cm cubes of death orbiting at 1000km, spread as evenly across the surface of this sphere as orbital mechanics would allow. Is humanity cut off from space?

I’m guessing the world has launched about 10,000 tons of satellites total. For guessing purposes, I’ll assume 2,500 tons of satellites and junk currently in High LEO. If satellites are made of aluminum, with a density of 2.70 g/cm3, then that’s 839,985,870 1cm cubes. A sphere for an orbit of 1,000km has a surface area of 682,752,000 square KM. So there would be one cube of junk per .81 square KM. If a rocket traveled through that, its odds of hitting that cube are tiny - less than 1 in 10,000.

So even in the worst case, we don’t lose access to space.

Now though you can travel through the debris, you couldn’t keep a satellite alive for long in this orbit of death. Kessler Syndrome at its worst just prevents us from putting satellites in certain orbits.

In real life, there’s a lot of factors that make Kessler syndrome even less of a problem than our worst case though experiment.

* Debris would be spread over a volume of space, not a single orbital surface, making collisions orders of magnitudes less likely.
* Most impact debris will have a slower orbital velocity than either of its original pieces - this makes it deorbit much sooner.
* Any collision will create large and small objects. Small objects are much more affected by atmospheric drag and deorbit faster, even in a few months from high LEO. Larger objects can be tracked by earth based radar and avoided.
* The planned big new constellations are not in High LEO, but in Low LEO for faster communications with the earth. They aren’t an issue for Kessler.
* Most importantly, all new satellite launches since the 1990’s are required to include a plan to get rid of the satellite at the end of its useful life (usually by deorbiting)

So the realistic worst case is that insurance premiums on satellites go up a bit. Given the current trend toward much smaller, cheaper micro satellites, this wouldn’t even have a huge effect.

I’m removing Kessler Syndrome from my list of things to worry about.

#### The risk is literally zero

Larry Getlen 19, Veteran Journalist, Editor, and Author, Frequent Contributor to the New York Post, Writer for Esquire, New York Magazine, Adweek, “Humans Are Probably Safe From A Catastrophic Asteroid Strike — For Now”, 6/11/2019, https://nypost.com/2019/06/11/humans-are-probably-safe-from-a-catastrophic-asteroid-strike-for-now/

The good news, though, is that the odds of such an object hitting Earth in our lifetimes is close to zero.

The Torino Scale considers the size of NEOs and the chances of them hitting Earth over the next hundred years to place the possible danger on a scale from 1 to 10.

At present, the upcoming century looks danger-free.

“There’s currently no known object with a Torino rating even as high as 1,” May writes. “Everything we know about is either too small to cause any damage, or there’s zero chance it will collide with Earth in the next hundred years.”

### Solvency

#### At the very least the aff has ZERO solvency - space tourism isn’t considered appropriation under the OST bc it’s considered a free use of space – banning appropriation doesn’t affect tourism

Space tourism is we go up and come back down. How is that more appropriation than satellites?

### Turns

#### Turn - private space exploration is key to solve all of the aff’s impacts. Rumende 21:

Thevnin Rumende {mechanical engineering junior and Community Voices columnist, }, 21 - ("Opinion: Critics are overlooking the technological benefits of the billionaire space race," Shorthorn, 9-14-2021, https://www.theshorthorn.com/opinion/opinion-critics-are-overlooking-the-technological-benefits-of-the-billionaire-space-race/article\_4cd73e2e-1512-11ec-874b-bb7e3009729b.html)//marlborough-wr/

There has been no shortage of opinion surrounding what has been derisively dubbed by some as the “pointless billionaire space race.” Pundits have not hesitated to express their ire toward what they view as a new pet project for billionaires. Despite the controversy that accompanies the uber-wealthy’s interest in the private space industry, this development and its effects deserve to be treated with more nuance. When discussing the topic of billionaires in space, the hatred and distrust toward these individuals often trumps any positive technological advancements their companies have achieved on the path to civilian space flight. Simply labeling their endeavors in commercial space flight “a rich person’s ‘joyride’” undercuts the sheer immensity of safely ferrying a person to and from the edge of space, and in the case of SpaceX, a private space manufacturer, having docked and undocked with the international space station in low-Earth orbit. While viewing the success of the current era of space transportation, one might overlook the fact that of the 355 astronauts who flew aboard NASA’s space shuttles from 1981 to 2011, 14 were killed. Simply put, many things can and have gone wrong when attempting to enter space, and any step taken closer to a safer launch system benefits all of humanity. However, for some people, they view the contest of private space companies as “a tragically wasteful ego contest,” a distraction from more pressing issues such as proliferating climate catastrophes, inequality, lack of health care and insufficient housing. This view is shortsighted as it fails to recognize the key role space is already playing in combating a host of the aforementioned crises. According to the World Economic Forum, space technology is helping end hunger by imaging vast swathes of agricultural land and by helping produce agricultural indexes, along with ensuring people access to clean water through the monitoring of reservoirs via satellite images. Cheaper and more efficient space launch systems mean deploying even more satellites to help better address these problems. The microgravity environment of space could potentially allow the fabrication of human organs using a 3D bioprinter. With the demand for yearly organ transplants dwarfing the supply, manufacturing organs in space would help address the overwhelming needs of medical patients. The most common contention leveled against these “space billionaires” is that the wealth they accumulate through their endeavors will only serve to enrich them, widening the gap between the haves and the have nots. While these concerns are natural, they often overlook technology’s profound ability to democratize knowledge and reshape society for the better. The private space industry has already significantly reduced the capital investment necessary to embark on projects such as internet satellite constellations. Satellite internet providers have long promised the ability to provide secure internet connectivity to the remaining 3.7 billion unconnected people on the earth, but only now is it attainable. With current technology, nearly a third of the human population could access secure financial accounts and the vast library of human knowledge, once restricted to more developed nations, in under a decade. The significance of these two effects alone toward the advancement of humanity, which could be further advanced through private interests in space, would be incalculable. Like the creation of the internet and the opening of the western frontier in the U.S., the impact that the opening of space will have on the course of humanity is unforeseeable. But the impact is sure to be monumental. We shouldn’t let our distaste of certain billionaires cloud our view of the path that lies ahead. Just as the robber barons of yesteryear played a large role in shaping the nation but are now long forgotten, so too will Jeff Bezos, Elon Musk and Sir Richard Branson.

#### Private space travel helps solve global warming.

Robin George **Andrews, 19** - ("Can Spaceflight Save the Planet?," Scientific American, 9-6-2019, 12-16-2021https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/can-spaceflight-save-the-planet/)//AW

The planet is warming, the oceans are acidifying, the Amazon is burning down, and plastic is snowing on the Arctic. Humanity’s environmental devastation is so severe, experts say, that a global-scale ecological catastrophe is already underway. Even those holding sunnier views would be hard-pressed to deny that our global footprint is presently less a light touch and more a boot stamping on Earth’s face. Against this dark background, one might ask if spending lavish sums to send humans to other worlds is a foolhardy distraction—or a cynical hedge against life’s downward spiral on this one. Spaceflight, however, has the potential to be more than just a planetary escape hatch for eccentric billionaires. Whether in today’s Earth-orbiting spacecraft or the outposts that may someday be built on the moon and Mars, to exist beyond Earth, we must somehow replicate all of our planet’s life-giving essentials off-world. Technologies that recycle practically everything—that make water, air and food as renewable and self-sustaining as possible—are essential for current and future human spaceflight. Then again, we already know how we are jeopardizing the planet and what needs to be done about it. “We have almost all of the tools we need to live sustainably right here, right now,” says Kate Marvel, a climate scientist at Columbia University and NASA. “Our failure to address climate change is not just because we’re interested in space.” Similarly, spaceflight alone cannot save Earth, but that does not mean it solely aids and abets naive dreams of leaving our planet behind. ADVERTISEMENT TIN CAN AGRICULTURE Astronauts need technological innovations to survive in space, but in the past, those solutions have been somewhat temporary—think of NASA’s crewed Apollo missions to the moon, which maxed out at just more than 12 days in duration. Change is afoot: the Trump administration now wants boots on the moon by 2024. Luke Roberson, senior principal investigator for flight research at NASA’s Kennedy Space Center, says the agency is pursuing sustainable architecture on the lunar surface as early as 2028—the sort requiring technology to provide long-term, regenerating caches of food, air and water. Some of this tech may not remain in space. After all, a surprising number of inventions funded or designed by space agencies have been transferred to the commercial sector. These include several ecology-focused projects, including one to make sustainable oil and another that uses LED color combinations, or “light recipes,” to trigger different styles of crop growth. Growing crops in space is anything but trivial. But, says Gioia Massa, a plant scientist at NASA, technologies such as specialized lighting and advanced sensors are of vital importance onboard the International Space Station (ISS), where experiments such as the Veggie system showcase energy-efficient food production. The system’s use of LEDs for plant growth was a concept conceived by NASA-funded research in the 1980s. That tech, Massa says, is now saving a lot of energy for indoor agriculture. NASA has also worked with Florikan, a company that developed a fertilizer whose polymer coating allows for a controlled, slow release of nutrients. It is designed to reduce the runoff of fertilizer into the environment, which can cause ecological havoc. This fertilizer is being used in space, Massa says, and it has demonstrated its ability to enhance plant growth on the ISS. These products, tweaked for continued use in space, are also being marketed to commercial greenhouse owners. Some eco-friendly innovations result from NASA simply trying to be environmentally responsible, says Daniel Lockney, who oversees the agency’s technology transfer efforts. Building spacefaring equipment on Earth is a dirty business, with fuels, paints, solvents and other toxic materials threatening to infiltrate the natural environment. That is why NASA has developed emulsified zero-valent iron (EZVI), a material that adheres to chlorinated solvents in groundwater. When dirty launchpads are scrubbed with potent chemicals, EZVI helps clean them up afterward. Beyond the launchpad, the compound has entered routine use at chemical-manufacturing plants and severely polluted Superfund sites across the country. ADVERTISEMENT A supply of potable water is also paramount for both spacefarers and surface dwellers. And water pollution happens to contribute to the deaths of millions every year, so any tech that could help nix that tragedy would be welcome. Lockney points to the microbial check valve as a solid example of how NASA can assuage this issue. Originally developed for the agency’s fleet of space shuttles, a more advanced version of the system now passively stops harmful microbes in wastewater from swimming back into potable-water reservoirs onboard the ISS. Other versions are at work right here on Earth, keeping water clean with minimal energy in areas with dirty water and without electricity access, as well as in dentists’ offices. (Remember the liquid you swish around in your mouth after a dental examination? That water is often purified by the very same valve to minimize the risk of oral infections.) Roberson and Melanie Pickett, a postdoctoral research fellow at NASA, both work on water-purification systems for spaceflight, including on the ISS. Wastewater there is typically broken down with chemical concoctions. “But that chemistry isn’t sustainable,” Roberson says, because it requires regular refills via resupply missions from Earth. He and Pickett are now designing systems harnessing plants and microbes to recycle waste more sustainably, and these approaches may eventually help redesign toilets and septic tanks on Earth. Sign up for Scientific American’s free newsletters. Sign Up As is the case for water, it is far from easy to make breathable air a limitless resource in space. Up on the ISS, oxygen is traditionally extracted from water that has to be brought from Earth, which is costly and wasteful. As of 2018, the European Space Agency (ESA) is changing that status quo with its new Advanced Closed Loop System, which scrubs the Space Station’s environs of carbon dioxide and, in the process, siphons out oxygen to replenish supplies of breathable air while saving water at the same time. Although on a far larger scale and with somewhat different operational requirements, carbon-capture systems are probably needed on Earth as part of a larger mix to slow down the pace of climate change. Technology developed for use in orbit may inform plans to do the same on our planet. ADVERTISEMENT SERENDIPITOUS SPIN-OFFS Not leaving anything to waste is the underlying principle of many of these innovations. In space, Massa says, waste must be seen as a resource, not something to mindlessly discard. That is part and parcel of so-called closed-loop systems: if such a system is perfect, all its components are recycled, and nothing is ejected from it as waste. Just think of sealed terraria, in which miniature plant ecosystems thrive by themselves for decades with no outside intervention. The Micro Ecological Life Support System Alternative (MELiSSA) project strongly abides by that ideal. Featuring a constantly tweaked “pilot plant” test facility in Barcelona, the target of this ESA-led endeavor is to create a self-sustaining, biologically driven closed-loop life-support system. The pilot plant, whose compartments attempt to degrade waste and use photosynthesis to clean the air, provide oxygen and produce food, employs a cohort of rats as astronaut stand-ins to see how effective the system could be at sustaining a crew for months at a time. Several generations of rats have been used, and so far, there have been zero casualties. Some MELiSSA-derived experiments, such as the photosynthesis-powered oxygen- and edible-biomass-making ARTEMISS, are being flown up to the ISS to see how they fare. The project, started in 1989, is intended to mature into a system capable of sustaining a human crew on a long-duration interplanetary voyage by the mid-2020s. In the meantime, its spin-offs are already showing promise, says Christophe Lasseur, head of MELiSSA at ESA. For instance, its urine-recycling tech could eventually be deployed in remote places and disaster sites to provide potable water in a cost-effective manner, with minimal environmental impact, obviating the need for porting in supplies of clean water from far afield. Lofty ideals are one thing, but the proof, as always, is in the pudding. Not all innovative ideas may become a reality, and for those that do, their development and transference from space to Earth hardly happen overnight. Roberson explains that his own inventions take, on average, seven to 10 years to be commercialized. MELiSSA is considered to be a 50-year effort. ADVERTISEMENT Patience is certainly a virtue. “There’s a serendipity to it,” Lockney says. “Just like we know that water is wet, we know that investment in these new missions will yield inventions that are of benefit to all of humankind.” If anything, these innovations underline why investment in basic R&D can be so worthwhile. “The really cool thing about science is that you really don’t know what’s going to come out of it,” Marvel says. After all, no one thought the World Wide Web would come out of the same journey that led to the Large Hadron Collider. Lengthy engineering timescales and unpredictability aside, spaceflight has already resulted in a range of effective (if not game-changing) eco-friendly by-products