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#### Commercial space sectors are promoting innovation now

Brian Weeden 15, technical adviser for the Secure World Foundation, 10-5-2015, "Op-ed," SpaceNews, https://spacenews.com/op-ed-american-leadership-in-space-2-0/

Of all the countries in the world, the United States is best placed to be able to fully leverage the benefits from a robust commercial space sector. It was the birthplace of the computer revolution, and is the global leader in information technology. It has a strong legal system for protecting intellectual property rights while simultaneously encouraging robust competition. It is the U.S. commercial space industry, not government space programs, that will truly play to America’s strengths in a more competitive environment. There are agencies within the U.S. government that have already embraced this approach. One standout is the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA). Under the leadership of Robert Cardillo, NGA is implementing a new strategy to find and exploit the innovations of the private sector, and increase the data and products it releases publicly. NGA understands that the only way it can succeed in a more complex and dynamic world is by staying ahead of technology trends, which in turn means embracing private-sector innovation. The rest of the U.S. government should follow NGA’s lead and continue to implement the elements of the Obama administration’s 2010 National Space Policy that encourage, foster and leverage the commercial space revolution. The focus should be on putting in place policies that will enable the U.S. commercial sector to innovate even faster, ensuring that it will continue to outpace foreign competition and foreign government programs. Where necessary, the U.S. government should be funding basic research and development, incentivizing industrial R&D, and helping new technologies move through the “valley of death” from basic research toward commercialization. It should be looking at how commercial products and services can complement, or even replace, government-only programs. And at the same time it should be watching out for the public good and putting in place minimal oversight functions to ensure a sustainable, reliable and predictable space environment that allows private investment to flourish.

#### Strong commercial space catalyzes tech innovation – progress at the margins and spinoff tech change global information networks

Joshua Hampson 2017, Security Studies Fellow at the Niskanen Center, 1-25-2017, “The Future of Space Commercialization”, Niskanen Center, https://republicans-science.house.gov/sites/republicans.science.house.gov/files/documents/TheFutureofSpaceCommercializationFinal.pdf

Innovation is generally hard to predict; some new technologies seem to come out of nowhere and others only take off when paired with a new application. It is difficult to predict the future, but it is reasonable to expect that a growing space economy would open opportunities for technological and organizational innovation. In terms of technology, the difficult environment of outer space helps incentivize progress along the margins. Because each object launched into orbit costs a significant amount of money—at the moment between $27,000 and $43,000 per pound, though that will likely drop in the future —each 19 reduction in payload size saves money or means more can be launched. At the same time, the ability to fit more capability into a smaller satellite opens outer space to actors that previously were priced out of the market. This is one of the reasons why small, affordable satellites are increasingly pursued by companies or organizations that cannot afford to launch larger traditional satellites. These small 20 satellites also provide non-traditional launchers, such as engineering students or prototypers, the opportunity to learn about satellite production and test new technologies before working on a full-sized satellite. That expansion of developers, experimenters, and testers cannot but help increase innovation opportunities. Technological developments from outer space have been applied to terrestrial life since the earliest days of space exploration. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) maintains a website that lists technologies that have spun off from such research projects. Lightweight 21 nanotubes, useful in protecting astronauts during space exploration, are now being tested for applications in emergency response gear and electrical insulation. The need for certainty about the resiliency of materials used in space led to the development of an analytics tool useful across a range of industries. Temper foam, the material used in memory-foam pillows, was developed for NASA for seat covers. As more companies pursue their own space goals, more innovations will likely come from the commercial sector. Outer space is not just a catalyst for technological development. Satellite constellations and their unique line-of-sight vantage point can provide new perspectives to old industries. Deploying satellites into low-Earth orbit, as Facebook wants to do, can connect large, previously-unreached swathes of 22 humanity to the Internet. Remote sensing technology could change how whole industries operate, such as crop monitoring, herd management, crisis response, and land evaluation, among others. 23 While satellites cannot provide all essential information for some of these industries, they can fill in some useful gaps and work as part of a wider system of tools. Space infrastructure, in helping to change how people connect and perceive Earth, could help spark innovations on the ground as well. These innovations, changes to global networks, and new opportunities could lead to wider economic growth.

#### Tech innovation solves every existential threat – cumulative extinction events outweigh the aff

Dylan **Matthews 18**. Co-founder of Vox, citing Nick Beckstead @ Rutgers University. 10-26-2018. "How to help people millions of years from now." Vox. https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/26/18023366/far-future-effective-altruism-existential-risk-doing-good

If you care about improving human lives, you should overwhelmingly care about those quadrillions of lives rather than the comparatively small number of people alive today. The 7.6 billion people now living, after all, amount to less than 0.003 percent of the population that will live in the future. It’s reasonable to suggest that those quadrillions of future people have, accordingly, hundreds of thousands of times more moral weight than those of us living here today do. That’s the basic argument behind Nick Beckstead’s 2013 Rutgers philosophy dissertation, “On the overwhelming importance of shaping the far future.” It’s a glorious mindfuck of a thesis, not least because Beckstead shows very convincingly that this is a conclusion any plausible moral view would reach. It’s not just something that weird utilitarians have to deal with. And Beckstead, to his considerable credit, walks the walk on this. He works at the Open Philanthropy Project on grants relating to the far future and runs a charitable fund for donors who want to prioritize the far future. And arguments from him and others have turned “long-termism” into a very vibrant, important strand of the effective altruism community. But what does prioritizing the far future even mean? The most literal thing it could mean is preventing human extinction, to ensure that the species persists as long as possible. For the long-term-focused effective altruists I know, that typically means identifying concrete threats to humanity’s continued existence — like unfriendly artificial intelligence, or a pandemic, or global warming/out of control geoengineering — and engaging in activities to prevent that specific eventuality. But in a set of slides he made in 2013, Beckstead makes a compelling case that while that’s certainly part of what caring about the far future entails, approaches that address specific threats to humanity (which he calls “targeted” approaches to the far future) have to complement “broad” approaches, where instead of trying to predict what’s going to kill us all, you just generally try to keep civilization running as best it can, so that it is, as a whole, well-equipped to deal with potential extinction events in the future, not just in 2030 or 2040 but in 3500 or 95000 or even 37 million. In other words, caring about the far future doesn’t mean just paying attention to low-probability risks of total annihilation; it also means acting on pressing needs now. For example: We’re going to be better prepared to prevent extinction from AI or a supervirus or global warming if society as a whole makes a lot of scientific progress. And a significant bottleneck there is that the vast majority of humanity doesn’t get high-enough-quality education to engage in scientific research, if they want to, which reduces the odds that we have enough trained scientists to come up with the breakthroughs we need as a civilization to survive and thrive. So maybe one of the best things we can do for the far future is to improve school systems — here and now — to harness the group economist Raj Chetty calls “lost Einsteins” (potential innovators who are thwarted by poverty and inequality in rich countries) and, more importantly, the hundreds of millions of kids in developing countries dealing with even worse education systems than those in depressed communities in the rich world. What if living ethically for the far future means living ethically now? Beckstead mentions some other broad, or very broad, ideas (these are all his descriptions): Help make computers faster so that people everywhere can work more efficiently Change intellectual property law so that technological innovation can happen more quickly Advocate for open borders so that people from poorly governed countries can move to better-governed countries and be more productive Meta-research: improve incentives and norms in academic work to better advance human knowledge Improve education Advocate for political party X to make future people have values more like political party X ”If you look at these areas (economic growth and technological progress, access to information, individual capability, social coordination, motives) a lot of everyday good works contribute,” Beckstead writes. “An implication of this is that a lot of everyday good works are good from a broad perspective, even though hardly anyone thinks explicitly in terms of far future standards.” Look at those examples again: It’s just a list of what normal altruistically motivated people, not effective altruism folks, generally do. Charities in the US love talking about the lost opportunities for innovation that poverty creates. Lots of smart people who want to make a difference become scientists, or try to work as teachers or on improving education policy, and lord knows there are plenty of people who become political party operatives out of a conviction that the moral consequences of the party’s platform are good. All of which is to say: Maybe effective altruists aren’t that special, or at least maybe we don’t have access to that many specific and weird conclusions about how best to help the world. If the far future is what matters, and generally trying to make the world work better is among the best ways to help the far future, then effective altruism just becomes plain ol’ do-goodery.\*

## 2

#### CP: The appropriation of outer space by private entities except for Large Satellite Constellations in Lower Earth Orbit is unjust.

#### Terrestrial Internet Cables are vulnerable now – risks access.

Griffiths 19 James Griffiths 7-26-2019 "The global internet is powered by vast undersea cables. But they’re vulnerable." <https://www.cnn.com/2019/07/25/asia/internet-undersea-cables-intl-hnk/index.html> (CNN Analyst)//ELmer

Hong Kong (CNN) - On July 29, 1858, two steam-powered battleships met in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean. There, they connected two ends of a 4,000 kilometer (2,500 mile) long, 1.5 centimeter (0.6 inch) wide cable, linking for the first time the European and North American continents by telegraph. Just over two weeks later, the UK’s Queen Victoria sent a congratulatory message to then US President James Buchanan, which was followed by a parade through the streets of New York, featuring a replica of a ship which helped lay the cable and fireworks over City Hall. In their inaugural cables, Queen Victoria hailed the “great international work” by the two countries, the culmination of almost two decades of effort, while Buchanan lauded a “triumph more glorious, because far more useful to mankind, than was ever won by conqueror on the field of battle. The message took over 17 hours to deliver, at 2 minutes and 5 seconds per letter by Morse code, and the cable operated for less than a month due to a variety of technical failures, but a global communications revolution had begun. By 1866, new cables were transmitting 6 to 8 words a minute, which would rise to more than 40 words before the end of the century. In 1956, Transatlantic No. 1 (TAT-1), the first underwater telephone cable, was laid, and by 1988, TAT-8 was transmitting 280 megabytes per second – about 15 times the speed of an average US household internet connection – over fiber optics, which use light to transmit data at breakneck speeds. In 2018, the Marea cable began operating between Bilbao, Spain, and the US state of Virginia, with transmission speeds of up to 160 terabits per second – 16 million times faster than the average home internet connection. Today, there are around 380 underwater cables in operation around the world, spanning a length of over 1.2 million kilometers (745,645 miles). Underwater cables are the invisible force driving the modern internet, with many in recent years being funded by internet giants such as Facebook, Google, Microsoft and Amazon. They carry almost all our communications and yet – in a world of wireless networking and smartphones – we are barely aware that they exist. Yet as the internet has become more mobile and wireless, the amount of data traveling across undersea cables has increased exponentially. “Most people are absolutely amazed” by the degree to which the internet is still cable-based, said Byron Clatterbuck, chief executive of Seacom, a multinational telecommunications firm responsible for laying many of the undersea cables connecting Africa to the rest of the world. “People are so mobile and always looking for Wi-Fi,” he said. “They don’t think about it, they don’t understand the workings of this massive mesh of cables working together. “They only notice when it’s cut.” Network down In 2012, Hurricane Sandy slammed into the US East Coast, causing an estimated $71 billion in damage and knocking out several key exchanges where undersea cables linked North America and Europe. “It was a major disruption,” Frank Rey, director of global network strategy for Microsoft’s Cloud Infrastructure and Operations division, said in a statement. “The entire network between North America and Europe was isolated for a number of hours. For us, the storm brought to light a potential challenge in the consolidation of transatlantic cables that all landed in New York and New Jersey.” For its newest cable, Marea, Microsoft chose to base its US operation further down the coast in Virginia, away from the cluster of cables to minimize disruption should another massive storm hit New York. But most often when a cable goes down nature is not to blame. There are about 200 such failures each year and the vast majority are caused by humans. “Two-thirds of cable failures are caused by accidental human activities, fishing nets and trawling and also ships’ anchors,” said Tim Stronge, vice-president of research at TeleGeography, a telecoms market research firm. “The next largest category is natural disaster, mother nature – sometimes earthquakes but also underwater landslides.” A magnitude-7.0 earthquake off the southwest coast off Taiwan in 2006, along with aftershocks, cut eight submarine cables which caused internet outages and disruption in Taiwan, Hong Kong, China, Japan, Korea and the Philippines. Stronge said the reason most people are not aware of these failures is because the whole industry is designed with it in mind. Companies that rely heavily on undersea cables spread their data across multiple routes, so that if one goes down, customers are not cut off. How a cable gets laid Laying a cable is a years-long process which costs millions of dollars, said Seacom’s Clatterbuck. The process begins by looking at naval charts to plot the best route. Cables are safest in deep water where they can rest on a relatively flat seabed, and won’t rub against rocks or be at risk of other disturbances. “The deeper the better,” Clatterbuck said. “When you can lay the cable down in deep water you rarely have any problems. It goes down on the bottom of the seabed and just stays there.” Things become more difficult the closer you get to shore. A cable that is only a few centimeters thick on the bottom of the ocean must be armored from its environment as reaches the landing station that links it with the country’s internet backbone. “Imagine a long garden hose, inside of which are very small tubes that house a very, very thin fiber pair,” Clatterbuck said. That hose is wrapped in copper, which conducts the direct current that powers the cable and its repeaters, sometimes up to 10,000 volts. “The fibers are wrapped in urethane and wrapped in copper and wrapped again in urethane,” he said. “If we’re going to have to put that cable on a shoreline that is very shallow and has a lot of rocks, you’re now going to have to armor coat that cable so no one can hack through it.” Cables in less hospitable areas can be far thicker than garden hoses, wrapped in extra plastic, kevlar armor plating, and stainless steel to ensure they can’t be broken. Depending on the coast, cable companies might also have to build concrete trenches far out to sea, to tuck the cable in to protect it from being bashed against rocks. “Before the cable-laying vessels go out they send out another specialized ship that maps the sea floor in the area when they want to go,” said TeleGeography’s Stronge. “They want to avoid areas where there’s a lot of undersea currents, certainly want to avoid volcanic areas, and avoid a lot of elevation change on the sea floor.” Once the route is plotted and checked, and the shore connections are secure, huge cable laying ships begin passing out the equipment. “Imagine spools of spools of garden hose along with a lot of these repeaters the size of an old travel trunk,” Clatterbuck said. “Sometimes it can take a month to load the cable onto a ship.” The 6,600 kilometer (4,000 mile) Marea cable weighs over 4.6 million kilograms (10.2 million pounds), or the equivalent of 34 blue whales, according to Microsoft, which co-funded the project with Facebook. It took more than two years to lay the entire thing. Malicious cuts The blackout came without warning. In February 2008, a whole swath of North Africa and the Persian Gulf suddenly went offline, or saw internet speeds slow to a painful crawl. This disruption was eventually traced to damage to three undersea cables off the Egyptian coast. At least one – linking Dubai and Oman – was severed by an abandoned, 5,400 kilogram (6-ton) anchor, the cable’s owner said. But the cause of the other damage was never explained, with suggestions it could have been the work of saboteurs. That raises the issue of another threat to undersea cables: deliberate human attacks. In a 2017 paper for the right-wing think tank Policy Exchange, British lawmaker Rishi Sunak wrote that “security remains a challenge” for undersea cables. “Funneled through exposed choke points (often with minimal protection) and their isolated deep-sea locations entirely public, the arteries upon which the Internet and our modern world depends have been left highly vulnerable,” he said. “The threat of these vulnerabilities being exploited is growing. A successful attack would deal a crippling blow to Britain’s security and prosperity.” However, with more than 50 cables connected to the UK alone, Clatterbuck was skeptical about how useful a deliberate outage could be in a time of war, pointing to the level of coordination and resources required to cut multiple cables at once. “If you wanted to sabotage the global internet or cut off a particular place you’d have to do it simultaneously on multiple cables,” he said. “You’d be focusing on the hardest aspect of disrupting a network.”

#### Mega-constellations provide fast, affordable internet that bridges digital divide – independently, competition lowers prices across the board.

Novo 21 Paula Novo 3-31-2021 "Will Starlink Change the Internet?' <https://www.highspeedoptions.com/resources/insights/will-starlink-change-the-internet> (With over four years of broadband experience, Paula Novo is the Site Editor and Senior Writer for HighSpeedOptions. She has helped develop the criterion by which HighSpeedOptions reviews and recommends internet service providers, striving to simplify and guide the user’s decision toward the best communications services. Paula also leads HighSpeedOptions coverage of the digital divide, ISP reviews, and broadband policy.)//Elmer

While it’s not the first – and won’t be the last – company to test low Earth orbit satellites, Starlink, the satellite internet division of SpaceX, is making waves in the telecommunications industry for its residential beta program launched in 2020. As the first U.S.-based firm to successfully bring LEO internet to market, Starlink shows promise where others have heroically failed. Every satellite company in history to launch a low Earth orbit (LEO) constellation has gone bankrupt, except for Starlink, that is. Said best in a tweet by Elon Musk, founder and CEO of this venture, “Starlink is a staggeringly difficult technical and economic endeavor. However, if we don’t fail, the cost to end-users will improve every year.” In the span of a decade, broadband moved from a “nice-to-have” to a “must-have” – the COVID-19 pandemic simply speeding up the clock on its shift towards a utility. Yet, we’re a far cry away from total connectivity. Due to availability and cost issues (to name a few), millions of Americans don’t have access to reliable internet, which further widens the education and wealth gaps. If successful, Starlink – and LEO satellite internet as a whole – may be the first real solution for billions of people missing out on the benefits of broadband. Current State of the Telecom Industry Despite advances in technology, the telecom industry is lagging behind. And, contrary to what internet service providers and the media report, the United States’ internet options are still very limited. The three biggest hurdles standing in the way of real progress include access, affordability, and lack of competition. Access According to the Federal Communications Commission’s (FCC) 2020 Broadband Deployment Report, roughly 6% of all Americans have zero access to fixed broadband at home. And, of those without access, a majority live in rural areas. That’s about 19 million people who, even if they could afford to subscribe to internet service, are out of luck. The FCC defines broadband speeds as just 25 Mbps down and 3 Mbps up, which may be fast enough to check emails but won’t reliably support your Breaking Bad marathon. You can see how living in an underserved area, then, can severely limit a person’s job prospects, schooling, and social connections. Still, we can’t rate internet access without also looking at affordability. While some 19 million Americans do not have access at all, as many as one in three Americans choose to not subscribe to internet service, citing cost as a leading factor. Affordability FCC data shows that nearly 35% of Americans, or about 114 million people, do not subscribe to broadband service at their homes. Affordability – or lack thereof – is often cited as the main driver for this decision. Despite government intervention via efforts like the FCC Lifeline Program and ISP subsidies to incentivize network expansions, America still seems to lag behind other developed countries when it comes to internet cost. In a 2020 study by New America, it turns out that we pay quite a bit more for internet service than most developed countries in Asia and Europe, regardless of speed. Before factoring in data caps and other ancillary ISP fees, we pay “nearly twice as much as European countries for high-speed internet.” Naturally, the ballooning question pops up – How did we fall behind? Lack of Competition The lack of competition today may be the single greatest obstacle preventing the telecom industry (read: ISPs and consumers) from thriving. A long history of privately-owned infrastructures and government regulations has enabled monopolies to quash competition in the marketplace and ignore the demand for innovation. Unsurprisingly, the Institute of Self-Reliance released a new report finding that two of the largest broadband companies in the U.S. – Comcast and Charter Spectrum – maintain a monopoly over 47+ million American households. It also sheds light on an additional 33 million homes only serviceable by one or two DSL providers. While these are just a few examples of the current market, you can easily see how large segments of the population lack the competitive supply needed to drive down costs and push for more development. What if there was a solution to address these pitfalls with the internet? What if Americans (or, really, anyone in the world) could circumvent some of the physical and political barriers stopping us from connecting from seemingly anywhere? These are questions Starlink is attempting to answer. Ways Starlink May Change the Internet First, what is Starlink and how is it different from other internet providers? It’s an Elon Musk satellite internet company bringing life to the telecom industry. In the last year, Starlink launched over 1,000 satellites into low orbit with the goal of offering a new type of broadband. If successful, this LEO service could not only supersede traditional satellite internet like HughesNet or Viasat but also rival the likes of fiber internet in rural and remote communities. Unlike GEO satellite providers who use a few hundred large satellites orbiting over 35,000 kilometers from Earth, Starlink plans to use up to 42,000 small satellites in low orbit no higher than 1,200 kilometers. Because of these key differences, Starlink is anticipated to offer reliable speeds up to 1 Gbps with lower latency of 20ms to 40ms worldwide. Essentially, it’d combine the performance of grounded internet with the geographical freedom of traditional satellite internet so people can live anywhere on Earth while staying connected. In general, LEO satellite service represents a real chance at solving connectivity issues for anyone outside city limits. Starlink may also pave the way for tangible changes to the industry as a whole, including lower prices, faster speeds, and better economic opportunities. Pricing of Internet As Starlink enters new markets, the added competition has the potential to drive down the cost of internet over time. In a study by the Analysis Group, they calculated that when just one new competitor joins a designated market area (DMA), the price of plans with speeds ranging from 50 Mbps to 1 Gbps sees a monthly decline of $1.50. That’s it? McDonald’s saves me more than that. Not so fast, though. Remember how we said Starlink isn’t the only company testing low orbit satellites? With other ventures like Blue Origin, OneWeb, and Telesat itching to launch their own LEO constellations, it won’t be long before new players enter the market. At which point, the Analysis Group guesstimates an 8% reduction in monthly broadband prices, or about $7.50. For low-income households, that may be the difference needed to break even on bills. And, even though Starlink itself is quite expensive, its presence in the market has the potential to still benefit consumers who could choose a (now) cheaper internet provider. Internet Speeds Similarly, the buzz around LEO internet speeds has industry heads raising their eyebrows as well. While Starlink is only testing speeds of 50 Mbps to 150 Mbps right now, in time it’s expected to offer speeds up to 1 Gbps with low latency. Normally these speeds are reserved for grounded connections like fiber or cable internet. So, if Starlink manages to deliver, we may no longer be limited by our geography. Even further, the Analysis Group reports that the availability of higher internet speeds in a DMA “increases the likelihood that other providers will introduce high-speed plans to match […] their competition.” In particular, they found that broadband providers are 4 to 17 percent more likely to increase their speeds on an annual basis because of competition. This goes to show that a little healthy rivalry in the marketplace first and foremost benefits the consumer. Economic Opportunity If Starlink is successful, we expect to see economic opportunity improve for billions with a B as well. With global availability, more people will have the means to compete for jobs in today’s digital age. To put things into perspective, consider the world population. Of the current 7.8 billion people, a little under half of them (40%) lack regular internet access. That’s nearly one out of every two people. If LEO satellite service can make it to where geography, price, and speeds aren’t roadblocks anymore, what happens? In general, more people with internet access equates to more job access. And, as jobs continue to transition online, it’s safe to assume that people won’t be as limited by obstacles such as disabilities, poor education, and wealth disparities when they compete for openings. In these ways, Starlink has the potential to help offset poverty where many governments have failed.

#### It's comparably faster than current competitors.

Lumanlan 21 August Dominic M Lumanlan 8-14-2021 "How Elon Musk’s Starlink will be the future of the Internet" <https://medium.com/@augustlumanlan2017/how-spacexs-starlink-will-be-the-future-of-the-internet-8f07adb4eb2> (Engineering Author)//Elmer

Internet speeds, satellite equipment, and user feedback Starlink has very high internet speeds, higher than the speed of internet we currently have in our homes. Speeds average around 100 mbps but it could go as far as 200 mbps, or even 300 mbps. It has a latency of 20 milliseconds. Latency just means the time it takes for the satellite to transmit the data packets (YouTube videos, Facebook messages, Google searches, etc.) from the ground station, to the nearest Starlink satellite, which then transmits it to other nearby satellites and whichever one is closest above the user will transmit it downward to the Starlink dish that receives the data packets, which can finally reach your home router and now you’re connected to the internet and received the data packets. The process can repeat vice versa. This means that the internet connection with Starlink is much faster than our current internet connection which has around 60 milliseconds of latency. A lot of beta testers have shared their experiences online and have been picked up by the media to know more about the Starlink internet program’s capabilities and the user’s feedback about them. What they say is true: They are so happy about it, they think it’s worth it. Because its so fast and reliable to many places around the world, you can easily connect to the internet and be able to do multiple things like watch YouTube or Google search, or even work conveniently anywhere you wish, as long as you have a ground Starlink dish with you.

#### Internet solves extinction

**Eagleman 10** [David Eagleman is a neuroscientist at Baylor College of Medicine, where he directs the Laboratory for Perception and Action and the Initiative on Neuroscience and Law and author of Sum (Canongate). Nov. 9, 2010, “ Six ways the internet will save civilization,”  
 http://www.wired.co.uk/magazine/archive/2010/12/start/apocalypse-no]

Many **great** civilisations have fallen, leaving nothing but cracked ruins and scattered genetics. Usually this results from: natural disasters, resource depletion, economic meltdown, disease, poor information flow and corruption. But we’re luckier than our predecessors because we command a technology that no one else possessed: a rapid communication network that finds its highest expression in the internet. I propose that there are six ways in which the net has vastly reduced the threat of societal collapse. Epidemics can be deflected **by telepresence** One of our more dire prospects for collapse is an infectious-disease epidemic**. Viral and bacterial epidemics precipitated the fall of** the Golden Age of Athens**,** the Roman Empire and most of the empires of the Native Americans. **The internet can be our key to survival because the ability to** work telepresently can inhibit microbial transmission by reducing human-to-human contact. In the face of an otherwise devastating epidemic, businesses can keep supply chains running with the maximum number of employees working from home. This can reduce host density below the tipping point required for an epidemic. If we are well prepared when an epidemic arrives, we can fluidly shift into a self-quarantined soc**iety** in which microbes fail due to host scarcity. Whatever the social ills of isolation, they are worse for the microbes than for us. **The internet will** predict natural disasters **We are witnessing the downfall of slow central control in the media**: news stories are increasingly becoming user-generated nets of up-to-the-minute information. **During the recent California wildfires,** locals went to the TV stations to learn whether their neighbourhoods were in danger. But the news stations appeared most concerned with the fate of celebrity mansions, so Californians changed their tack: they uploaded geotagged mobile-phone pictures, updated Facebook statuses and tweeted. The balance tipped: **the internet carried news about the fire more quickly and accurately than any news station could.** In this grass-roots, decentralised scheme, there were embedded reporters on every block, and the news shockwave kept ahead of the fire. This head start could provide the extra hours that save us. If the Pompeiians had had the internet in 79AD, they could have easily marched 10km to safety, well ahead of the pyroclastic flow from Mount Vesuvius. **If the Indian Ocean had the Pacific’s networked tsunami-warning system, South-East Asia would look quite different today. Discoveries are retained and shared** Historically, **critical information has required constant rediscovery**. Collections of learning -- from the library at Alexandria to the entire Minoan civilisation -- have fallen to the bonfires of invaders or the wrecking ball of natural disaster. Knowledge is hard won but easily lost. And information that survives often does not spread. **Consider smallpox inoculation**: this was under way in India, China and Africa centuries before it made its way to Europe**. By the time the idea reached North America, native civilisations who needed it had already collapsed. The net solved the problem. New discoveries catch on immediately;** information spreads widely. In this way, societies can optimally ratchet up, using the latest bricks of knowledge in their fortification against risk. **Tyranny is mitigated Censorship of ideas** was a familiar spectre in the last century, with state-approved news outlets ruling the press, airwaves and copying machines **in the USSR**, Romania, Cuba, China, Iraq **and elsewhere**. In many cases, such as Lysenko’s agricultural despotism in the USSR, it **directly contributed to the collapse of the nation**. Historically**, a more successful strategy has been to confront free speech with free speech -- and the internet allows this in a natural way.** It democratises the flow of information by offering access to the newspapers of the world, the photographers of every nation, the bloggers of every political stripe. Some posts are full of doctoring and dishonesty whereas others strive for independence and impartiality -- but all are available to us to sift through. Given the attempts by some governments to build firewalls, it’s clear that this benefit of the net requires constant vigilance. Human capital is vastly increased **Crowdsourcing brings people together to solve problems.** Yet far fewer than one per cent of the world’s population is involved. We need expand human capital. Most of the world not have access to the education afforded a small minority. For every Albert Einstein, Yo-Yo Ma or Barack Obama who has educational opportunities, uncountable others do not. This squandering of talent translates into reduced economic output and a smaller pool of problem solvers. The net opens the gates education to anyone with a computer. A motivated teen anywhere on the planet can walk through the world’s knowledge -- from the webs of Wikipedia to the curriculum of MIT’s OpenCourseWare. The new human capital will serve us well when we confront existential threats we’ve never imagined before**. Energy expenditure is reduced** Societal collapse can often be understood in terms of an energy budget: **when energy spend outweighs energy return, collapse ensues**. This has taken the form of deforestation or soil erosion; **currently, the worry involves fossil-fuel depletion. The internet addresses the energy problem with a natural ease**. Consider the massive energy savings inherent in the shift from paper to electrons -- as seen in the transition from the post to email. **Ecommerce reduces the need to drive long distances to purchase products. Delivery trucks are more eco-friendly** than individuals driving around, not least because of tight packaging and optimisation algorithms for driving routes. Of course, there are energy costs to the banks of computers that underpin the internet -- but these costs are less than the wood, coal and oil that would be expended for the same quantity of information flow. **The** tangle of events that triggers societal collapse can be complex, and there are several threats the net does not address. But vast, networked communication can be an antidote to several of the most deadly diseases threatening civilisation. The next time your coworker laments internet addiction, the banality of tweeting or the decline of face-to-face conversation, you may want to suggest that the net may just be the technology that saves us.

#### Starlink solves internet monopolies

**Krow 21** Krow, A. (2021, February 27). *Will Starlink disrupt spectrum’s internet provider monopoly?* Medium. <https://medium.com/technology-hits/will-starlink-disrupt-spectrums-internet-provider-monopoly-c3b33d20be11> (Teacher. Writer. Future Author. Aspiring Linguist. Progressive Voter. Twitter @ajkrow\_writer.) //Aadit

Throughout college and well into my teaching career, I’ve spent several hundred dollars sitting in coffee shops, drinking a latte or a Frappuccino while I completed work using their Wi-Fi until closing. Once I arrived home, I opened YouTube on my phone and played a video at the lowest resolution, 144p. I waited for several minutes as the video buffered. This became a daily occurrence when living in a rural area. Millions still don’t have access to fast internet at home As of [2019](https://www.digitaltrends.com/web/31-percent-us-households-no-broadband-internet/), a third of households nationwide do not have a reliable internet connection. The only way those families can access the internet is to leave their homes and go to a public library, school, or Starbucks. A week before schools transitioned to virtual learning in 2020, I remember some of my students stared at their phones under their desks. When I caught them and asked them to turn it in, they refused. For many students, the only internet access they had available was at school. [As of September 2020](https://usafacts.org/articles/internet-access-students-at-home/), 3.7 million children still did not have access to an internet connection at home. In August of 2020, teachers were expected to provide live (synchronous) classes to students via Zoom. I panicked. I still did not have access to the internet in my rural home. I immediately went on apartments.com and searched for a decent apartment that would have access to the internet. Once school started, many students could not log in to Google Classroom or Zoom and attend class. Of the seventy or so students I see every other day, less than half log in to Zoom. All the other students have never logged in, nor have they turned in a single assignment since school began. As a result, teachers, schools, and [districts nationwide failed them](https://apnews.com/article/distance-learning-coronavirus-pandemic-oregon-7fde612c3dbfd2e21fab9673ca49ad89). Corporations control who gets access to the internet In the United States, only two companies control a majority of the internet service available in the country. Those are Spectrum (also known as Comcast) and Charter (also known as Xfinity). Both companies decided they wouldn’t compete against each other. Instead, they would each claim one area and be the only internet service provider available. By doing so, they could raise prices and provide data caps. Customers have no choice other than to agree to the terms and conditions. In the U.S., [83.3 million people](https://ilsr.org/report-most-americans-have-no-real-choice-in-internet-providers/) are controlled by an internet monopoly: either Charter or Spectrum. Since both corporations have no other competition, they have no incentive to innovate or expand their services to other areas, namely rural areas. Spectrum and Charter see no benefit in laying out hundreds or thousands of feet of underground cable and spend tens of thousands of dollars to provide internet to a rural home, as the customer would only pay $50-$100 a month. Meanwhile, their “competitors” provide poor services and fail to offer any sort of competition to Charter or Spectrum. ViaSat, for example, offers limited data plans — its most expensive plan offers 150GB for $200 per month. In a family of four or five people, where children are connected to Zoom meetings, that data plan will reach its limit very quickly. This data plan also can’t compare to Spectrum, which offers unlimited internet for a quarter of the price of ViaSat. However, ViaSat and HughesNet are the only internet service providers available to rural areas. Since ViaSat and HughesNet face no competition from Spectrum and Charter, they have no incentive to provide fast speeds for their consumers. The average speed of ViaSat clocks in at [11.7Mbps](https://testmy.net/hoststats/viasat), or 1.4 Megabytes per second. At that speed, a YouTube video has to be played at the lowest resolution and would still buffer. Google Fiber failed to disrupt the market Roughly ten years ago, Google announced it would become an internet service provider. Google planned to disrupt Spectrum and Charter’s current control of the market by offering internet using fiber-cable. This new technology would allow for faster speeds. [As of 2020](https://support.google.com/fiber/answer/6250056?hl=en), it is about five times faster than Spectrum internet. Today, a majority of the U.S. population still does not have access to Google Fiber. According to Google, Fiber is [only available in twelve cities](https://fiber.google.com/) in the country. Rural customers still don’t have a solution, nor do city people have access to more than one or two options. Starlink will do what Google couldn’t A few years ago, Elon Musk announced Starlink, a division of SpaceX. Musk intends on providing internet access to everyone around the world wirelessly through the use of satellites. So far, SpaceX has launched over a thousand satellites into low-Earth orbit, though the FCC has approved SpaceX to launch over 12,000 satellites for Starlink usage. As more satellites are launched into space, internet coverage will expand around the world. Whether you live in an urban, suburban, or rural area, you will have access to high-speed internet. Many YouTubers who have preordered the Starlink service have already received their installation package and are testing it out in remote areas. As of [a few days ago](https://www.cnbc.com/2021/02/22/elon-musk-spacex-will-double-starlink-internet-speed-later-this-year.html), Elon Musk made a few promises. People would have access to 300Mbps speed internet, and coverage will be available worldwide by the end of 2021. This timeline beats Google Fiber, as Google is only providing coverage to a dozen cities in the U.S. For people who lack internet access or want something other than Spectrum or Charter, Starlink will be the answer.

## Case

### Framing

#### The role of the ballot is to determine if the aff’s a good idea—anything else is self-serving, arbitrary and begs the question of the rest of the debate.

#### Focus on large scale catastrophes is good and they outweigh – appeals to social costs, moral rules, and securitization play into cognitive biases and flawed risk calculus – 2020 is living proof

Weber 20 (ELKE U. WEBER is Gerhard R. Andlinger Professor in Energy and the Environment and Professor of Psychology and Public Affairs at Princeton University.), November-December 2020 Issue, "Heads in the Sand," Foreign Affairs, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2020-10-13/heads-sand> mvp

We are living in a time of crisis. From the immediate challenge of the COVID-19 pandemic to the looming existential threat of climate change, the world is grappling with massive global dangers—to say nothing of countless problems within countries, such as inequality, cyberattacks, unemployment, systemic racism, and obesity. In any given crisis, the right response is often clear. Wear a mask and keep away from other people. Burn less fossil fuel. Redistribute income. Protect digital infrastructure. The answers are out there. What’s lacking are governments that can translate them into actual policy. As a result, the crises continue. The death toll from the pandemic skyrockets, and the world makes dangerously slow progress on climate change, and so on.

It’s no secret how governments should react in times of crisis. First, they need to be nimble. Nimble means moving quickly, because problems often grow at exponential rates: a contagious virus, for example, or greenhouse gas emissions. That makes early action crucial and procrastination disastrous. Nimble also means adaptive. Policymakers need to continuously adjust their responses to crises as they learn from their own experience and from the work of scientists. Second, governments need to act wisely. That means incorporating the full range of scientific knowledge available about the problem at hand. It means embracing uncertainty, rather than willfully ignoring it. And it means thinking in terms of a long time horizon, rather than merely until the next election. But so often, policymakers are anything but nimble and wise. They are slow, inflexible, uninformed, overconfident, and myopic.

Why is everyone doing so badly? Part of the explanation lies in the inherent qualities of crises. Crises typically require navigating between risks. In the COVID-19 pandemic, policymakers want to save lives and jobs. With climate change, they seek a balance between avoiding extreme weather and allowing economic growth. Such tradeoffs are hard as it is, and they are further complicated by the fact that costs and benefits are not evenly distributed among stakeholders, making conflict a seemingly unavoidable part of any policy choice. Vested interests attempt to forestall needed action, using their money to influence decision-makers and the media. To make matters worse, policymakers must pay sustained attention to multiple issues and multiple constituencies over time. They must accept large amounts of uncertainty. Often, then, the easiest response is to stick with the status quo. But that can be a singularly dangerous response to many new hazards. After all, with the pandemic, business as usual would mean no social distancing. With climate change, it would mean continuing to burn fossil fuels.

But the explanation for humanity’s woeful response to crises goes beyond politics and incentives. To truly understand the failure to act, one must turn to human psychology. It is there that one can grasp the full impediments to proper decision-making—the cognitive biases, emotional reactions, and suboptimal shortcuts that hold policymakers back—and the tools to overcome them.

AVOIDING THE UNCOMFORTABLE

People are singularly bad at predicting and preparing for catastrophes. Many of these events are “black swans,” rare and unpredictable occurrences that most people find difficult to imagine, seemingly falling into the realm of science fiction. Others are “gray rhinos,” large and not uncommon threats that are still neglected until they stare you in the face (such as a coronavirus outbreak). Then there are “invisible gorillas,” threats in full view that should be noticed but aren’t—so named for a psychological experiment in which subjects watching a clip of a basketball game were so fixated on the players that they missed a person in a gorilla costume walking through the frame. Even professional forecasters, including security analysts, have a poor track record when it comes to accurately anticipating events. The COVID-19 crisis, in which a dystopic science-fiction narrative came to life and took everyone by surprise, serves as a cautionary tale about humans’ inability to foresee important events.

Not only do humans fail to anticipate crises; they also fail to respond rationally to them. At best, people display “bounded rationality,” the idea that instead of carefully considering their options and making perfectly rational decisions that optimize their preferences, humans in the real world act quickly and imperfectly, limited as they are by time and cognitive capacity. Add in the stress generated by crises, and their performance gets even worse.

Because humans don’t have enough time, information, or processing power to deliberate rationally, they have evolved easier ways of making decisions. They rely on their emotions, which serve as an early warning system of sorts: alerting people that they are in a positive context that can be explored and exploited or in a negative context where fight or flight is the appropriate response. They also rely on rules. To simplify decision-making, they might follow standard operating procedures or abide by some sort of moral code. They might decide to imitate the action taken by other people whom they trust or admire. They might follow what they perceive to be widespread norms. Out of habit, they might continue to do what they have been doing unless there is overwhelming evidence against it.

Not only do humans fail to anticipate crises; they also fail to respond rationally to them.

Humans evolved these shortcuts because they require little effort and work well in a broad range of situations. Without access to a real-time map of prey in different hunting grounds, for example, a prehistoric hunter might have resorted to a simple rule of thumb: look for animals where his fellow tribesmen found them yesterday. But in times of crisis, emotions and rules are not always helpful drivers of decision-making. High stakes, uncertainty, tradeoffs, and conflict—all elicit negative emotions, which can impede wise responses. Uncertainty is scary, as it signals an inability to predict what will happen, and what cannot be predicted might be deadly. The vast majority of people are already risk averse under normal circumstances. Under stress, they become even more so, and they retreat to the familiar comfort of the status quo. From gun laws to fossil fuel subsidies, once a piece of legislation is in place, it is hard to dislodge it, even when cost-benefit analysis argues for change.

### NC

#### 1] Equating settler expansion into the solar system as settler colonialism is a move to innocence – asteroids and ice shards aren’t Indigenous people and labeling that appropriation as clearing or genocide is colonial equivocation that homogenizes all violence and imperial activity into a narrow frame of decolonial frameworks, which decreases the potency and accuracy of those frameworks

#### 2] alt cause – public entities put satellites into space

#### 3] space innov by private good for native

#### - helps them w their research

#### 4] starlink not only cause for light blockages

### NC—Col Good

#### Space colonization is good and possible – new developing tech and adaptation solves civil war, extinction, civilization collapse, and exploration defense doesn’t apply.

Kennedy ’19 [Fred, “To Colonize Space Or Not To Colonize: That Is The Question (For All Of Us)”, 12-18-2019, Forbes, https://www.forbes.com/sites/fredkennedy/2019/12/18/to-colonize-or-not-to-colonize--that-is-the-question-for-all-of-us/?sh=65a8d2702367]//pranav

It’s important to distinguish between colonize and explore. Exploration already enjoys broad approval here in America. In June, 77% of U.S. respondents told Gallup pollsters that NASA’s budget should either be maintained or increased – undeniable evidence of support for the American space program (as it’s currently constituted). By any measure, we’ve done an admirable job of surveying the solar system over the past 60 years – an essential first step in any comprehensive program of exploration. Unmanned probes developed and launched by the United States and the Soviet Union conducted flybys of the Moon and the terrestrial planets not long after we reached Earth orbit, and since then, we’ve flown by the outer planets. Multiple nations have placed increasingly sophisticated robotic emissaries on the surfaces of the Moon, Mars, Venus and Saturn’s largest moon, Titan. Most stunningly, in a tour de force of technology and Cold War chutzpah, the U.S. dispatched humans to set foot on another world, just 50 years and a few months ago. But after only six such visits, we never returned. Moon habitats in lava tubes, crops under glass domes, ice mining at the south pole? No. NASA’s Artemis program may place a man and a woman on the Moon again in 2024. But that’s hardly colonization. For perspective, let’s look closer to home. Sailors from an American vessel may have landed on Antarctica as early as 1821 – the claim is unverified – but no scientific expeditions “wintered” there for another 75 years. The first two of these, one Belgian and one British, endured extreme cold and privation – one inadvertently, the other by design. And yet, 200 years after the first explorer set foot on the continent, there are no permanent settlements (partially as a result of a political consensus reached in the late 1950s, but in no small part due to the difficulty of extracting resources such as ore or fossil fuels through kilometers of ice). Less than 5,000 international researchers and support staff comprise the “summer population” at the bottom of the world. That number dwindles to just 1,100 during the harsh Antarctic winter, requiring millions of tons of supplies and fuel to be delivered every year – none of which can be produced locally. To suggest that Antarctica is colonized would be far overstating the sustainability of human presence there. If Antarctica is hard, the Moon, Mars, asteroids, and interplanetary space will be punishingly difficult. Writing in Gizmodo this past July, George Dvorsky describes the challenges to a human colony posed by low gravity, radiation, lack of air and water, and the psychological effects of long-term confinement and isolation inside artificial structures, in space or on planetary surfaces. Add to this the economic uncertainties of such a venture – where the modern analog of a Dutch or British East India Company would face enormous skepticism from investors regarding the profitability of shipping any good or finished product between colonial ports of call – and it becomes clear why nation states and mega-corporations alike have so far resisted the temptation to set up camp beyond geosynchronous orbit. Perhaps, many argue, we should focus our limited resources on unresolved problems here at home? Yet a wave of interest in pursuing solar system colonization is building, whether its initial focus is the Moon, Mars, or O’Neill-style space habitats. Jeff Bezos has argued eloquently for moving heavy industry off the home planet, preserving Earth as a nature reserve, and building the space-based infrastructure that will lower barriers and create opportunities for vast economic and cultural growth (similar to how the Internet and a revolution in microelectronics has allowed Amazon and numerous other companies to achieve spectacular wealth). Elon Musk and Stephen Hawking both suggested the need for a “hedge” population of humans on Mars to allow human civilization to reboot itself in the event of a catastrophe

on Earth – an eggs-in-several-baskets approach which actually complements the arguments made by Bezos. And while both are valid reasons for pursuing colonization, there’s a stronger, overarching rationale that clinches it. I’ll assert that a fundamental truth – repeatedly borne out by history – is that expanding, outwardly-focused civilizations are far less likely to turn on themselves, and far more likely to expend their fecundity on growing habitations, conducting important research and creating wealth for their citizens. A civilization that turns away from discovery and growth stagnates – a point made by NASA’s Chief Historian Steven Dick as well as Mars exploration advocate Robert Zubrin. As a species, we have yet to resolve problems of extreme political polarization (both internal to nation states as well as among them), inequalities in wealth distribution, deficiencies in civil liberties, environmental depredations and war. Forgoing opportunities to expand our presence into the cosmos to achieve better outcomes here at home hasn’t eliminated these scourges. What’s more, the “cabin fever” often decried by opponents of colonization (when applied to small, isolated outposts far from Earth) turns out to be a potential problem for our own planet. Without a relief valve for ideological pilgrims or staunch individualists who might just prefer to be on their own despite the inevitable hardships, we may well run the risk of exacerbating the polarization and internecine strife we strive so hard to quell. Focusing humanity’s attention and imagination on a grand project may well give us the running room we need to address these problems. But the decision cannot be made by one country, or one company, or one segment of the human population. If we do this, it will of necessity be a truly international endeavor, a cross-sector endeavor (with all commercial, civil, and defense interests engaged and cooperating). The good news: Critical technologies such as propulsion and power generation systems will improve over time. Transit durations between celestial destinations will shorten (in the same way sailing vessels gave way to steam ships and then to airliners and perhaps, one day, to point-to-point ballistic reusable rockets). Methods for obtaining critical resources on other planets will be refined and enhanced. Genetic engineering may be used to better adapt humans, their crops and other biota to life in space or on other planetary surfaces – to withstand the effects of low or micro-gravity, radiation, and the psychological effects of long-duration spaceflight.

#### Colonization’s coming within the century

Reedy 17 [Christiana Reedy, Futurism editor. When Will the First Human Space Colony Be Established? August 17, 2017. https://futurism.com/when-will-the-first-human-space-colony-be-established]

Will humanity be ready to colonize space before doomsday? We asked Futurism readers when they thought humans will colonize off-planet, and the results revealed quite a consensus. More than 70 percent of people who took the poll thought a colony will be established during the first half of the 21st century, and the decade with the most votes — a whopping 36 percent of participants — was the 2030s. Satish Varma, a software engineer, explained why he voted for this decade. Varma wrote in his response that our technological advances in spacecraft design, artificial intelligence (AI), and bionics will be the driving forces that finally propel us into space long term. “Currently there are some promising advances in space exploration and artificial intelligence by companies like SpaceX, Google, and Tesla in a short time frame,” Varma wrote. Varma’s observations are right on — both SpaceX and Blue Origin have recently reached significant milestones in developing reusable rockets, which will be key in making space travel economically viable. Google has recently developed an AI that can learn almost as fast as we can, making the technology much more promising for real-world applications, like flying spaceships. What The Experts Have To Say The technologies have enticed governments and companies around the world to take the idea of space colonization seriously. The two most popular targets for human occupation are currently Mars and the Moon. The Moon gets a little less attention these days, but scientists have estimated that we could build a colony there over the pan of six years and for as little as $10 billion. The Chinese and European space agencies are carefully examining the possibility of a Moon base, as such a resource would greatly reduce the cost of traveling to other planets — including Mars. On the Mars front, the United Arab Emirates (UAE) has announced its intention to establish a settlement on the Red Planet by 2117. Other nations are likely to beat the UAE in reaching this goal, however, as the U.S. government has tasked NASA with getting humans on Mars by 2033,

and China has set an even more ambitions goal: by the end of the decade. These government efforts align with readers’ predictions. But SpaceX CEO Elon Musk hopes to prove just how much more efficient private companies are than government bureaucracies. His plan, too, is to send humans to Mars by 2020, but that isn’t his only goal. He wants to make travel to the Red Planet affordable, setting the price cap at $200,000 in his new plan that focuses on establishing a self-sustaining space civilization rather than a simple exploratory expedition. Such an establishment will be paramount to the future of the human species, Musk said. “History suggests there will be some doomsday event, and I would hope you would agree that becoming a multi-planetary species would be the right way to go,” Musk said at a press conference last year. “I want to make Mars seem possible… like something that we can do in our lifetimes.” With all these efforts to get humans off world over the course of the next few decades, it seems like a good bet a Martian colony is not only something this generation could see, but something it will.

#### Space colonization solves climate change

Youn and Theodorou 19, 5/9, "Blue Origin, Jeff Bezos unveils plans for space colonization," ABC News, https://abcnews.go.com/Business/blue-origin-jeff-bezos-unveils-lunar-lander-mission/story?id=62941981 TDI  
His inspiration? American physicist Gerard O'Neill, who became interested in the idea of space colonization in 1969.

Bezos extolled his belief in the idea that humans could live in environments that were ideal and create colonies where heavy industry can be carried out without subjecting the earth to atmospheric pollution. He also did refer to coming back to Earth.

“Earth is the best planet. It is not even close. Don’t even get me started on Venus," Bezos said.

The Amazon founder identified two initial goals that Blue Origin would focus on: a radical reduction in launch costs and establishing resources for space. Like Elon Musk's SpaceX, Blue Origin has focused on reusable rockets.

Blue Origin would begin by sending humans into space in 2019 on New Shepard -- a suborbital vehicle designed for space tourism -- which uses liquid hydrogen, an incredibly efficient fuel source.