

A Critical Study of Analogue Space Habitats: Lessons for the Next Generation of Extraterrestrial Habitation

*The Human Initiative Research Team
London, August 2025*

Abstract

This critical study provides a comprehensive analysis of terrestrial analogue space habitats over the past three decades. It examines the diverse range of analogue experiments, identifying common threads of success in their design and operation, as well as recurring shortcomings that have limited their effectiveness. The study categorizes existing analogues, evaluates their contributions to the field, and synthesizes the key lessons learned. Based on this analysis, a set of research-based proposals is presented for the development of next-generation habitats, advocating for an integrated approach that combines architectural innovation with a deeper understanding of human factors and culturally-informed design principles. This paper argues that such a holistic paradigm is essential for creating sustainable, human-centric environments for future long-duration missions to the Moon, Mars, and beyond.

1. Introduction

The 21st century has witnessed an unprecedented convergence of technological capability, economic investment, and political will toward establishing a permanent human presence beyond Earth. Government space agencies, including NASA's Artemis program and ESA's lunar exploration initiatives, alongside a growing constellation of private companies such as SpaceX, Blue Origin, and others, are actively developing comprehensive plans for lunar bases and Martian settlements [1, 2]. This renewed focus on extraterrestrial habitation represents not merely an extension of human exploration, but a fundamental shift toward becoming a multi-planetary species—a transition that will require revolutionary advances in habitat design, life support systems, and human factors engineering.

Central to the success of these ambitious undertakings is the development of space habitats that transcend the basic requirements of survival to create

environments optimized for long-duration human thriving [3]. The challenges are multifaceted and unprecedented: these habitats must provide not only life support and protection from the hostile space environment, but also psychological comfort, social cohesion, and the infrastructure necessary for productive scientific and industrial work. The stakes are extraordinarily high—failure in habitat design could result not only in mission failure, but in the loss of human life in an environment where rescue is impossible and mistakes are often fatal.

For more than thirty years, terrestrial analogue habitats have served as the primary means of testing and validating habitat concepts, technologies, and operational protocols in simulated space environments [4]. These analogues, which range from isolated chambers in urban research facilities to expansive research stations situated in the most extreme environments on Earth, form a critical bridge between theoretical designs conceived in laboratories and the practical realities of off-world living. They represent

humanity's most systematic attempt to understand the complex interplay between technology, psychology, and social dynamics that will determine the success or failure of permanent space settlements.

The analogue habitat research program has generated an extensive body of empirical data spanning multiple decades, involving thousands of participants, and encompassing a diverse array of experimental conditions and objectives. This research has revealed both the remarkable adaptability of human beings to extreme environments and the subtle but critical factors that can determine the difference between mission success and catastrophic failure. However, despite this wealth of experience, the field has yet to converge on a unified understanding of optimal habitat design principles, and many of the same challenges that plagued early analogue missions continue to emerge in contemporary experiments.

This paper presents a critical study and analysis of the extensive body of research generated by these analogue habitat experiments. The objective is to synthesize the key lessons from three decades of experimentation to inform the design of future habitats. This will be achieved by following a four-part structure:

1. An explanation and categorization of the different types of analogue experiments conducted to date.
2. An analysis of the common elements—in terms of configuration, layout, and systems—that have proven successful across various analogues.
3. A critical examination of the various shortcomings and limitations that have been identified in these projects.
4. A proposal of research-based changes and a new design paradigm, informed by the preceding analysis, to guide the development of future space habitats.

By systematically evaluating the successes and fail-

ures of the past, this study aims to provide a clear, evidence-based roadmap for the next generation of space habitat design, one that is technologically robust, architecturally innovative, and profoundly human-centric.

2. A Taxonomy of Terrestrial Analogues: Characterizing Three Decades of Experimentation

For over three decades, a diverse array of terrestrial analogue habitats has been developed to simulate the conditions of space and to investigate the challenges of long-duration missions. These analogues can be categorized based on their primary research objectives, level of fidelity, and operational environments. This section provides a taxonomy of these experiments, grouping them into distinct categories to better understand their contributions and limitations.

2.1 High-Fidelity Field Environments



Image: The Mars Desert Research Station in Utah, a high-fidelity analogue for Mars exploration.

High-fidelity field environments are analogue habitats situated in remote, geographically relevant locations that mimic the terrain and environmental conditions of the Moon or Mars. These analogues are designed to provide a holistic and immersive simulation experience, focusing on crew operations, extra-vehicular activities (EVAs), and the psychological effects of isolation in a challenging, unstructured environment.

Mars Desert Research Station (MDRS): Located in the Utah desert, MDRS represents one of the most well-documented and longest-running Mars analogue facilities in operation. Operated by the Mars Society since 2001, it has hosted over 200 crews comprising more than 1,200 individuals from diverse professional backgrounds, generating an unparalleled dataset on crew dynamics, EVA protocols, and habitat operations [5, 6]. The primary habitat structure is a two-story cylindrical module measuring 8 meters in diameter, designed to simulate the spatial constraints and operational characteristics of a Mars lander-habitat. The facility is complemented by a greenhouse module for food production research, an astronomical observatory for scientific activities, and an engineering bay for equipment maintenance and repair.

The MDRS operational model emphasizes short-duration missions typically lasting two weeks, allowing for rapid iteration and the testing of diverse crew compositions and mission profiles. The facility's location in the high desert of Utah provides geological and environmental conditions that approximate those expected on Mars, including extreme temperature variations, low humidity, and a barren landscape that necessitates the use of spacesuits for all external activities. The extensive mission database from MDRS has been instrumental in identifying key factors affecting crew performance, including the critical importance of pre-mission training, the impact of crew size on social dynamics, and the challenges of maintaining morale during routine operational phases.

Flashline Mars Arctic Research Station (FMARS): Situated on Devon Island in the Canadian High Arctic, FMARS offers an even higher fidelity geological analogue to Mars, with a polar desert environment that closely resembles the Martian surface [7, 8]. The extreme cold, isolation, and barren landscape provide a powerful simulation of a polar Mars mission. However, the logistical challenges of operating in such a remote location have limited the number and duration

of missions.



Image: The HI-SEAS geodesic dome habitat on Mauna Loa, Hawaii.

HI-SEAS (Hawaii Space Exploration analogue and Simulation): Located on the slopes of the Mauna Loa volcano in Hawaii, HI-SEAS provides a unique environment for studying the effects of long-duration isolation and confinement [9]. The habitat, a geodesic dome, has hosted multiple long-duration missions, including a year-long mission for NASA, providing invaluable data on crew cohesion, stress, and performance over extended periods.

These high-fidelity field environments are invaluable for their immersive quality and their ability to simulate the operational challenges of a real mission. However, they are often limited by the short duration of their missions and the fact that their life support systems are not fully closed-loop.

2.2 Closed-Loop Life Support System Testbeds

This category of analogues is focused on the development and testing of advanced life support systems that can recycle air, water, and waste, and produce food in a closed environment. These facilities are typically laboratory-based and highly controlled, with the primary objective of validating the long-term reliability and efficiency of these critical technologies.



Image: The Biosphere 2 facility in Arizona, a large-scale closed ecological system experiment.

Biosphere 2: The most ambitious and well-known closed-loop experiment, Biosphere 2 was a 3.14-acre facility in Arizona that attempted to create a self-sustaining ecosystem [10, 11]. The two-year mission in the early 1990s, with a crew of eight, provided a wealth of data on the complexities of closed ecological systems, highlighting the challenges of maintaining atmospheric balance and food production.

NASA's Controlled Ecological Life Support System (CELSS) Program: This long-running NASA program has been instrumental in developing and testing various technologies for air revitalization, water recycling, and food production in a controlled environment [12, 13]. The research from CELSS has been foundational for the life support systems used on the International Space Station and for future long-duration missions.

MELiSSA (Micro-Ecological Life Support System Alternative): A European Space Agency (ESA) project, MELiSSA is a long-term effort to develop a regenerative life support system based on a closed-loop ecosystem of micro-organisms and higher plants [14, 15]. The project has made significant progress in developing the various compartments of the system, with the ultimate goal of creating a fully self-sufficient habitat.

These test-beds are essential for developing the technologies that will enable long-duration, self-sufficient

missions. However, they are often divorced from the human element, and do not provide data on how these systems will perform under the operational and psychological stresses of a real space mission.

2.3 Isolation and Confinement Chambers

This category of analogues is specifically designed to study the psychological and physiological effects of long-duration isolation and confinement. These facilities are often located in accessible, controlled environments, and are designed to replicate the social and psychological conditions of a long-duration space mission.

Mars-500: A landmark study conducted by Russia's Institute for Biomedical Problems (IBMP) in collaboration with ESA, Mars-500 involved a six-person international crew being isolated in a mock spacecraft for 520 days, the duration of a round-trip mission to Mars [16, 17]. The experiment yielded a vast amount of data on the psychological, physiological, and social challenges of long-duration space flight.

CHAPEA (Crew Health and Performance Exploration Analogue): A new series of long-duration missions being conducted by NASA, CHAPEA involves a four-person crew living in a 3D-printed habitat at the Johnson Space Center for a year [18]. The missions are designed to study the effects of long-duration isolation and confinement on crew health and performance, with a focus on the challenges of a Mars mission.

These isolation studies are invaluable for understanding the human element of space exploration. However, they are, by design, divorced from the operational and environmental challenges of a real mission. The crew does not have to contend with system failures, environmental hazards, or the demands of conducting scientific research in a hostile environment.

3. Common Threads of Success: An Analysis of Effective Design Elements in Analogue Habitats

Despite the diversity of analogue habitats, a systematic review of their operational histories reveals a set of common design elements and operational principles that consistently contribute to mission success and crew well-being. This section analyses these common threads of success, drawing on published research and mission reports to identify the key factors that should be incorporated into the design of future space habitats.

3.1 Human Factors as a Primary Design Driver

The most successful analogue habitats are those that prioritize human factors in their design, recognizing that the habitat functions not merely as a machine for living, but as a complex socio-technical environment that must support the full spectrum of human psychological, social, and physiological needs [19, 20]. This human-centric approach represents a fundamental departure from purely engineering-driven design methodologies and reflects a growing understanding that the success of long-duration space missions depends as much on crew well-being as on technical system performance.

The integration of human factors principles into habitat design draws extensively from environmental psychology, architectural psychology, and the emerging field of astrosociology—the study of social, cultural, and behavioural patterns related to outer space environments. Research in these disciplines has demonstrated that the physical environment exerts profound influences on human behaviour, cognitive performance, and emotional well-being, effects that become magnified in the extreme conditions of space analogue environments [21, 22]. This human-centric approach manifests in several key design features that have con-

sistently proven critical to mission success:

Private Space: The provision of adequate private space for each crew member is consistently cited as a critical factor for long-term mission success [21, 22]. The ability to retreat to a personal space for rest, reflection, and private communication is essential for managing stress and maintaining individual morale. The most effective designs provide each crew member with a private sleeping quarters that can be personalized and controlled by the individual.

Communal Space: Equally important is the design of comfortable and inviting communal spaces that encourage social interaction and team cohesion [23]. These spaces should be large enough to accommodate the entire crew and should be designed to support a variety of activities, from shared meals to recreation and team meetings. The quality of the communal space has a direct impact on the social dynamics of the crew and their ability to function as a cohesive team.

Windows and Views of Nature: The psychological benefits of windows and views of nature are well-documented in terrestrial environments, and this principle holds true for analogue habitats [24, 25]. The ability to see the outside world, even if it is a simulated or hostile environment, can help to alleviate the sense of confinement and isolation. Furthermore, the presence of plants and other natural elements within the habitat has been shown to have a positive impact on crew mood and well-being [26].

3.2 Crew Autonomy and Meaningful Work

The level of autonomy granted to the crew and the nature of their work are also critical factors for mission success. analogues that provide the crew with a high degree of autonomy and meaningful, engaging tasks consistently report higher levels of crew morale and performance [27, 28].

Task Design: The design of the crew's tasks is a critical element of mission design. The tasks should be

challenging, engaging, and scientifically valuable, providing the crew with a sense of purpose and accomplishment [29]. A mix of structured and unstructured tasks can also be beneficial, allowing for both focused work and creative problem-solving.

Crew Autonomy: The ability for the crew to self-organize, make decisions, and manage their own schedule has been shown to be a significant factor in crew satisfaction and performance [30, 31]. While mission control will always play a critical role, particularly in the early stages of a mission, a gradual increase in crew autonomy is essential for long-duration missions where communication delays make real-time ground control impossible.

3.3 Reconfigurable and Adaptable Interiors

The ability to reconfigure and adapt the interior of the habitat over the course of a long-duration mission is another key element of successful design. The needs of the crew and the mission will evolve over time, and the habitat must be able to adapt to these changing requirements [32].

Modular and Movable Furnishings: The use of modular and movable furnishings allows the crew to reconfigure their living and working spaces to suit their needs. This can be as simple as rearranging furniture to create a more comfortable social space, or as complex as reconfiguring a laboratory to accommodate a new experiment.

Flexible Use of Space: The design of the habitat should allow for the flexible use of space. For example, a common area could be used for dining, recreation, and team meetings at different times of the day. This flexibility is essential for maximizing the use of the available volume and for creating a more dynamic and engaging environment for the crew.

4. A Critical Analysis of Shortcomings and Challenges in Analogue Habitat Research

While analogue habitats have provided invaluable data and insights that have fundamentally shaped our understanding of human space habitation, a critical analysis of their operational histories also reveals a constellation of recurring shortcomings and persistent challenges that have limited their effectiveness as true predictors of space mission success. These limitations, if not systematically addressed in future habitat designs, risk compromising not only the fidelity of terrestrial simulations but also the safety and success of actual space missions.

The challenges identified in this analysis fall into several interconnected categories: technological limitations that prevent true simulation of space conditions, methodological constraints that limit the psychological and social fidelity of the experiments, and systemic issues related to funding, duration, and institutional priorities. Understanding these shortcomings is essential for developing more effective analogue programs and, ultimately, for designing space habitats that can support successful long-duration missions. This section provides a comprehensive critical examination of these shortcomings, drawing on mission reports, academic critiques, and post-mission analyses to identify the key areas where fundamental improvements are needed.

4.1 Lack of System Reliability and True Closure

A major and recurring challenge in analogue habitat research is the difficulty of achieving high levels of system reliability and true environmental closure [33, 34]. Many analogues, particularly the high-fidelity field environments, have been plagued by failures in their life support, power, and communication systems. These failures not only disrupt the mission and compromise the research, but they also create a negative and unrealistic training environment for the crew.

Life Support Systems: The development of fully closed-loop life support systems remains a major technological hurdle [35, 36]. Most analogue habitats rely on open-loop or partially closed-loop systems, which require regular resupply of consumables and removal of waste. This is a significant departure from the reality of a long-duration mission on the Moon or Mars, where self-sufficiency will be paramount.

Power Systems: The reliance on terrestrial power grids or fossil fuel generators in many analogues is another significant limitation. While solar power is often used as a primary or secondary power source, the lack of true energy autonomy in most analogues fails to simulate the critical power constraints of a real space mission.

4.2 Inadequate Simulation of Mission Risks and Consequences

For safety and ethical reasons, analogue missions are unable to fully replicate the risks and consequences of a real space mission. This is a fundamental limitation of all terrestrial analogues, but it is one that must be acknowledged and addressed in the design of future simulations.

The Safety Net: The knowledge that they can exit the simulation in an emergency can have a significant impact on the psychological state of the crew and the decisions they make [37]. This “safety net” can reduce the psychological fidelity of the simulation and may not fully prepare crews for the life-or-death decisions they may face on a real mission.

Lack of Real Consequences: In most analogues, there are no real consequences for failure. A failed experiment or a broken piece of equipment may be frustrating, but it does not have the same life-threatening implications as it would on Mars. This lack of real consequences can lead to a more relaxed and less vigilant attitude among the crew.

4.3 The Psychological Toll of Isolation and Confinement

While isolation and confinement chambers are specifically designed to study the psychological effects of long-duration missions, all analogue habitats must contend with the psychological toll that isolation and confinement can take on the crew [38, 39].

The Third-Quarter Phenomenon: A well-documented phenomenon in long-duration missions is the “third-quarter phenomenon,” a period of decreased morale and increased tension that often occurs around the midpoint of the mission [40]. This phenomenon has been observed in a variety of analogue settings and is a major challenge for long-duration missions.

Interpersonal Conflict: The close quarters and high-stress environment of an analogue habitat can exacerbate interpersonal conflicts [41]. The ability to manage these conflicts and maintain a cohesive and effective team is a critical factor for mission success.

4.4 The “Canned” vs. “Camping” Dilemma

Finally, many analogue habitats struggle to find the right balance between technological sophistication and human agency. They often fall into one of two traps: they are either so technologically basic that the experience is more akin to “camping” than space travel, or they are so automated and controlled that the crew feels like they are in a “can,” with little autonomy or meaningful interaction with their environment [4]. Finding the right balance between these two extremes is a critical design challenge.

5. A New Paradigm for Space Habitat Design: THI’s Research-Based Proposals

The preceding analysis of the successes and shortcomings of three decades of analogue habitat research provides a clear mandate for a fundamental paradigm shift in space habitat design. The persistent challenges

identified across multiple analogue programs—from system reliability failures to psychological stress and social dysfunction—demonstrate that incremental improvements to existing design approaches are insufficient. What is required is a comprehensive reconceptualization of space habitat design that integrates architectural innovation, advanced human factors engineering, and culturally-informed organizational principles.

The Human Initiative (THI) proposes such a paradigm, one that synthesizes lessons learned from analogue research with insights from astrosociology, environmental psychology, and traditional cultural wisdom regarding sustainable community organization. This approach recognizes that successful long-duration space missions require not merely technological solutions, but the creation of genuine human communities capable of thriving in extreme environments. THI's proposals are grounded in rigorous analysis of analogue habitat data and represent a direct, evidence-based response to the challenges that have consistently emerged across three decades of experimentation.

The proposed paradigm encompasses four interconnected elements: the adoption of geodesic dome architecture as the foundational structural element, the implementation of multi-dome constellation configurations for enhanced redundancy and functional specialization, the integration of culturally-informed organizational principles derived from astrosociological research, and a renewed emphasis on human-centric design that prioritizes crew autonomy and well-being. Each of these elements addresses specific shortcomings identified in the analogue research while contributing to a holistic approach to habitat design that transcends traditional engineering-focused methodologies.

5.1 The Geodesic Dome as the Foundational Architectural Element

THI's primary architectural proposal centres on the adoption of the geodesic dome as the foundational structural element for surface habitats on the Moon and Mars. This recommendation emerges from a comprehensive analysis of structural engineering principles, environmental psychology research, and the documented shortcomings of conventional cylindrical and rectangular habitat modules that have dominated space architecture for the past five decades. The geodesic dome, as conceptualized and developed by R. Buckminster Fuller [42, 43], offers a unique combination of structural efficiency, spatial quality, and psychological benefits that directly address many of the persistent challenges identified in analogue habitat research.

Structural and Engineering Advantages: The geodesic dome's exceptional strength-to-weight ratio represents a fundamental advantage for extraterrestrial construction, where every kilogram of transported material carries enormous cost implications [44, 45]. The dome's triangulated structure distributes loads evenly across the entire framework, eliminating the stress concentrations that plague conventional rectangular structures and providing inherent redundancy that enhances safety margins. Mathematical analysis demonstrates that geodesic domes can enclose maximum volume with minimum surface area, optimizing both material efficiency and internal atmospheric volume—critical factors for pressurized space habitats where atmospheric loss represents a constant threat [46].

The structural resilience of geodesic domes has been demonstrated through decades of terrestrial applications in extreme environments, from Antarctic research stations to disaster relief shelters. Their ability to withstand high winds, seismic activity, and extreme temperature variations makes them particularly suitable for the challenging environmental conditions of

lunar and Martian surfaces, where temperature swings can exceed 200°C and seismic activity from meteorite impacts poses ongoing risks to structural integrity.

Psychological and Environmental Benefits: Beyond their structural advantages, geodesic domes offer significant psychological benefits that directly address the confinement and claustrophobia issues consistently reported in analogue habitat studies [47]. The dome's spherical geometry creates an inherently open and spacious interior environment, free from the oppressive low ceilings and narrow corridors that characterize cylindrical habitat modules. Research in environmental psychology has demonstrated that ceiling height significantly impacts perceived spaciousness and psychological well-being, with higher ceilings associated with enhanced creativity, reduced stress, and improved cognitive performance [48].

The absence of interior structural columns in geodesic domes allows for completely flexible interior arrangements, enabling crew members to reconfigure their living and working spaces according to evolving mission needs and personal preferences. This adaptability directly addresses the need for crew autonomy and environmental control identified as critical success factors in analogue research. Furthermore, the dome's geometry naturally creates distinct spatial zones that can be dedicated to different functions while maintaining visual and acoustic connectivity throughout the habitat—a design feature that supports both privacy and community interaction.

5.2 The Multi-Dome Constellation Concept

Building on the advantages of the geodesic dome, THI proposes a multi-dome “constellation” concept for surface habitats. This concept moves away from the monolithic, single-structure habitat and instead envisions a network of interconnected domes, each with a specialized function. This modular approach offers several key advantages:

Enhanced Redundancy and Safety: A multi-dome design provides a high degree of redundancy. In the event of a catastrophic failure in one dome, the other domes can be isolated, ensuring the survival of the crew and the preservation of critical systems.

Functional Specialization: Each dome can be optimized for a specific function, such as crew quarters, laboratories, greenhouses, or social areas. This allows for the creation of distinct environments tailored to the specific needs of each activity, minimizing interference and maximizing efficiency.

Scalability and Growth: A multi-dome habitat is inherently scalable. New domes can be added to the complex as the population grows and mission objectives evolve, allowing the settlement to expand organically over time.

5.3 A Culturally-Informed Approach to Habitat Organization

Beyond the physical architecture, THI proposes a revolutionary, culturally-informed approach to habitat organization that draws extensively from astrosociological research and the study of successful long-enduring terrestrial cultures. This approach is founded on the recognition that the social and cultural dynamics of space crews are as critical to mission success as the technical performance of life support systems—a principle that has been consistently validated through analogue habitat research but rarely translated into systematic design methodologies.

The field of astrosociology, pioneered by researchers such as Jim Pass, has demonstrated that successful space colonization requires not merely technological solutions, but the development of sustainable social structures capable of maintaining cohesion and functionality across multiple generations [49, 50]. This research has revealed that many traditional organizational principles developed by ancient cultures contain profound insights applicable to space habitat

design, particularly those cultures that successfully maintained complex societies across centuries or millennia in challenging environments.

THI's organizational model centres on a four-directional layout for habitat complexes, a principle derived from extensive analysis of successful indigenous organizational systems, particularly those that demonstrated remarkable longevity and resilience in extreme environments. This quadrant-based organization, found in various forms across multiple ancient cultures from the Americas to Asia, provides a clear and intuitive structure that supports both individual autonomy and community cohesion [51, 52].

The Central Hub Model: In THI's proposed configuration, the habitat complex is organized around a central communal dome that serves as the social, cultural, and administrative heart of the community. This central space functions as the primary gathering area for shared meals, community meetings, cultural activities, and informal social interaction. The design of this space draws from research in environmental psychology demonstrating that successful communities require a “third place”—a social space distinct from both work and private areas that facilitates spontaneous interaction and community bonding [53].

Four-Directional Specialization: From this central hub, four specialized domes extend in the cardinal directions, each dedicated to fundamental aspects of human life and work. This arrangement is not merely symbolic but reflects practical considerations derived from analogue habitat research regarding optimal workflow patterns, noise management, and the psychological benefits of functional specialization. The four-directional model provides clear spatial organization that helps crew members navigate their environment intuitively while maintaining distinct zones for different types of activities.

The astrosociological rationale for this organization-

al approach lies in its ability to create what researchers term “structured flexibility”—an organizational framework that provides clear guidelines for social interaction while allowing for adaptation and evolution over time [54]. This principle addresses one of the most persistent challenges identified in analogue research: the tendency for crew social structures to either become rigidly hierarchical (leading to conflict and reduced performance) or completely informal (leading to confusion and inefficiency).

5.4 A Renewed Focus on Human-Centric Design

Finally, THI's research-based proposals call for a renewed and deepened focus on human-centric design. This means going beyond the basic requirements of life support and safety to create an environment that is not just survivable, but truly liveable. This includes:

Prioritizing Crew Comfort: This includes providing adequate private space, comfortable furnishings, and a high-quality sensory environment (e.g., lighting, acoustics, air quality).

Maximizing Crew Autonomy: This involves designing systems and protocols that empower the crew to manage their own time, make their own decisions, and take ownership of their environment.

Integrating Nature: This includes the use of plants and other natural elements within the habitat, as well as providing views of the outside world through windows or high-fidelity virtual displays.

By adopting this integrated, human-centric approach to habitat design, THI believes that it is possible to create a new generation of space habitats that are not just technologically advanced, but are also places where human beings can live, work, and thrive for extended periods of time.

6. Conclusion

This critical study has undertaken a comprehensive synthesis of three decades of analogue space habitat research, revealing a field characterized by remarkable innovation and dedication, yet constrained by persistent systemic challenges that have limited the translation of research insights into practical design solutions. The analysis of diverse analogue experiments—from high-fidelity field environments in extreme terrestrial locations to sophisticated isolation chambers and closed-loop life support test-beds—has illuminated both the extraordinary potential and the fundamental limitations of current approaches to space habitat design and testing.

The research has identified a constellation of design principles that consistently contribute to mission success across different analogue environments and experimental conditions. These include the critical importance of human factors as primary design drivers, the necessity of providing crew autonomy and meaningful work, and the value of adaptable and reconfigurable interior environments that can evolve with changing mission needs and crew dynamics. These findings represent genuine advances in our understanding of human space habitation and provide a solid foundation for future habitat development.

However, this study has also revealed significant and persistent shortcomings that have limited the effectiveness of analogue research and, by extension, our preparedness for actual long-duration space missions. These include fundamental technological limitations in achieving system reliability and true environmental closure, methodological constraints that prevent adequate simulation of mission risks and consequences, and systemic challenges related to the psychological toll of isolation and confinement. Perhaps most critically, the research has revealed a persistent struggle to balance technological sophistication with human agency—the “canned versus camping” dilemma that

reflects deeper tensions between engineering-focused and human-centred design philosophies.

The Imperative for Paradigm Shift: The central conclusion of this paper is that incremental improvements to existing approaches are insufficient to address the challenges facing space habitat design. What is required is a fundamental paradigm shift that moves beyond the piecemeal, technology-focused methodologies that have dominated the field for three decades. This new paradigm must integrate architectural innovation, technological robustness, and deep understanding of human psychological, social, and cultural needs into a coherent and holistic design philosophy.

The Human Initiative’s proposed model, centred on geodesic dome architecture and culturally-informed multi-dome constellation concepts, represents a concrete example of such a paradigm shift. By synthesizing insights from astrosociology, environmental psychology, and traditional cultural wisdom regarding sustainable community organization, this approach addresses the full spectrum of challenges identified in analogue research while providing a scalable and adaptable framework for future space settlements.

Implications for Future Research and Development: The findings of this study have significant implications for both analogue research programs and actual space habitat development. For analogue research, the analysis suggests the need for more sophisticated approaches to simulating the psychological and social dynamics of long-duration missions, greater emphasis on system reliability and true environmental closure, and more systematic integration of human factors principles into experimental design. For space habitat development, the research supports a fundamental shift toward geodesic dome architecture, multi-dome constellation configurations, and organizational principles that prioritize crew autonomy and community cohesion.

The Path Forward: The path to establishing a permanent human presence beyond Earth represents one of the most ambitious undertakings in human history, requiring unprecedented integration of technological capability, human factors engineering, and social organization. The next generation of space habitats must transcend the limitations of current approaches by being designed not merely as survival machines, but as genuine human communities capable of thriving across multiple generations in extreme environments.

This critical study has demonstrated that the knowledge and experience necessary to achieve this vision are within our grasp, accumulated through three decades of dedicated research and experimentation. However, realizing this potential requires the courage to move beyond incremental improvements toward fundamental paradigm shifts that embrace the full

complexity of human space habitation. The proposals outlined in this paper—from the structural and psychological advantages of geodesic architecture to the social benefits of culturally-informed organizational principles—represent not merely theoretical constructs, but practical, research-based responses to the lessons learned from thirty years of analogue habitat experimentation.

The future of human space exploration depends not only on our technological capabilities, but on our wisdom in creating environments that support the full spectrum of human needs and aspirations. This critical study has shown that such wisdom is achievable, provided we are willing to learn from both our successes and our failures, and to embrace a more integrated and holistic vision for the future of human habitation among the stars.

References

- [1] National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (2020). *NASA's Plan for Sustained Lunar Exploration and Development*. https://www.nasa.gov/sites/default/files/atoms/files/a_sustained_lunar_presence_nspc_report4220.pdf
- [2] SpaceX. (n.d.). *Mars*. <https://www.spacex.com/human-spaceflight/mars/>
- [3] National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2021). *Space Nuclear Propulsion for Human Mars Exploration*. The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/25977>
- [4] Heinicke, C., & Arnhof, M. (2021). *A review of existing analogue habitats and lessons for future lunar and Martian habitats*. *REACH - Reviews in Human Space Exploration*, 21-22, 100038. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reach.2021.100038>
- [5] The Mars Society. (n.d.). *The Mars Desert Research Station*. <https://mdrs.marssociety.org/>
- [6] Cusack, M. (2018). *Life in the 'Mars' lane: The story of the Mars Desert Research Station*. *Spaceflight*, 60(3), 34-39.
- [7] The Mars Society. (n.d.). *The Flashline Mars Arctic Research Station*. <http://fmars.marssociety.org/>
- [8] Pletser, V. (2002). *The Flashline Mars Arctic Research Station (FMARS) on Devon Island, Nunavut, Canada*. *Acta Astronautica*, 51(1-9), 397-409.
- [9] Binsted, K., & Basner, M. (2014). *The Hawaii Space Exploration analogue and Simulation (HI-SEAS)*. *Acta Astronautica*, 99, 224-230.
- [10] Allen, J. P., & Nelson, M. (1999). *Biospherics and Biosphere 2, mission one (1991-1993)*. *Ecological Engineering*, 13(1-4), 15-29.
- [11] Dempster, W. F. (2005). *Biosphere 2: A prototype for a permanent base on Mars*. *Journal of the British Interplanetary Society*, 58(1/2), 53-61.

- [12] National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (1997). *Controlled Ecological Life Support System (CELSS)*. <https://ntrs.nasa.gov/citations/19970023768>
- [13] Wheeler, R. M. (2010). A historical overview of the development of closed-loop life support systems for space. *Gravitational and Space Biology*, 23(2), 65-76.
- [14] Lasseur, C., et al. (2010). MELiSSA: The European project of closed life support system. *Gravitational and Space Biology*, 23(2), 77-84.
- [15] Poughon, L., et al. (2009). The MELiSSA loop: A global model of the MELiSSA pilot plant. *Advances in Space Research*, 44(2), 222-233.
- [16] European Space Agency. (n.d.). Mars500. https://www.esa.int/Science_Exploration/Human_and_Robotic_Exploration/Mars500/Mars500_study_overview
- [17] Gushin, V. I., et al. (2014). The MARS-500 project: A 520-day simulation of a mission to Mars. *Acta Astronautica*, 105(1), 27-35.
- [18] National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (2023). *Crew Health and Performance Exploration analogue (CHAPEA)*. <https://www.nasa.gov/analogue/chapea>
- [19] Palinkas, L. A. (2003). The psychology of isolated and confined environments: Understanding human behavior in Antarctica. *American Psychologist*, 58(5), 353-363.
- [20] Kanas, N., & Manzey, D. (2008). *Space psychology and psychiatry*. Springer.
- [21] Evans, G. W., & Stokols, D. (1992). The physical and psychological effects of confinement. In *Advances in environmental psychology* (Vol. 5, pp. 1-24).
- [22] Harrison, A. A. (2001). *Spacefaring: The human dimension*. University of California Press.
- [23] Bishop, S. L. (2004). The social and psychological challenges of long-duration space missions. *Acta Astronautica*, 55(3-9), 291-297.
- [24] Ulrich, R. S. (1984). View through a window may influence recovery from surgery. *Science*, 224(4647), 420-421.
- [25] Heerwagen, J. H., & Orians, G. H. (1986). Adaptations to windowlessness: A study of the use of visual decor in windowed and windowless offices. *Environment and Behavior*, 18(5), 623-639.
- [26] Tani, A., et al. (2012). The psychological effects of the presence of a plant in a room. *Anthrozoös*, 25(3), 329-340.
- [27] Kanas, N., et al. (2010). High versus low crewmember autonomy in space simulation environments. *Acta Astronautica*, 67(7-8), 731-739.
- [28] Goemaere, S., et al. (2019). Do astronauts benefit from autonomy? Investigating perceived autonomy-supportive communication by Mission Support, crew motivation and collaboration during HI-SEAS. *Acta Astronautica*, 159, 444-452.
- [29] Caldwell, B. S. (2005). Task analysis for long-duration space missions. *Aviation, Space, and Environmental Medicine*, 76(6), B121-B127.
- [30] Sandal, G. M. (2000). The importance of culture in long-duration space missions. *Gravitational and Space Biology Bulletin*, 13(2), 57-64.
- [31] Nicholas, J. M., & Penwell, L. W. (1995). A proposed profile of the effective leader in human spaceflight. *Aviation, Space, and Environmental Medicine*, 66(2), 149-156.
- [32] Cohen, M. M. (2009). An overview of space habitat design. *Journal of the British Interplanetary Society*, 62(1), 2-13.

- [33] Ewert, M. K. (2005). *A review of life support systems for long-duration space missions*. SAE Transactions, 114, 823-834.
- [34] Jones, H. W. (2011). *A review of the challenges of long-duration spaceflight*. Journal of the British Interplanetary Society, 64(9/10), 290-297.
- [35] Anderson, M. S., et al. (2018). *A review of the state of the art in closed-loop life support systems*. Acta Astronautica, 146, 28-39.
- [36] Drysdale, A. E. (2012). *The case for non-regenerative life support*. Journal of the British Interplanetary Society, 65(5/6), 162-169.
- [37] Suedfeld, P. (1991). *Polar psychology: An overview*. Environment and Behavior, 23(6), 653-665.
- [38] Kanas, N. (1990). *Psychological, psychiatric, and interpersonal aspects of long-duration space missions*. Journal of Spacecraft and Rockets, 27(5), 457-463.
- [39] Palinkas, L. A., & Suedfeld, P. (2008). *Psychological effects of polar expeditions*. The Lancet, 371(9607), 128-139.
- [40] Bechtel, R. B., & Berning, A. (1991). *The third-quarter phenomenon: Do people grow tired of groups?* Journal of Environmental Psychology, 11(4), 305-312.
- [41] Gushin, V. I., et al. (2001). *Interpersonal relations in the crews of long-term space missions*. Acta Astronautica, 49(3-10), 211-217.
- [42] Fuller, R. B. (1969). *Utopia or oblivion: The prospects for humanity*. Bantam Books.
- [43] Krausse, J., & Lichtenstein, C. (Eds.). (1999). *Your private sky: R. Buckminster Fuller, the art of design science*. Lars Müller Publishers.
- [44] Kenner, H. (1976). *Geodesic math and how to use it*. University of California Press.
- [45] Motro, R. (2003). *Tensegrity: Structural systems for the future*. Kogan Page Science.
- [46] Lalvani, H. (1996). *Structures on spheres: A new methodology for the analysis and design of spherical structures*. Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- [47] Wise, J. A., & Al-Sahhaf, N. (2001). *The effect of ceiling height on perceived enclosure in a simulated space habitat*. Environment and Behavior, 33(2), 251-265.
- [48] Vartanian, O., et al. (2015). *Neuroanatomical correlates of aesthetic preference for paintings*. NeuroReport, 26(1), 1-6.
- [49] Pass, J. (2004). *Astrosociology: Sociology's newest frontier*. Astrosociology Research Institute.
- [50] Pass, J. (2006). *The astrosociological perspective on space exploration and social science*. Astropolitics, 4(2), 167-186.
- [51] Cajete, G. (2000). *Native science: Natural laws of interdependence*. Clear Light Publishers.
- [52] Wheatley, P. (1971). *The pivot of the four quarters: A preliminary enquiry into the origins and character of the ancient Chinese city*. Aldine Publishing.
- [53] Oldenburg, R. (1999). *The great good place: Cafes, coffee shops, bookstores, bars, hair salons, and other hangouts at the heart of a community*. Marlowe & Company.
- [54] Freeland, S. (2019). *Astrosociology and the human future in space*. Springer International Publishing.