# 1NC

### 1

#### Interpretation—the aff must disclose the plan text, framework, and advantage areas 30 minutes before the round. To clarify, disclosure can occur on the wiki or over message.

#### Violation—they didn’t – verbally said it was new

#### Vote neg for prep and clash—two internal links—a) neg prep—4 minutes of prep is not enough to put together a coherent 1nc or update generics—30 minutes is necessary to learn a little about the affirmative and piece together what 1nc positions apply and cut and research their applications to the affirmative b) aff quality—plan text disclosure discourages cheap shot affs. If the aff isn’t inherent or easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, it should lose—this will answer the 1ar’s claim about innovation—with 30 minutes of prep, there’s still an incentive to find a new strategic, well justified aff, but no incentive to cut a horrible, incoherent aff that the neg can’t check against the broader literature.

#### Voters:

#### Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### Precision o/w – anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### Drop the debater to deter future abuse and because the 2N doesn’t get new disads to whole rez so it’s permanently skewed.

#### Use competing interps – a) reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter, b) collapses to competing interps – we justify 2 brightlines under an offense defense paradigm just like 2 interps.

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms

#### Evaluate T before 1AR theory – a) norms – we only have a couple months to set T norms but can set 1AR theory norms anytime, b) magnitude – T affects a larger portion of the debate since the aff advocacy determines every speech after it

### 2

#### Interp – Appropriation means permanent control over a region of space.

Trapp 13, Timothy Justin. "Taking up Space by Any Other Means: Coming to Terms with Nonappropriation Article of the Outer Space Treaty." U. Ill. L. Rev. (2013): 1681. (JD Candidate at UIUC Law School)//Re-cut by Elmer

The issues presented in relation to the nonappropriation article of the Outer Space Treaty should be clear.214 The ITU has, quite blatantly, created something akin to “property interests in outer space.”215 It allows nations to exclude others from their orbital slots, even when the nation is not currently using that slot.216 This is directly in line with at least one definition of outer-space appropriation.217

[\*\*Start Footnote 217\*\*Id. at 236 (“Appropriation of outer space, therefore, is ‘the exercise of exclusive control or exclusive use’ with a sense of permanence, which limits other nations’ access to it.”) (quoting Milton L. Smith, The Role of the ITU in the Development of Space Law, 17 ANNALS AIR & SPACE L. 157, 165 (1992)). \*\*End Footnote 217\*\*]

The ITU even allows nations with unused slots to devise them to other entities, creating a market for the property rights set up by this regulation.218 In some aspects, this seems to effect exactly what those signatory nations of the Bogotá Declaration were try3ing to accomplish, albeit through different means.219

#### 2] Violation – Space Tourism is travel over a short duration – the events are neither permanent nor limit other uses by other actors of a particular region of space – even if they win singular examples of tourism that could be appropriation, they explicitly include travel that is temporary which makes the Aff Extra-Topical at best.

Henderson and Tsui 19 Henderson, I. L., and W. H. K. Tsui. "The role of niche aviation operations as tourist attractions." Air transport: A tourism perspective (2019): 233-244. (Massey University School of Aviation, Palmerston North, New Zealand)//Elmer

17.5 Space Tourism Space tourism is another niche segment of the aviation industry that seeks to give tourists the ability to become astronauts and experience space travel for recreational, leisure, or business purposes. Since space tourism is extremely expensive, it is a case of a very small segment of consumers that are able and willing to purchase a space experience. There are several options for space tourists. For example, Crouch et al. (2009) investigate the choice behaviour between four types of space tourism: high altitude jet fighter flights, atmospheric zero-gravity flights, short-duration suborbital flights, and longer duration orbital trips into space. Reddy et al. (2012) find the following motivational factors behind space tourism (in order of importance): vision of earth from space, weightlessness, high speed experience, unusual experience, and scientific contribution. Currently, only high-altitude jet fighter flights and atmospheric zero-gravity flights are commercially available to tourists in the space tourism sector. Accordingly, this section provides an example of each, whilst the potential for suborbital and longer duration orbital trips into space are discussed later in this chapter. Case Study 17.3 Examples of Space Tourism MiG-29 Edge of Space Flight One current option for space tourists is to be taken up into the stratosphere in a supersonic fighter jet (see MiGFlug, 2017a). MiGFlug acts as a sales agent for this unique space tourism activity, which usually involves reaching an altitude of 20–22 km. At such an altitude, the curvature of the earth can be seen, the sky is dark, and it is possible to see into space. As part of this space travel experience, tourists are also given an opportunity to control the aircraft and there are a number of aerobatic manoeuvres that are performed by an experienced pilot. This operation is based out of Russia. The Mikoyan MiG-29 Fulcrum is a Russian military fighter jet that allows for rates of climb of 330 m/s and a top speed of Mach 2.25 (2390 km/h). MiGFlug sells three different services in this aircraft. For €12,500 a passenger can enjoy a 25-min flight featuring a number of aerobatic manoeuvres but without supersonic flight. For €14,500 a passenger can enjoy a 45-min flight that includes higher aerobatics and supersonic flight. The ‘Edge of Space’ flight includes aerobatics, supersonic flight, and the experience of being taken up into the stratosphere and is sold for €17,500.

#### 3] Standards –

#### a] Limits – temporary actions explodes Ground – Aff’s can affect temporary docking of private actors on the ISS, using lunar bases in a temporary manner for broader space exploration efforts, and temporary satellites which devastates neg prep burdens.

#### b] Ground – temporary actions means the neg can’t say private appropriation good since it assumes permanence – we lose any link magnitude since the plan only effects a small amount of time.

### 3

#### Statesought to call a global constitutional convention and establish a constitution reflecting intergenerational concern with exclusive authority to ban private space tourism and bind participating bodies to its result

#### That solves the aff – it addresses shared anxieties while building political consensus

Gardiner 14 1 [Stephen M. Gardiner, Professor of Philosophy and Ben Rabinowitz Endowed Professor of Human Dimensions of the Environment at the University of Washington, Seattle, “A Call for a Global Constitutional Convention Focused on Future Generations,” 2014, *Ethics & International Affairs*, Vol. 28, Issue 3, pp. 299-315, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0892679414000379, EA]

A Constitutional Convention

In my view, the above line of reasoning leads naturally to a more specific proposal: that we—concerned individuals, interested community groups, national governments, and transnational organizations—should initiate a call for a global constitutional convention focused on future generations. This proposal has two components. The first component is procedural. The proposal takes the form of a “call to action.” It is explicitly an attempt to engage a range of actors, based on a claim that they have or should take on a set of responsibilities, and a view about how to go about discharging those responsibilities. The second component is substantive. The main focus for action is a push for the creation of a constitutional convention at the global level, whose role is to pave the way for an overall constitutional system that appropriately embodies intergenerational concern.

The substantive idea rests on several key ideas. Still, for the purposes of a basic proposal, I suggest that these be understood in a relatively open way that, as far as is practicable, does not prejudge the outcome of the convention, and especially its main recommendations. First, the convention itself should be understood as “a representative body called together for some occasional or temporary purpose” and “constituted by statute to represent the people in their primary relations.”14 Second, a constitutional system should be thought of in a minimalist sense as “a set of norms (rules, principles or values) creating, structuring, and possibly defining the limits of government power or authority.”15 Third, the “instigating” role of the convention should be to discuss, develop, make recommendations toward, and set in motion a process for the establishment of a constitution. Fourth, its primary subject matter should be the need to adequately reflect and embody intergenerational concern, where this would include at least the protection of future generations, the promotion of their interests (where “interests” is to be broadly conceived so as to include rights, claims, welfare, and so on), and the discharging of duties with respect to them. It may also (and in my view should) include some way of reflecting concern for past generations, including responsiveness to at least certain of their interests and views. However, I will leave that issue aside in what follows.

The proposal to initiate a call for a global constitutional convention has at least two attractive features. First, it is based in a deep political reality, and does not underplay the challenge. It acknowledges the problem as it is, both specific and general, and calls attention to the heart of that problem, including to the failures of the current system, the need for an alternative, and the background issue of responsibility. Moreover, though the proposal is dramatic and rhetorically eye-catching, it is so in a way that is appropriately responsive to the seriousness of the issue at hand, the persistent political inertia surrounding more modest initiatives, and the fact that (grave though concerns about it are) climate change is only one instance of the tyranny of the contemporary (and the wider perfect moral storm), and we should expect others to arise over the coming decades and centuries.

The second attractive feature of the proposal is that, though ambitious, it is not alienating. While it does not succumb to despair in the face of the challenge, neither does it needlessly polarize and divide from the outset (for example, by leaping to specific recommendations about how to fill the institutional gap). Instead, it acknowledges that there are fundamental difficulties and anxieties, but uses them to start the right kind of debate, rather than to foreclose it. As a result, the proposal is a promising candidate to serve as the subject of a wide and overlapping political consensus, at least among those who share intergenerational concern.

Selective Mirroring

To quell some initial anxieties, it is perhaps worth clarifying the open-ended and non-alienating character of the proposal. One temptation would be to view the call for a global constitutional convention as a fairly naked plea for world government, a prospect that would be deeply alienating—indeed anathema—to many. However, that is not my intention. Though it is possible that a global constitutional convention would lead in this direction, it is by no means certain.

At a minimum, no such body could plausibly recommend any form of “world government” without simultaneously advancing detailed suggestions about how to avoid the standard threats such an institution might pose. Moreover, it seems perfectly conceivable, even likely under current ways of thinking, that a global constitutional convention would pursue what we might call a selective mirroring strategy. Specifically, a convention would seek to develop a broader system of institutions and practices that reflected the desirable features of a powerful and highly centralized global authority but neutralized the standing threats posed by it (for example, it might employ familiar strategies such as the separation of powers). In all likelihood, one feature of a selective mirroring approach would be the significant preservation of existing institutions to serve as a bulwark against the excesses of any newly created ones. Whether and how such a strategy might be made effective against the perfect moral storm, and whether something closer to a “world government” would do better, would be a central issue for discussion by the convention.

#### It spills over to foster broader intergenerational representation, but independence is key

Gardiner 14 2 [Stephen M. Gardiner, Professor of Philosophy and Ben Rabinowitz Endowed Professor of Human Dimensions of the Environment at the University of Washington, Seattle, “A Call for a Global Constitutional Convention Focused on Future Generations,” 2014, *Ethics & International Affairs*, Vol. 28, Issue 3, pp. 299-315, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0892679414000379, EA]

One set of guidelines concerns how the global constitutional convention relates to other institutions. The first guideline concerns relative independence:

(1) Autonomy: Any global constitutional convention should have considerable autonomy from other institutions, and especially from those dominated by factors that generate or facilitate the tyranny of the contemporary (and the perfect moral storm, more generally).

Thus, for example, attempts should be made to insulate the global constitutional convention from too much influence from short-term and narrowly economic forces.

The second guideline concerns limits to that independence:

(2) Mutual Accountability: Any global constitutional convention should be to some extent accountable to other major institutions, and they should be accountable to it.

Thus, for example, though the global constitutional convention should not be able to decide unilaterally that national institutions should be radically supplanted, nevertheless such institutions should not have a simple veto on the recommendations of the convention, including those that would result in sharp limits to their powers.

A third guideline concerns adequacy:

(3) Functional Adequacy: The global constitutional convention should be constructed in such a way that it is highly likely to produce recommendations that are functionally adequate to the task.

Thus, for example, the tasks of the global constitutional convention should not be assigned to any currently existing body whose design and authority is clearly unsuitable. In my view, this guideline rules out proposals such as the Royal Society’s suggestion that governance of geoengineering should be taken up by the United Nations’ Commission on Sustainable Development,20 or the Secretary-General’s recommendation of a new United Nations’ High Commissioner for Future Generations.21 Though such proposals may have merit for some purposes (for example, as pragmatic, incremental suggestions to highlight the importance of intergenerational issues), they are too modest, in my opinion, to reflect the gravity of the threats posed by climate change in particular, and the perfect moral storm more generally.

Aims

A second set of guidelines concerns the aims of the global constitutional convention. Here, the perfect moral storm analysis would suggest:

(4) Comprehensiveness: The convention should be under a mandate to consider a very broad range of global, intergenerational issues, to focus on such issues at a foundational level, and to recommend institutional reform accordingly.

(5) Standing Authority: Though the convention may recommend the establishment of some temporary and issue-specific bodies, its focus should be on the establishment of institutions with standing authority over the long term.

These guidelines are significant in that they stand against existing issue-specific approaches to global and intergenerational problems, and encourage not only a less ad hoc but also a more proactive approach. In particular, the global constitutional convention might be expected to recommend institutions that would be charged with identifying, monitoring, and taking charge of intergenerational issues as such. For example, such institutions should address not only specific policy issues (such as climate change, large asteroid detection, and long-term nuclear waste) but also the need to identify similar threats before they arise.

#### Proactive measures mitigate a laundry list of emerging catastrophic risks – extinction

Beckstead et al. 14 [Nick Beckstead, Nick Bostrom, Niel Bowerman, Owen Cotton-Barratt, William MacAskill, Seán Ó hÉigeartaigh, Toby Ord, \* Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford, \*\* Director, Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford, \*\*\* Global Priorities Project, Centre for Effective Altruism; Department of Physics, University of Oxford, \*\*\*\* Global Priorities Project, Centre for Effective Altruism; Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford, \*\*\*\*\* Uehiro Centre for Practical Ethics, University of Oxford, \*\*\*\*\*\* Cambridge Centre for the Study of Existential Risk; Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford, \*\*\*\*\*\*\* Programme on the Impacts of Future Technology, Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford, “Policy Brief: Unprecedented Technological Risks,” 2014, *The Global Priorities Project, The Future of Humanity Institute, The Oxford Martin Programme on the Impacts of Future Technology, and The Centre for the Study of Existential Risk*, https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Unprecedented-Technological-Risks.pdf, Accessed: 03/13/21, EA]

In the near future, major technological developments will give rise to new unprecedented risks. In particular, like nuclear technology, developments in synthetic biology, geoengineering, distributed manufacturing and artificial intelligence create risks of catastrophe on a global scale. These new technologies will have very large benefits to humankind. But, without proper regulation, they risk the creation of new weapons of mass destruction, the start of a new arms race, or catastrophe through accidental misuse. Some experts have suggested that these technologies are even more worrying than nuclear weapons, because they are more difficult to control. Whereas nuclear weapons require the rare and controllable resources of uranium-235 or plutonium-239, once these new technologies are developed, they will be very difficult to regulate and easily accessible to small countries or even terrorist groups.

Moreover, these risks are currently underregulated, for a number of reasons. Protection against such risks is a global public good and thus undersupplied by the market. Implementation often requires cooperation among many governments, which adds political complexity. Due to the unprecedented nature of the risks, there is little or no previous experience from which to draw lessons and form policy. And the beneficiaries of preventative policy include people who have no sway over current political processes — our children and grandchildren.

Given the unpredictable nature of technological progress, development of these technologies may be unexpectedly rapid. A political reaction to these technologies only when they are already on the brink of development may therefore be too late. We need to implement prudent and proactive policy measures in the near future, even if no such breakthroughs currently appear imminent.

#### Maintaining sustainable use of outer space is key to future generations

**Islam 18** [Mohammad Saiful Islam, Mohammad works for the Institute of Advanced Judicial Studies and the Beijing Institute of Technology. 4-27-2018, "The Sustainable Use of Outer Space: Complications and Legal Challenges to the Peaceful Uses and Benefit of Humankind," Beijing Law Review, <https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=85201> accessed 12/12/21] Adam

4.2. Ensure the Rights of Future Generations in Outer Space

Sustainable development is the establishing principle for achieving present human needs without damaging the demands of future generations maintaining integrity and constancy of the natural systems. The modern idea of sustainable development is derived from the Brundtland Report in 1987. Generally considered in modern application and exploration of outer space, fundamental elements are the area must be dedicated to peaceful purposes; and the area must be preserved for future generations [(Heim, 1990)](https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=85201#ref17). It is an indispensable and inordinate challenge to confirm uphold the healthy environment and make sure development without destroying the rights of future generations in space. Article IX of The Outer Space Treaty provided, in the exploration and use of outer space, States should pursue studies and conduct exploration of outer space so as to avoid harmful contamination and also adverse changes in the environment of the Earth [(Outer Space Treaty, 1967)](https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=85201#ref35). The issues of what constitutes harmful contamination in Earth’s environment have yet to be interpreted. The legal definition of “adverse” and “harmful” will also modification as Earth, indigenous sciences progress, separately or in concert, with the planetary exploration space sciences [(Robinson, 2005)](https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=85201#ref38). As a result of multifaceted political, economic, scientific, technological, educational, and other global problems, there has been practicing exclusively only international cooperation for sustainable space development among the developed countries [(Noichim, 2005)](https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=85201#ref34). The space faring nations should promote a supportive environment for peaceful and sustainable use of space, decrease environmental effects on Earth and protect the terrestrial environment. We should escape a regime that will ultimately reflect the over-exploitation of resources and environmental havoc [(Fountain, 2002)](https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=85201#ref9).

## Case

#### Resilience and countermeasures prevent spread – distinct from burnout

Adalja 16

Amesh Adalja is an infectious-disease physician at the University of Pittsburgh, The Atlantic, June 17, 2016, “Why Hasn't Disease Wiped out the Human Race?”, https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2016/06/infectious-diseases-extinction/487514/

But when people ask me if I’m worried about infectious diseases, they’re often not asking about the threat to human lives; they’re asking about the threat to human life. With each outbreak of a headline-grabbing emerging infectious disease comes a fear of extinction itself. The fear envisions a large proportion of humans succumbing to infection, leaving no survivors or so few that the species can’t be sustained.

I’m not afraid of this apocalyptic scenario, but I do understand the impulse. Worry about the end is a quintessentially human trait. Thankfully, so is our resilience.

For most of mankind’s history, infectious diseases were the existential threat to humanity—and for good reason. They were quite successful at killing people: The 6th century’s Plague of Justinian knocked out an estimated 17 percent of the world’s population; the 14th century Black Death decimated a third of Europe; the 1918 influenza pandemic killed 5 percent of the world; malaria is estimated to have killed half of all humans who have ever lived.

Any yet, of course, humanity continued to flourish. Our species’ recent explosion in lifespan is almost exclusively the result of the control of infectious diseases through sanitation, vaccination, and antimicrobial therapies. Only in the modern era, in which many infectious diseases have been tamed in the industrial world, do people have the luxury of death from cancer, heart disease, or stroke in the 8th decade of life. Childhoods are free from watching siblings and friends die from outbreaks of typhoid, scarlet fever, smallpox, measles, and the like.

**Intervening actors check**

**Zakaria 9—**Editor of Newsweek, BA from Yale, PhD in pol sci, Harvard. He serves on the board of Yale University, The Council on Foreign Relations, The Trilateral Commission, and Shakespeare and Company. Named "one of the 21 most important people of the 21st Century" (Fareed, “The Capitalist Manifesto: Greed Is Good,” 13 June 2009, http://www.newsweek.com/id/201935)

Note—Laurie Garrett=science and health writer, winner of the Pulitzer, Polk, and Peabody Prize

It certainly looks like another example of crying wolf. **After bracing ourselves for a global pandemic, we've suffered** something more like **the usual seasonal influenza**. Three weeks ago the World Health Organization declared a health emergency, warning countries to "prepare for a pandemic" and said that the only question was the extent of worldwide damage. **Senior officials prophesied that millions could be infected** by the disease. **But as of last week, the WHO had confirmed only 4,800 cases** of swine flu, with 61 people having died of it. Obviously, these low numbers are a pleasant surprise, but it does make one wonder, what did we get wrong? **Why did** the **predictions of a pandemic turn out to be so exaggerated**? Some people blame an overheated media, but it would have been difficult to ignore major international health organizations and governments when they were warning of catastrophe. I think **there is a** broader **mistake in the way we look at the world.** Once we see a problem, we can describe it in great detail, extrapolating all its possible consequences. But **we** can **rarely anticipate the human response to that crisis. Take** **swine flu. The virus** **had crucial characteristics** **that led researchers to worry that it could spread far and fast**. They described—and the media reported—what would happen if it went unchecked. **But it did not go unchecked**. **In fact, swine flu was met by an extremely vigorous response at its epicenter**, **Mexico. The Mexican government reacted quickly** and massively, quarantining the infected population, testing others, providing medication to those who needed it. **The noted expert on this subject,** Laurie **Garrett, says, "**We should all stand up and scream, **'Gracias, Mexico**!' because the Mexican people and the Mexican government have sacrificed on a level that I'm not sure as Americans we would be prepared to do in the exact same circumstances. They shut down their schools. They shut down businesses, restaurants, churches, sporting events. **They** basically paralyzed their own economy. They've suffered billions of dollars in financial losses still being tallied up, and thereby **really brought transmission to a halt." Every time one of these viruses is detected**, writers and **officials bring up the Spanish influenza** epidemic **of 1918** in which millions of people died. Indeed, during the last pandemic scare, in 2005, President George W. Bush claimed that he had been reading a history of the Spanish flu to help him understand how to respond. **But the world we live in today looks nothing like 1918. Public health-care systems are far better** and more widespread than anything that existed during the First World War. **Even Mexico, a developing country, has a first-rate public-health system**—far better than anything Britain or France had in the early 20th century.

#### Disease outbreaks will be defeated with quarantines

**Szalai 7/26** [(Jennifer Szalai - author for the NYT) “The Extradordinary History (and likely busy future) of quarantine” The New York Times. 7-26-2021]

**Quarantine can be lifesaving**; it can also be dangerous, an exercise of extraordinary power in the name of disease control, a presumption of guilt instead of innocence.

In “Until Proven Safe,” a new book about quarantine’s past and future, Geoff Manaugh and Nicola Twilley do an impressively judicious job of explaining exactly why fears of quarantine are understandable and historically justified, while also showing how in coming years “we will almost certainly find ourselves more dependent on quarantine, not less.” Quarantine has to do with risk and uncertainty, and its logic is simple: “There might be something dangerous inside you — something contagious — on the verge of breaking free.”

**While medical advances have made some diseases more diagnosable** and less deadly, newfound knowledge can also accentuate the depths of our ignorance. The more we know, the more we know how much we don’t know — not to mention that **modern life, with escalating numbers of people and goods churning** their way **around the world**, has **increased the opportunities for contagion.**

Quarantine is distinct from isolation, even if the terms are often used interchangeably. Someone is isolated when they are known to be sick; **someone is quarantined when they might be but we cannot be sure**. Manaugh, an architecture and technology blogger, and Twilley, the co-host of a podcast about the science and history of food, bring an impressively wide range of interests to bear on a subject that involves not only infectious disease but also — in their ambitious yet seamless narration — politics, agriculture, surveillance and even outer space.

#### Quarantines solve climate change – COVID was responsible for the largest drop in emissions ever

**Alexander 20** [(Kurtis, a general assignment reporter for The San Francisco Chronicle, frequently writing about water, wildfire, climate and the American West. His recent work has focused on the impacts of drought, the widening rural-urban divide and state and federal environmental policy. Before joining the Chronicle, Alexander worked as a freelance writer and as a staff reporter for several media organizations, including The Fresno Bee and Bay Area News Group, writing about government, politics and the environment.) "Coronavirus has altered the global warming trajectory. But for how long?" San Francisco Chronicle, 5/20/20, https://www.sfchronicle.com/health/article/Greenhouse-gas-emissions-on-track-for-record-drop-15279312.php] TDI

The disruption caused by the coronavirus has been so profound that it’s altered the trajectory of global warming.

Not since World War II — and perhaps never before — have the emissions of heat-trapping gases dropped as much around the planet as they have during the COVID-19 outbreak.

The latest and most detailed study yet on the pandemic’s impact on climate pollution, published Tuesday and authored by the research group Global Carbon Project chaired by Stanford University’s Rob Jackson, finds that the Earth will see up to a 7% decrease in carbon dioxide this year. The dip is five times the decline in emissions in 2009, when the recession choked the world’s economy, and double what it was in 1992, after the fall of the Soviet Union.

The paper’s findings mirror other reports that have similarly found sharp drops in greenhouse gases recently. The emerging research also is in agreement that the lull will likely be short-lived and, at best, buy time before the most devastating effects of climate change take hold. The lockdown that has halted factories, energy plants and automobiles during the pandemic is already lifting, and without deliberate action, carbon-intense activities are bound to resume.

“That’s the danger here,” said Jackson, a professor of earth system science and senior fellow at Stanford Woods Institute for the Environment. “We’ve decreased emissions for the wrong reasons. Will they jump back up starting this fall, or could the virus allow us to rethink transportation and other parts of the economy?”

The answer to the question, say Jackson and others, may not be so straightforward. Greenhouse gases could rebound in some areas, and there could be lasting decreases in others.

Measuring heat-trapping gas emissions, for which carbon dioxide is a proxy, is not easy to do, especially in real time. The researchers at the Global Carbon Project analyzed daily economic activity in 69 countries from January through April and modeled the carbon pollution that likely resulted, then compared it to last year. The countries included have historically produced almost all of the world’s carbon dioxide.

The researchers found that China, the largest polluter, reduced emissions by nearly 24% on some days in mid-February. The United States, the second-largest polluter, cut emissions by nearly 32% for almost two weeks in mid-April. The European Union, including Great Britain, trimmed emissions by about 27% during the first week of April.

The dates of peak reductions varied in different parts of the globe because each locked down at a different time. The biggest cumulative drop in carbon dioxide was on April 7 and measured about 17%, according to the study.

While a variety of activity explains the declines, fewer people driving was the largest contributor worldwide. Less industrial pollution was also a big contributor.

Based on the observed drops in emissions, the researchers estimate that going forward, carbon dioxide will fall between 4% and 7% for the year worldwide, depending on how quickly countries end their lockdowns.

Jackson said the amount of the decline can be viewed as both considerable, given that it’s the largest ever seen, and humbling because it’s the minimum needed annually to put the planet on track to meet the Paris climate agreement — enough of a drop to prevent the global temperature from rising 2 degrees Celsius above preindustrial levels.

“We would need to do this every year,” he said.

The International Energy Agency recently projected an 8% dip in greenhouse gases for the year while the International Monetary Fund came up with an estimate closer to 6%. Both organizations said carbon pollution would likely rise again in 2021.

After the decline in emissions in 2009 of about 1.4%, the following year saw an increase of 5.1%.

The Global Carbon Project says there’s reason to think that at least some parts of the globe will try to prevent heat-trapping gases from bouncing back. Stimulus programs aimed at developing clean energy and new carbon-friendly ways of living adopted during the pandemic, such as working from home, could help limit emissions.

“Cities from Seattle to Milan are keeping roads closed to cars and letting them stay open to bikes and pedestrians even after the shelter-in-place,” Jackson said. “And maybe COVID-19 and stimulus funding will jump-start electric cars.”

#### Shutdowns solve climate change – substantially reduce emissions, air and water pollution, directs attention to climate

**Chow 20** [(Denise, a reporter for NBC News Science focused on general science and climate change) "Coronavirus shutdowns have unintended climate benefits: cleaner air, clearer water," NBC News, 3/18/20, https://www.nbcnews.com/science/environment/coronavirus-shutdowns-have-unintended-climate-benefits-n1161921] DRD

Concentrations of nitrogen dioxide in the atmosphere over Italy also fell precipitously, as they did in China. An analysis by The Washington Post found that the most dramatic drop was observed over northern Italy.

Nitrogen dioxide can irritate the lungs, and inhaling the pollutant can increase the risk of asthma and inflammation of the lungs. Although the noxious gas isn't thought to be a major contributor to climate change, studying its concentration in the atmosphere can help scientists understand other heat-trapping greenhouse gases that do drive global warming.

Jacqueline Klopp, co-director of the Center for Sustainable Urban Development at Columbia University in New York City, said she expects to see greenhouse gas emissions plummet across the board because of the quarantine measures.

"People were in their homes and really stopped a lot of the activities that lead to greenhouse gas emissions and other pollution," she said.

Early observations have shown that extreme social-distancing measures are likely also having an effect on air pollution at the city level in the U.S.

Jordan Wildish, a project director at Earth Economics, an environmental non-profit organization based in Tacoma, Washington, developed an online dashboard to track air quality in San Francisco, New York City and the Seattle area, comparing the measurements with figures from the same time last year.

In San Francisco, which is under shelter-in-place orders to control the spread of the coronavirus, the average concentration of fine particulate matter — tiny particles in the air that are dangerous because they can be breathed deeply into the lungs — over the past five days was almost 40 percent lower than the previous year.

In New York City, there was a 28 percent drop over the same period of time, and the Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue saw a 32 percent decrease.

But experts warned that observed reductions are temporary and that as cities, countries and economies bounce back, so, too, will emissions — unless major infrastructure or societal changes are adopted.

Klopp said the pandemic could make companies and governments realize that other threats to humanity, including climate change, could be just as devastating and that it's imperative to develop protective measures.

#### 1] Collision risk is infinitesimally small

Fange 17 Daniel Von Fange 17, Web Application Engineer, Founder and Owner of LeanCoder, Full Stack, Polyglot Web Developer, “Kessler Syndrome is Over Hyped”, 5/21/2017, http://braino.org/essays/kessler\_syndrome\_is\_over\_hyped/

The orbital area around earth can be broken down into four regions. Low LEO - Up to about 400km. Things that orbit here burn up in the earth’s atmosphere quickly - between a few months to two years. The space station operates at the high end of this range. It loses about a kilometer of altitude a month and if not pushed higher every few months, would soon burn up. For all practical purposes, Low LEO doesn’t matter for Kessler Syndrome. If Low LEO was ever full of space junk, we’d just wait a year and a half, and the problem would be over. High LEO - 400km to 2000km. This where most heavy satellites and most space junk orbits. The air is thin enough here that satellites only go down slowly, and they have a much farther distance to fall. It can take 50 years for stuff here to get down. This is where Kessler Syndrome could be an issue. Mid Orbit - GPS satellites and other navigation satellites travel here in lonely, long lives. The volume of space is so huge, and the number of satellites so few, that we don’t need to worry about Kessler here. GEO - If you put a satellite far enough out from earth, the speed that the satellite travels around the earth will match the speed of the surface of the earth rotating under it. From the ground, the satellite will appear to hang motionless. Usually the geostationary orbit is used by big weather satellites and big TV broadcasting satellites. (This apparent motionlessness is why satellite TV dishes can be mounted pointing in a fixed direction. You can find approximate south just by looking around at the dishes in your northern hemisphere neighborhood.) For Kessler purposes, GEO orbit is roughly a ring 384,400 km around. However, all the satellites here are moving the same direction at the same speed - debris doesn’t get free velocity from the speed of the satellites. Also, it’s quite expensive to get a satellite here, and so there aren’t many, only about one satellite per 1000km of the ring. Kessler is not a problem here. How bad could Kessler Syndrome in High LEO be? Let’s imagine a worst case scenario. An evil alien intelligence chops up everything in High LEO, turning it into 1cm cubes of death orbiting at 1000km, spread as evenly across the surface of this sphere as orbital mechanics would allow. Is humanity cut off from space? I’m guessing the world has launched about 10,000 tons of satellites total. For guessing purposes, I’ll assume 2,500 tons of satellites and junk currently in High LEO. If satellites are made of aluminum, with a density of 2.70 g/cm3, then that’s 839,985,870 1cm cubes. A sphere for an orbit of 1,000km has a surface area of 682,752,000 square KM. So there would be one cube of junk per .81 square KM. If a rocket traveled through that, its odds of hitting that cube are tiny - less than 1 in 10,000.

#### 2] Low risk of collisions – it’s overhyped

Albrecht 16 [Mark Albrecht, chairman of the board of USSpace LLC, head of the White House National Space Council from 1989 to 1992, and Paul Graziani, CEO and founder of Analytical Graphics, a company that develops software and provides mission assurance through the Commercial Space Operations Center (ComSpOC), Congested space is a serious problem solved by hard work, not hysteria, 2016, https://spacenews.com/op-ed-congested-space-is-a-serious-problem-solved-by-hard-work-not-hysteria/]

Popular culture has embraced the risks of collisions in space in films like Gravity. Some participants have dramatized the issue by producing graphics of Earth and its satellites, which make our planet look like a fuzzy marble, almost obscured by a dense cloud of white pellets meant to conceptualize space congestion. Unfortunately, for the sake of a good visual, satellites are depicted as if they were hundreds of miles wide, like the state of Pennsylvania (for the record, there are no space objects the size of Pennsylvania in orbit). Unfortunately, this is the rule, not the exception, and almost all of these articles, movies, graphics, and simulations are exaggerated and misleading. Space debris and collision risk is real, but it certainly is not a crisis. So what are the facts? On the positive side, space is empty and it is vast. At the altitude of the International Space Station, one half a degree of Earth longitude is almost 40 miles long. That same one half a degree at geostationary orbit, some 22,000 miles up is over 230 miles long. Generally, we don’t intentionally put satellites closer together than one-half degree. That means at geostationary orbit, they are no closer than 11 times as far as the eye can see on flat ground or on the sea: That’s the horizon over the horizon 10 times over. In addition, other than minute forces like solar winds and sparse bits of atmosphere that still exist 500 miles up, nothing gets in the way of orbiting objects and they behave quite predictably. The location of the smallest spacecraft can be predicated within a 1,000 feet, 24 hours in advance. Since we first started placing objects into space there have been 11 known low Earth orbit collisions, and three known collisions at geostationary orbit. Think of it: 135 space shuttle flights, all of the Apollo, Gemini and Mercury flights, hundreds of telecommunications satellites, 1,300 functioning satellites on orbit today, half a million total objects in space larger than a marble, and fewer than 15 known collisions. Why do people worry?

#### No Escalation:

#### 1] Planning Priorities

Bowen 18 Bleddyn Bowen 2-20-2018 “The Art of Space Deterrence” <https://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/commentary/the-art-of-space-deterrence/> (Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Leicester)//Elmer

Space is often an afterthought or a miscellaneous ancillary in the grand strategic views of top-level decision-makers. A president may not care that one satellite may be lost or go dark; it may cause panic and Twitter-based hysteria for the space community, of course. But the terrestrial context and consequences, as well as the political stakes and symbolism of any exchange of hostilities in space matters more. The political and media dimension can magnify or minimise the perceived consequences of losing specific satellites out of all proportion to their actual strategic effect.

#### 2] Military Precedent

Zarybnisky 18, Eric J. Celestial Deterrence: Deterring Aggression in the Global Commons of Space. Naval War College Newport United States, 2018. (Senior Materiel Leader at United States Air Force)//Elmer

PREVENTING AGGRESSION IN SPACE While deterrence and the Cold War are strongly linked in the public’s mind through the nuclear standoff between the United States and the Soviet Union, the fundamentals of deterrence date back millennia and deterrence remains relevant. Thucydides alludes to the concept of deterrence in his telling of the Peloponnesian War when he describes rivals seeking advantages, such as recruiting allies, to dissuade an adversary from starting or expanding a conflict.6F 6 Aggression in space was successfully avoided during the Cold War because both sides viewed an attack on military satellites as highly escalatory, and such an action would likely result in general nuclear war.7F 7 In today’s more nuanced world, attacking satellites, including military satellites, does not necessarily result in nuclear war. For instance, foreign countries have used highpowered lasers against American intelligence-gathering satellites8F 8 and the United States has been reluctant to respond, let alone retaliate with nuclear weapons. This shift in policy is a result of the broader use of gray zone operations, to which countries struggle to respond while limiting escalation. Beginning with the fundamentals of deterrence illuminates how it applies to prevention of aggression in space.

### No Ag War

#### The countries that matter for their impact are resilient and institutional responses prevent escalation

Sarah **Cliffe 16**, Director of the Center on International Cooperation at New York University, 3/29/16, “Food Security, Nutrition, and Peace,” http://cic.nyu.edu/news\_commentary/food-security-nutrition-and-peace

However, current research **does not** yet indicate a clear link between climate change, food insecurity and conflict, except perhaps where rapidly deteriorating water availability cuts across existing tensions and weak institutions. But a series of interlinked problems – changing global patterns of consumption of energy and scarce resources, increasing demands for food imports (which draw on land, water, and energy inputs) can create pressure on fragile situations.

Food security – and food prices – are a highly political issue, being a very immediate and visible source of popular welfare or popular uncertainty. But their **link to conflict** (and the wider links between climate change and conflict) is indirect rather than direct.

What makes some countries more resilient than others?

**Many** countries face food price or natural resource shocks **without falling into conflict**. Essentially, the two important factors in determining their resilience are: First, whether food insecurity is combined with **other stresses** – issues such as unemployment, but most fundamentally issues such as political exclusion or human rights abuses. We sometimes read nowadays that the 2006-2009 drought was a factor in the Syrian conflict, by driving rural-urban migration that caused societal stresses. It may of course have been one factor amongst many but it would be **too simplistic** to suggest that it was the primary driver of the Syrian conflict. Second, whether countries have strong enough institutions to fulfill a social compact with their citizens, providing help quickly to citizens affected by food insecurity, with or without international assistance. During the 2007-2008 food crisis, developing countries with low institutional strength experienced more food price protests than those with higher institutional strengths, and more than half these protests turned violent. This for example, is the difference in the events in Haiti versus those in **Mexico or the Philippines** where far greater institutional strength existed to deal with the food price shocks and **protests did not spur deteriorating national security** or widespread violence.

#### No impact – humans can survive post-collapse and there’s no relationship between survival and biodiversity – their authors use flawed data analysis

Hough 14 [Rupert, Environmental Scientist with Expertise in Risk Modelling and Exposure Assessment and PhD from Nottingham University, February, “Biodiversity and human health: evidence for causality?” Biodiversity and Conservation, Vol. 23 No. 2, pg. 272-3/AKG]

Large country-level assessments (e.g. MEA 2005; Huynen et al. 2004; Sieswerda et al. 2001) must be interpreted with some caution. Data measured at country-level are likely to mask regional and local-level effects. Apart from the fact that there are limitations to regression analysis in providing any proof of causality, least squares regression models assume linear relationships between reductions in biodiversity and human health and thus imply a linear relationship between loss of biodiversity and the provision of relevant ecosystem goods and services. A number of authors, however, have suggested that ecosystems can lose a proportion of their biodiversity without adverse consequences to their functioning (e.g. Schwartz et al. 2000). Only when a threshold in the losses of biodiversity is reached does the provision of ecosystem goods and services become compromised. These models also tend to assume a positive relationship between socio-economic development and loss of biodiversity. One problem with this expectation is that the loss in biodiversity in one country is not per definition the result of socio-economic developments in that particular country, but could also be the result of socio-economic developments in other parts of the world (Wackernagel and Rees 1996). Furthermore, the use of existing data means researchers can only make use of available indicators. Unlike for human health and socio-economic development, there are no broadly accepted core-set of indicators for biodiversity (Soberon et al. 2000). The lack of correlation between biodiversity indicators (Huynen et al. 2004) shows that the selected indicators do not measure the same thing, which hinders interpretation of results. Finally, there is likely to be some sort of latency period between ecosystem imbalance and any resulting health consequences. To date, this has not been investigated using regression approaches. Finally, it is thought that provisioning services are more crucial for human health and well-being that other ecosystem services (Raudsepp-Hearne et al. 2010). Trends in measures of human well-being are clearly correlated with food provisioning services, and especially with meat consumption (Smil 2002). While \*60 % of the ecosystem services assessed by the MEA were found to be in decline, most of these were regulating and supporting services, whereas the majority of expanding services were provisioning services such as crops, livestock and aquaculture (MEA 2005). Raudsepp-Hearne et al. (2010) investigated the impacts on human well-being from decreases in non-food ecosystem services using national-scale data in order to reveal human well-being trends at the global scale. At the global scale, forest cover, biodiversity, and fish stocks are all decreasing; while water crowding (a measure of how many people shared the same flow unit of water placing a clear emphasis on the social demands of water rather than physical stress (Falkenmark and Rockstro¨m 2004)), soil degradation, natural disasters, global temperatures, and carbon dioxide levels are all on the rise, and land is becoming increasingly subject to salinization and desertification (Bennett and Balvanera 2007). However, across countries, Raudsepp-Hearne et al. (2010) found no correlation between measures of wellbeing and the available data for non-food ecosystem services, including forest cover and percentage of land under protected-area status (proxies for many cultural and regulating services), organic pollutants (a proxy for air and water quality), and water crowding index (a proxy for drinking water availability, Sieswerda et al. 2001; WRI 2009) This suggests there is no direct causal link between biodiversity decline and health, rather the relationship is a ‘knock-on’ effect. I.e. if biodiversity decline affects mankind’s ability to produce food, fuel and fibre, it will therefore impact on human health and well-being. As discussed in the introduction, the fact that humans need food, water and air to live is an obvious one. All these basic provisions can be produced in a diversity-poor environment. Therefore, to understand whether there is a potential causality relationship between biodiversity in its own right and human health, we need to move beyond the basic provisioning services.