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#### USICA passes now.

Flatly and Edgerton 1-12 [Daniel Flatley, reporter on foreign policy, Anna Edgerton, Bloomberg journalist, 1-12-2022, "House Leaders Near Agreement on Stalled China Competition Bill," Bloomberg, <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-01-12/house-leaders-assembling-compromise-on-china-competition-bill> [accessed 1-14-22] Lydia

The U.S. House of Representatives is preparing to move forward on a China competitiveness bill that would authorize billions of dollars in funding to bolster U.S. research and development as well as aid for the domestic semiconductor industry, according to a leadership aide. The move comes after Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi in November announced a deal to find a way to get the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act through Congress after the Senate had passed it in June. The legislation, which has bipartisan support, is a major legislative priority for Schumer and the Biden administration. There is no timing yet on a vote, but the bill’s supporters say agreement on its contents must be reached before midterm election campaigns are in full swing, and compromise becomes even more difficult in the Capitol.  The administration has been pressing House leadership to take action on the measure, including the nearly $52 billion in grants and incentives it would provide for the semiconductor industry amid a global chip shortage. Commerce Secretary Gina Raimondo and President Joe Biden were expected to reach out to Pelosi directly on the package, according to Senator John Cornyn, a Texas Republican and sponsor of the semiconductor provision, who said he spoke to Raimondo about the matter. Pelosi has told the chairs of several committees -- including Science, Foreign Affairs and Energy and Commerce -- to draft proposals for a piece of legislation the House can take to conference with the Senate, with the aim of getting a bill both chambers agree on. The House Science Committee earlier passed several bipartisan measures that included similar elements to the Senate bill but were not packaged together. The Foreign Affairs panel, which is expected to play a major role in the legislation, approved a China competitiveness bill last year that Republicans attacked as too soft on Beijing and too focused on climate change. That bill has since stalled in the House. Foreign Affairs Chair Gregory Meeks reiterated his commitment to the climate portions of the bill in November, saying it was “tremendously important” and that he would not simply approve what the Senate had passed. The bill has a narrow path to success in the House -- much narrower in some ways than in the Senate, where it made it through on a 68-32 tally. Representative Cathy McMorris Rodgers of Washington State, the top Republican on the Energy and Commerce Committee, called an earlier version of USICA a repeat of “the mistakes of the Obama-Biden Administration.” And the Republican Study Committee, which boasts a large membership in the House, also has panned the legislation. Progressive Concerns On the other end of the political spectrum, some progressive groups have criticized the bill as too aggressively focused on competition with China -- an approach they say could ignite a new cold war. They advocate a more collaborative approach in a [letter](https://quincyinst.org/2021/05/17/65-orgs-cold-war-with-china-is-a-dangerous-and-self-defeating-strategy/) posted to the Quincy Institute website in May. But business groups, including the Semiconductor Industry Association, have pushed Congress to pass a bill that addresses competition with China, particularly boosting domestic chip manufacturing. The chief executives of several companies, including Tim Cook of [Apple Inc.](https://www.bloomberg.com/quote/AAPL:US), Sundar Pichai of Google parent [Alphabet Inc.](https://www.bloomberg.com/quote/GOOGL:US) and Mary Barra of [General Motors Co.](https://www.bloomberg.com/quote/GM:US) wrote a letter late last year calling on Congress to pass the measure.

#### But, partisan legislation trades off.

Segers 21 [Grace, Staff writer at The New Republic, “A New Year’s Resolution for Congress: Finish What You Started in 2021,” TNR, 12/22/2021, <https://newrepublic.com/article/164719/congress-democrats-2022-agenda>] recut lydia

But lo, there are also several things that Congress wants to do. The U.S. Innovation and Competition Act, formerly known by the far cooler title of the Endless Frontier Act, is at the top of the list. The Senate earlier this year passed the legislation known as USICA that aims to increase competitiveness with China; it has since stalled in the House. In November, Schumer and Speaker Nancy Pelosi announced that the bill would go through the bicameral conference process, in which both chambers work together to reconcile their differences. Most legislation these days is preconferenced, which means that committee chairs come to an agreement before a bill even gets to the floor to ensure that it will be able to pass both houses. So actually going through the conferencing process is a somewhat unusual step for the modern Congress.

Funding the government, the NDAA and USICA provide rare opportunities for bipartisanship on the Hill. GOP Senator John Cornyn told The New Republic that USICA was perhaps “something that we can get done early.” “The closer we get to the midterms, hopefully our Democratic colleagues will have a little less appetite for purely partisan legislation,” Cornyn said. “I’m confident that we’ll find some things to work on together while we continue to fight like cats and dogs.”

#### That’s the plan. NewSpace companies will lobby for their survival, spurring partisan division.

GC 17 [GC Magazine; Autumn 2017; Business thinking, In-house management, Published by legal500; “The new space race,” <https://www.legal500.com/gc-magazine/feature/the-new-space-race/>] brett

The upshot is that the ability to engage with legislators and policymakers will be essential for the long-term viability of companies like Planetary Resources.

‘We’re seeing already that with a regulatory framework laid out for a very quickly growing and expanding sector, there’s a lot of opportunity for policy engagement. That’s equally true in other countries too, which are either enacting their first national space laws or overhauling them,’ says Israel.

Before Israel joined the company, Planetary Resources was heavily involved in lobbying the US Congress to support the Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act – better known as the SPACE Act.

That piece of legislation explicitly granted permission to US entities to ‘engage in the commercial exploration and exploitation of “space resources”.’ But the international community remains divided over whether the SPACE Act runs contrary to the obligations imposed on the US under the Outer Space Treaty.

‘The Americans are a sovereign state and according to their international treaty commitments, it’s hard to say that their domestic law is compatible with international law,’ says Smith.

Lobbying, both at a domestic and international level, stands to become increasingly critical, particularly as the US is in the process of crafting a framework for supervising non-governmental space activities, while ensure conformity with the Outer Space Treaty.
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‘It is incumbent on Congress to use the 50-year anniversary of the Outer Space Treaty to properly determine our actual international obligations, decide if specific articles in the Treaty are self-executing or not, and ensure that our domestic policy moving forward creates an environment that provides certainty for industry while protecting our national security,’ said Senator Ted Cruz, earlier this year.

‘The design and objectives in doing this must not only be to implement the government’s obligations, but to do so in a way that is not unduly burdensome on emerging space activities,’ adds Israel.

‘This is particularly relevant when the exact contours of how the activity will be carried out are not known, which makes it imperative that the regulators do not get too far ahead of the technology and make guesses about how it will be done, what is feasible, then lock in standards that are ultimately irrelevant and unworkable.’

#### Key to tech leadership.

Murray 21 [Ashley, Post-Gazette Washington Bureau, “Tech bills in U.S. Congress could be 'generational opportunity' for Pittsburgh,” Post-Gazette, 12/19/2021, https://www.post-gazette.com/news/politics-nation/2021/12/19/Tech-bills-U-S-Congress-Pittsburgh-China-Argo-AI-5G-robotics-USICA-innovation-competition-act/stories/202112190108]

WASHINGTON — A proposal in Congress to boost U.S. competitiveness in advanced technology could mean millions of education and industry dollars for the region and be a “generational opportunity” for Pittsburgh, a city that boasts its status as the birthplace of driverless tech and the cradle of numerous start-ups.

Bills in both chambers outline billions in investment to support initiatives all the way from K-12 STEM education to semiconductors, quantum computing, climate science research and “high intensity laser” exploration. And could ensure U.S. leadership and security — namely from China’s creeping dominance — for decades to come, advocates and lawmakers on both sides of the aisle say.

While the D.C. spotlight has been focused on the massive bipartisan infrastructure law and President Joe Biden’s stalled social and climate spending bill, tech insiders in Pittsburgh see the innovation-focused legislation as one of the most significant moves the U.S. could make.

Under consideration is an estimated $200 billion Senate bill titled the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act, or USICA. The sprawling, bipartisan 2,000-page proposal aims to establish National Science Foundation programs for the commercialization of artificial intelligence, advanced computing and other areas while also protecting domestic research and expanding trade provisions with China.

On the House side, bipartisan support is strong for multiple bills that would double the National Science Foundation research funding to $78 billion over five years and direct $50 billion over the same time period for Department of Energy projects.

“This is a generational scale investment in that type of economic development, in strengthening our core research universities, but also putting money in there for translational research [to private industry],” said Brian Kennedy, senior vice president of operations and government affairs for the Pittsburgh Technology Council, which represents 1,000 companies in the Pittsburgh region.

The tech leader estimates that in “the very short term” roughly $100 million to $200 million in funding could roll into southwestern Pennsylvania.

“But in all honesty I think that’s just the tip of the iceberg,” said Mr. Kennedy, who cited what previous investments have done for the university lab-to-company pipeline.

“If you look at Pittsburgh’s story in terms of tech, it’s really hard to tell it without mentioning Carnegie Mellon and the University of Pittsburgh,” he continued.

Mr. Kennedy traced the thread from inside the robotics and computer science labs to the marquee Pittsburgh-based manufacturing hubs and tech companies across the city. Carnegie Mellon University’s Advanced Robotics Institute established itself where once the city’s steel mills sat on Hazelwood Green. Argo AI has led Pittsburgh to the forefront of autonomous vehicle testing, he said, and Astrobotic soon will direct a mission to the moon from its North Side-based control room.

“It’s the kind of investments that are front-and-center on the planet right now — AI, biotechnology, cybersecurity. These are all the core capabilities of Pittsburgh, and they’re also the core things pressing everyone on the planet.”

China

China’s advances in technological innovation have become a top concern among tech leaders, defense officials and lawmakers.

The world’s second largest economy became the top manufacturer of high-tech goods in 2020, and it either already has sped ahead or is poised to overtake the U.S. in the next decade in various advanced technologies, according to a report published this month by the Harvard Kennedy School.

China has become a major competitor to the U.S. in artificial intelligence, and America’s 5G infrastructure rollout is years behind its rival, the study reported. Additionally, the report asserts that while the U.S. is a leader in other areas, including semiconductor design, green energy and cell therapy, China is building competitive capacity in manufacturing and biotechnology.

This leads some experts to conclude that America’s plan is behind the curve.

“I wish they passed this bill 10 years ago,” said Kevin Chen, a professor with the University of Pittsburgh’s Swanson School of Engineering.

“This is really a no brainer. I can tell you what happens if this bill is not passed. The United States as a country is going to continue to under invest in technology, especially in this important technology,” he said.

“Think about 5G. The U.S. government didn’t invest a lot of R&D into 5G. Who’s leading right now? I think you know that: Huawei,” he said, referring to the Chinese tech company. “... You don’t want to be in that situation for semiconductors.”

In either substance or rhetoric, both U.S. chambers point to the innovation bills as an answer to this threat.

The Senate version cites China hundreds of times regarding policies limiting cooperation with the nation, lists page after page on the flow of goods, and promotes a “Buy America” strategy.

The bill also outlines ways to tackle security of research developed in the United States, which Mr. Kennedy sees as a possible snag in the proposal for academics.

“There’s a lot of concern about how that might get played out in actuality, how that might actually hurt competitiveness of American universities and hurt the transparency of research we do that’s meant for the world,” he said.

A Republican aide who is knowledgeable of the House versions said that lawmakers on both sides of the aisle are trying to chart a middle path between global innovation and U.S. intellectual property.

“International collaboration is critical for scientific progress, and we certainly don’t want to harm that, but we need to find a balance between protecting taxpayer-funded research from theft while encouraging the collaboration that has always made science successful,” the aide said.

However, Mr. Kennedy and others say the potential fruits of the plan appear too sweet to limit the focus just to China.

Zoning in on China is a “one dimensional way of thinking of it,” said Stephen Herzenberg, economist and executive director of the progressive Keystone Research Center.

“Many other countries have been constructively nationalist when it comes to manufacturing policy for a long time, think of Germany and Japan,” he said. “... The bottom line is [a nationwide manufacturing policy] would help a lot.”

A Democratic House aide noted that  the “bills are certainly broader than China.”

“It’s very much sort of taking stock of U.S. leadership and U.S. competitiveness challenged by any comer and making sure that U.S. is equipped to respond and lead and succeed in the face of the rest of the world, which is not standing idly by,” the aide said.

#### Chinese tech supremacy causes nuclear war.

Kroenig 18 [Matthew, Deputy Director for Strategy, Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security; Associate Professor of Government and Foreign Service, Georgetown University, “Will disruptive technology cause nuclear war?” The Bulletin, 11/12/2018, https://thebulletin.org/2018/11/will-disruptive-technology-cause-nuclear-war/]

Recently, analysts have argued that emerging technologies with military applications may undermine nuclear stability (see here, here, and here), but the logic of these arguments is debatable and overlooks a more straightforward reason why new technology might cause nuclear conflict: by upending the existing balance of power among nuclear-armed states. This latter concern is more probable and dangerous and demands an immediate policy response.

For more than 70 years, the world has avoided major power conflict, and many attribute this era of peace to nuclear weapons. In situations of mutually assured destruction (MAD), neither side has an incentive to start a conflict because doing so will only result in its own annihilation. The key to this model of deterrence is the maintenance of secure second-strike capabilities—the ability to absorb an enemy nuclear attack and respond with a devastating counterattack.

Recently analysts have begun to worry, however, that new strategic military technologies may make it possible for a state to conduct a successful first strike on an enemy. For example, Chinese colleagues have complained to me in Track II dialogues that the United States may decide to launch a sophisticated cyberattack against Chinese nuclear command and control, essentially turning off China’s nuclear forces. Then, Washington will follow up with a massive strike with conventional cruise and hypersonic missiles to destroy China’s nuclear weapons. Finally, if any Chinese forces happen to survive, the United States can simply mop up China’s ragged retaliatory strike with advanced missile defenses. China will be disarmed and US nuclear weapons will still be sitting on the shelf, untouched.

If the United States, or any other state acquires such a first-strike capability, then the logic of MAD would be undermined. Washington may be tempted to launch a nuclear first strike. Or China may choose instead to use its nuclear weapons early in a conflict before they can be wiped out—the so-called “use ‘em or lose ‘em” problem.

According to this logic, therefore, the appropriate policy response would be to ban outright or control any new weapon systems that might threaten second-strike capabilities.

This way of thinking about new technology and stability, however, is open to question. Would any US president truly decide to launch a massive, bolt-out-of-the-blue nuclear attack because he or she thought s/he could get away with it? And why does it make sense for the country in the inferior position, in this case China, to intentionally start a nuclear war that it will almost certainly lose? More important, this conceptualization of how new technology affects stability is too narrow, focused exclusively on how new military technologies might be used against nuclear forces directly.

Rather, we should think more broadly about how new technology might affect global politics, and, for this, it is helpful to turn to scholarly international relations theory. The dominant theory of the causes of war in the academy is the “bargaining model of war.” This theory identifies rapid shifts in the balance of power as a primary cause of conflict.

International politics often presents states with conflicts that they can settle through peaceful bargaining, but when bargaining breaks down, war results. Shifts in the balance of power are problematic because they undermine effective bargaining. After all, why agree to a deal today if your bargaining position will be stronger tomorrow? And, a clear understanding of the military balance of power can contribute to peace. (Why start a war you are likely to lose?) But shifts in the balance of power muddy understandings of which states have the advantage.

You may see where this is going. New technologies threaten to create potentially destabilizing shifts in the balance of power.

For decades, stability in Europe and Asia has been supported by US military power. In recent years, however, the balance of power in Asia has begun to shift, as China has increased its military capabilities. Already, Beijing has become more assertive in the region, claiming contested territory in the South China Sea. And the results of Russia’s military modernization have been on full display in its ongoing intervention in Ukraine.

Moreover, China may have the lead over the United States in emerging technologies that could be decisive for the future of military acquisitions and warfare, including 3D printing, hypersonic missiles, quantum computing, 5G wireless connectivity, and artificial intelligence (AI). And Russian President Vladimir Putin is building new unmanned vehicles while ominously declaring, “Whoever leads in AI will rule the world.”

If China or Russia are able to incorporate new technologies into their militaries before the United States, then this could lead to the kind of rapid shift in the balance of power that often causes war.

If Beijing believes emerging technologies provide it with a newfound, local military advantage over the United States, for example, it may be more willing than previously to initiate conflict over Taiwan. And if Putin thinks new tech has strengthened his hand, he may be more tempted to launch a Ukraine-style invasion of a NATO member.

Either scenario could bring these nuclear powers into direct conflict with the United States, and once nuclear armed states are at war, there is an inherent risk of nuclear conflict through limited nuclear war strategies, nuclear brinkmanship, or simple accident or inadvertent escalation.

This framing of the problem leads to a different set of policy implications. The concern is not simply technologies that threaten to undermine nuclear second-strike capabilities directly, but, rather, any technologies that can result in a meaningful shift in the broader balance of power. And the solution is not to preserve second-strike capabilities, but to preserve prevailing power balances more broadly.

When it comes to new technology, this means that the United States should seek to maintain an innovation edge. Washington should also work with other states, including its nuclear-armed rivals, to develop a new set of arms control and nonproliferation agreements and export controls to deny these newer and potentially destabilizing technologies to potentially hostile states.

These are no easy tasks, but the consequences of Washington losing the race for technological superiority to its autocratic challengers just might mean nuclear Armageddon

### 1NC---CP

#### States ought to establish a regulatory framework regarding private entities in Low Earth Orbit that:

#### ---mandates incorporation of Space Sustainability Ratings;

#### ---mandates Space Traffic Management for all entities in space, including Active Debris Removal;

#### --- facilitates the creation of Public Private Partnerships between States and private entities creating megaconstellations.

#### Solves tracking satellites, norms, co-operation, info, collisions, and access---empirics prove.

Bhakare 21 [Nikita; IV B.A. LL.B. student, ILS Law College, Pune (India) “THE NEED FOR EVOLVING LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR REGULATION OF SPACE DEBRIS CAUSED BY SATELLITE CONSTELLATIONS” <https://conference.sdo.esoc.esa.int/proceedings/sdc8/paper/310/SDC8-paper310.pdf>] brett

In view of all the grey areas of Law and Policies in order to regulate satellite constellations, it has been clear that since the law is not always binding, it tends to leave much scope for ruthless exploitation of the legislative frameworks. Hence, it could prove to be valuable by incorporating the following concepts while allowing large sat-structures up in the skies.

7.1 Space Sustainability Ratings (SSR) and Space-Traffic Management (STM)

Space Sustainability Ratings is a novel concept that implores companies to inculcate the Long-Term Sustainability Principles while tracking the satellite activity, in this case, in corporate and commercial ventures, an initiative by MIT and Bryce Space.

Space-Traffic Management is a highly essential technique that should be made non-negotiable and mandatory for every entity present in space. It may include methods such as Active Debris Removal (ADR). “Rules of the road, including right of way and similar behavioural norms, are in their infancy today for space in the way of practice, domestic policy or international guidelines” and the Space Data Association (SDA) is working on co-operation for international mutual benefit via formal rules of distributing information, coordinating manoeuvres, etc, also applied at high seas and international airspaces as well. [29]

7.2 Newspace & Public-Private Partnerships

In an era of Privatisation, it only makes sense to resort to Public-private partnerships in order to facilitate ease of legal access besides financial and business relationships. The concept of NewSpace must be inculcated in the traditional Space Code and Policies, in order to not restrict the growth of human endeavours. There are several ways where the outcome of Government and private companies interacting is advantageous. For eg, CleanSpace, engaging in ADR mentioned above.

### 1NC---DA

#### Megaconstellations solve rural broadband---Starlink alone solves.

Weinschenk ‘21 [Carl; February 21; Freelance Editor, Freelance. Contributor, Telecompetitor, Technology, U.S. “Report: Starlink Looks Very Promising for Rural Broadband,” <https://www.telecompetitor.com/report-starlink-looks-very-promising-for-rural-broadband/>] brett

SpaceX’s Starlink satellite broadband service has the potential to be a game changer for rural broadband, according to an analysis by PCMag of Starlink speeds. The analysis is based on beta tester data exclusively provided to it by Ookla Speedtest.

The site looked at data from rural, suburban and urban areas. Among its more than 10,000 users in its semi-public beta were “a perplexing” number in urban and suburban areas where a variety of high-speed options already are available. The story cites Chicago, Seattle and Minneapolis as places where there were testers, despite readily available alternatives.

The site compared download speeds against other fixed service providers in 30 counties with at least 30 samples in any month from December 30 to February 24. The counties in which the fixed providers had the biggest speed advantage over Spacelink were urban or suburban: Los Angeles and Santa Clara counties, CA; Cook County, IL; King County, WA and Washington County, MN.

It is in rural areas that Starlink shines, according to the research. The five counties in which Starlink had the biggest download speed advantage over the fixed group were rural: Vilas County, WI; Ravali County, MT; Waldo County, ME; Okanogan County, WA and Lamoile County, VT.

Source: PCMag

The number of counties in which Starlink beat the fixed providers and those in which the fixed providers beat Starlink appeared to be about equal, as was the speed differential.

“Our own analysis shows that Starlink will make the biggest difference in rural, low-density, low-population counties with few options other than lower-quality satellite services,” wrote Sascha Segan, author of the PCMag article about Startlink rural speeds.

There is some skepticism about Starlink and its ability to serve rural broadband at scale, especially considering it has committed to serve 642K locations through the FCC RDOF program. Detractors have argued the service will struggle to provide adequate broadband speeds to that many rural customers.

At this point, Starlink is geographically constrained. The story says that reports put its current constellation most effectively covering areas ” between either 44 degrees or 45 degrees north, and either 52 degrees or 53 degrees north.” This region is in the northern third of the country and extends into Canada. A distribution map shows most beta testers in the northwest, with some in the upper Midwest and a smattering in the northeast and central and southern California.

Beta users report download speeds of as much as 170 Mbps with no data caps.

Starlink may be getting a speed boost. Last week, Space X CEO Elon Musk tweeted that he expects download speeds to hit 300 Mbps later this year. He added that latency will be 20 milliseconds.

#### Rural broadband is key to precision ag---solves supply which turns FDI 12.

USDA ‘19 [US department of agriculture, April 2019, A Case For Rural Broadband, accessed 8/12/21, <https://mobroadband.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/44/2020/07/case-for-rural-broadband.pdf>] brett

Across the agricultural production cycle, farmers and ranchers can implement digital technologies as other modern businesses are doing, enhancing agriculture by driving decision-making based on integrated data, automating processes to increase operational efficiency, improving productivity with tasks driven by real-time insights, augmenting the role of management in the business of farming, and creating new markets with extended geographic reach. These patterns of digital transformation create fundamental shifts in agricultural production, developing new ways of working that make the industry more productive, attractive, and financially sustainable for farmers and ranchers. Tech companies which stand to benefit from industry transformation continue to capitalize on these shifts by developing new technologies, which according to one recent study, may help position themselves to capture a portion of an estimated $254 billion to $340 billion in global addressable digital agriculture market.13 Business Management shifts decision making from instinct to integrated data Precision Agriculture is transforming the way producers collect, organize, and rely on information to make key decisions. Traditionally, producers’ long-term experiences have created a competitive advantage: years of experiments have produced insights and instincts about the land they have farmed and the animals they have raised. But the volume of data that is possible to collect today can accelerate that learning curve, helping producers learn faster and more rapidly adapt to market shifts—particularly on new fields and with new animals—and creating more nuanced insights, enabling them to act on leading indicators. This creates a disparity between producers who can utilize high-speed Internet service and those who cannot. Examples include the ability to do the following: • create decision tools to help farmers and ranchers estimate the potential profit and economic risks associated with growing one particular crop over another • decide which fertilizer is best for current soil conditions • apply pesticides in targeted areas of the field, to control pests rather than applying pesticides over the entire field • use limited water resources more effectively • respond to findings of sensors that monitor animal health and nutrition Better choices about what, where, and when to plant, fertilize, and harvest—or breed, feed, and slaughter—can drive above-average returns by removing unrecognized inefficiencies and scaling insights. Digitization shifts supply chain management and resource allocation from generic to precise. Precision Agriculture helps make the business of farming more efficient by minimizing inputs— such as raw materials and labor—and maximizing outputs. For example, previous research has found that 40 percent of fields are over-fertilized, which not only inflates the cost of inputs but also results in 15 percent–20 percent yield loss suffered from improper fertilizer application.14 Precise application of inputs, such as fertilizer, herbicides, and pesticides, allows farmers to adjust inputs to location-based characteristics and use exact amounts needed, which saves money and increases sustainability due to more efficient resource stewardship. Improved fertilizer, soil, and water use can significantly improve water quality with less runoff and reduce climate gas emissions, which is important since agriculture accounts for 10-15 percent of worldwide emissions.15 Despite reductions in necessary inputs, Next Generation Precision Agriculture helps maintain or increase yields, leading to significant gains in efficiency14. Real-time insights also improve logistics. When growing melons, for instance, real-time data can help farmers overcome challenges in storing and shipping their products. Melons should be stored in an optimal refrigeration environment to minimize spoilage, and real-time precision sensors can reduce spoilage by alerting staff to suboptimal variations in temperature and humidity, allowing the execution of remedies before major losses occur. When refrigerated storage is full or the market price is at a peak, the “Internet of Things” can provide real-time information about where trucks are located and locating customers to market products to help make the sale. LABOR EFFICIENCY boosts productivity by automating routine processes and enabling real-time response Connected devices equip farmers with a clear picture of their operations at any moment, making it possible to prioritize tasks more effectively and triage the most pressing issues. While routine inspection and scouting has typically been a regular part of farm management and has increased farm profitability14, connected technologies can track, sense, and flag where a producer should focus their time and attention that day. Similarly, e-connectivity has allowed rural farms to access new training resources and high-skilled labor that has not been previously available. Real-time data and automation can radically improve a producer’s peace of mind and performance under time constraints, especially because of reduced physical and mental stress (no longer struggling to keep the machine on a row line between 6 and 10 hours in the field during harvest or planting). On dairy farms, for example, automated devices that milk and feed animals can also track each cow’s activity and alert producers to potential problems. Because these tasks are traditionally done by the producer and farm personnel, e-connectivity can substantially reduce the amount of time and effort necessary to run farms. This leads to dramatic increases in flexibility, enabling time and talent to be directed to more advanced tasks. Farmers can use newly found time to re-invest in more high-value tasks like long-term planning and management of the operation. This shift towards farm management opens new possibilities for the way that farms conduct business. GEOGRAPHIC ACCESS extends the reach of the supply chain and shifts marketing from standard to differentiated As explained in the previous section, as Precision Agriculture unlocks additional time and resources to explore new ways of doing business farmers are re-investing their time into identifying options to improve inputs, including better-trained labor and more effective types of inputs. New customers and markets can also be explored to increase sales volume and revenues.

#### Precision ag solves runoff.

Ling 17, Geoffrey Ling, a retired U.S. Army colonel, is an expert in technology development and commercial transition. He is a professor of neurology at Johns Hopkins University and the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences and a partner of Ling and Associates. Scientific American, June 26, 2017. “Precision Farming Increases Crop Yields” <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/precision-farming/> brett

As the world’s population grows, farmers will need to produce more and more food. Yet arable acreage cannot keep pace, and the looming food security threat could easily devolve into regional or even global instability. To adapt, large farms are increasingly exploiting precision farming to increase yields, reduce waste, and mitigate the economic and security risks that inevitably accompany agricultural uncertainty.

Traditional farming relies on managing entire fields—making decisions related to planting, harvesting, irrigating, and applying pesticides and fertilizer—based on regional conditions and historical data. Precision farming, by contrast, combines sensors, robots, GPS, mapping tools and data-analytics software to customize the care that plants receive without increasing labor. Stationary or robot-mounted sensors and camera-equipped drones wirelessly send images and data on individual plants—say, information about stem size, leaf shape and the moisture of the soil around a plant—to a computer, which looks for signs of health and stress. Farmers receive the feedback in real time and then deliver water, pesticide or fertilizer in calibrated doses to only the areas that need it. The technology can also help farmers decide when to plant and harvest crops.

As a result, precision farming can improve time management, reduce water and chemical use, and produce healthier crops and higher yields—all of which benefit farmers’ bottom lines and conserve resources while reducing chemical runoff.

Many start-ups are developing new software, sensors, aerial-based data and other tools for precision farming, as are large companies such as Monsanto, John Deere, Bayer, Dow and DuPont. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, NASA and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration all support precision farming, and many colleges now offer course work on the topic.

In a related development, seed producers are applying technology to improve plant “phenotyping.” By following individual plants over time and analyzing which ones flourish in different conditions, companies can correlate the plants’ response to their environments with their genomics. That information, in turn, allows the companies to produce seed varieties that will thrive in specific soil and weather conditions. Advanced phenotyping may also help to generate crops with enhanced nutrition.

Growers are not universally embracing precision agriculture for various reasons. The up-front equipment costs—especially the expense of scaling the technology to large row-crop production systems—pose a barrier. Lack of broadband can be an obstacle in some places, although the USDA is trying to ameliorate that problem. Seasoned producers who are less computer-literate may be wary of the technology. And large systems will also be beyond the reach of many small farming operations in developing nations. But less expensive, simpler systems could potentially be applied. Salah Sukkarieh of the University of Sydney, for instance, has demonstrated a streamlined, low-cost monitoring system in Indonesia that relies on solar power and cell phones. For others, though, cost savings down the road may offset the financial concerns. And however reticent some veteran farmers may be to adopt new technology, the next generation of tech-savvy farmers are likely to warm to the approach.

#### Gulf hypoxia is growing because of ag runoff---it’ll collapse whole oceans---extinction

Dr. Ian Hendy 17, PhD in Trophic Marine Biology, Research and Communication Officer and Senior Scientific Researcher in Marine Ecology at the University of Portsmouth, Institute of Marine Sciences Laboratories, Gulf of Mexico 'Dead Zone' Is Already A Disaster – But It Could Get Worse, Phys Org, 8-14, https://phys.org/news/2017-08-gulf-mexico-dead-zone-disaster.html

Each summer, a large part of the Gulf of Mexico "dies". This year, the Gulf's "dead zone" is the largest on record, stretching from the mouth of the Mississippi, along the coast of Louisiana to waters off Texas, hundreds of miles away. Around 8,776 square miles of ocean, an area the size of New Jersey or Wales, is almost lifeless.

John Muir, the famed naturalist and early conservation campaigner, once said that: "When we try to pick out anything by itself, we find it hitched to everything else in the Universe." His point was that everything in nature is connected, and that no part of our ecosystem exists entirely independently from any other.

It is perhaps no surprise then that ultimate cause of the Gulf of Mexico's dead zone can be found many miles inland. Fertilisers used by farmers then wash into the Mississippi River and eventually into the sea, where nutrients such as nitrogen and phosphorus stimulate an explosion in microscopic algae, creating huge "algal blooms". The algae then die and sink to the bottom, where they decompose. But the same bacteria which decompose the algae also use the sea's oxygen during the process, leaving an "anoxic" ocean.

Fish and other mobile sea creatures are able to escape the suffocating dead zone. Less lucky however are the sponges, corals, sea squirts and other animals who live their lives fixed in one place on the sea bed. Low oxygen levels place them under great stress and we have seen huge mortalities. Such losses will of course ripple up the food web, creating a negative chain reaction of increasing mortality rates in larger and larger animals.

The "dead zone" has grown this year due to increased rainfall in America's Midwest washing ever greater amounts of nutrients into the Mississippi, which ultimately end up in the Gulf. Not only is this a huge conservation issue – the Gulf contains key nursery habitats such as mangrove forests, sea grass beds and coral reefs that benefit adjacent fisheries – but it also has huge consequences for the local fishing economy, particularly the shrimp industry.

Steps are under way to slow down the ecological disaster. Some farmers in the Mississippi basin are using large grassy zones along waterways in order to soak up the agricultural fertilisers and filter out many of the nutrients before they make their way down the Mississippi to pollute the Gulf. However, it remains to be seen whether such measures are effective – and US farmers certainly need to greatly reduce the nitrogen and phosphates they use.

In the century since Muir's death, things have sped up. A larger population demands more food which means more deforestation, more farmland and more fertiliser. The increase demand placed on our land is ultimately affecting the marine environment.

These losses are unsustainable. The marine environment is integral for all life on earth, from an ecological and economic point of view. If we keep losing ecosystem services such as coastal nursery habitats and spawning grounds at this current rate, it will not just be an area the size of a state that is a dead zone, but the whole Gulf, or even whole oceans.

## Case

#### No 1ar theory - their responses to my counter interp will be new necessitating intervention which justifies intervention since there’s no 3nr

### 1NC---Kessler

#### Long time frame.

Burns Interviewing Kessler **’**13 Corrinne Burns, interviewing Donald Kessler, who made up the concept. [Space junk apocalypse: just like Gravity? 11-15-2013, https://www.theguardian.com/science/blog/2013/nov/15/space-junk-apocalypse-gravity]//BPS

Now? Are we in trouble? Not yet. Kessler syndrome isn't an acute phenomenon, as depicted in the movie – it's a slow, decades-long process. "It'll happen throughout the next 100 years – we have time to deal with it," Kessler says. "The time between collisions will become shorter – it's around 10 years at the moment. In 20 years' time, the time between collisions could be reduced to five years." Fortunately, communications satellites are, in the main, situated high up in geosynchronous orbit (GEO), whereas the risk of collisions lies mainly in the much lower, and more crowded, low Earth orbit (LEO). But that doesn't mean we can relax. "We've got to get a handle on it – we need to prevent the cascade process from speeding up." And the only way to do that is, he says, to begin actively removing junk from space. Charlotte Bewick agrees. She's a mission concepts engineer with the German space technology company OHB System, with special expertise in space junk – specifically, how we can capture it and bring it back to Earth. While agreeing with Kessler that the movie scenario is exaggerated, she remains concerned. "Fragments of junk can naturally re-enter the atmosphere [and so be removed from orbit]. But we're at the stage where the rate of creation of new debris fragments is higher than the rate of natural removal. The orbits most at risk harbour important space assets – satellites for weather forecasting, oil spill and bush fire detection, and polar ice monitoring." Bewick highlights the case of Envisat, a defunct 8,000kg spacecraft circling Earth in an orbit that is very popular with space agencies and, hence, pretty crowded. "If Envisat collides with a piece of debris or a micrometeorite, the fragments could render the whole orbital region unusable." So can we get the junk down, I asked Massimiliano Vasile, part of the Mechanical & Aerospace Department at the University of Strathclyde and co-ordinator of the Stardust network. He told me defunct satellites in the high GEO region have, for some time, been shifted to higher "graveyard orbits" to keep them out of the way. But that's not an option for items in low Earth orbit. For this, he tells me, researchers are looking seriously into active debris removal – in-orbit capture techniques like harpooning, netting and tethering, the use of contactless systems like ion-beams or lasers, and even onboard robotics to position the junk away from high-risk orbital regions. As for middle Earth orbit – well, ideas are welcome, he says. We're in no immediate danger from Kessler syndrome – but it's not a problem that's going away. Despite Gravity's artistic license, Donald Kessler is pleased to see the phenomenon represented on the big screen. "It is very improbable that events would play out as they did in the film," he says. "But if it raises awareness, then that's great."

#### Solar storms are an alt cause

Wild 15 (Jim Wild, Professor of Space Physics at Lancaster University, “With So Much Vested In Satellites, Solar Storms Could Bring Life To A Standstill,” July 30, 2015, https://theconversation.com/with-so-much-vested-in-satellites-solar-storms-could-bring-life-to-a-standstill-45204)

These can disrupt satellite operations by depositing electrical charge within the on-board electronics, triggering phantom commands or overloading and damaging sensitive components. The effects of space weather on the Earth’s upper atmosphere disrupts radio signals transmitted by navigation satellites, potentially introducing positioning errors or, in more severe cases, rendering them unusable.

These are not theoretical hazards: in recent decades, solar storms have caused outages for a number of satellites services – and a handful of satellites have been lost altogether. These were costly events – satellite operator losses have run into hundreds of millions of dollars. The wider social and economic impact was relatively limited, but even so it’s unclear how our growing amount of space infrastructure would fare against the more extreme space weather that we might face.

When Space Weather Becomes A Hurricane

The largest solar storm on record was the Carrington event in September 1859, named after the British astronomer who observed it. Of course there were no Victorian satellites to suffer the consequences, but the telegraph systems of the time were crippled as electrical currents induced in the copper wires interfered with signals, electrocuted operators and set telegraph paper alight. The geomagnetic storm it triggered was so intense that the northern lights, usually a polar phenomenon, were observed as far south as the Bahamas.

Statistical analysis of this and other severe solar storms suggests that we can expect an event of this magnitude once every few hundred years – it’s a question of “when” rather than “if”. A 2007 study estimated a Carrington event today would cause US$30 billion in losses for satellite operators and threaten vital infrastructure in space and here on the ground. It’s a risk taken sufficiently seriously that it appears on the UK National Risk Register and has led the government to draw up its preparedness programme.

#### No collisions.

**Mosher** **’19** [Dave; September 3rd; Journalist with more than a decade of experience reporting and writing stories about space, science, and technology; Business Insider, “Satellite collisions may trigger a space-junk disaster that could end human access to orbit. Here’s How,” <https://www.usafa.edu/app/uploads/Space_and_Defense_2_3.pdf>; GR]

The Kessler syndrome plays center-stage in the movie "Gravity," in which an accidental space collision endangers a crew aboard a large space station. But Gossner said that type of a runaway space-junk catastrophe is unlikely. "Right now I don't think we're close to that," he said. "I'm not saying we couldn't get there, and I'm not saying we don't need to be smart and manage the problem. But I don't see it ever becoming, anytime soon, an unmanageable problem." There is no current system to remove old satellites or sweep up bits of debris in order to prevent a Kessler event. Instead, space debris is monitored from Earth, and new rules require satellites in low-Earth orbit be deorbited after 25 years so they don't wind up adding more space junk. "Our current plan is to manage the problem and not let it get that far," Gossner said. "I don't think that we're even close to needing to actively remove stuff. There's lots of research being done on that, and maybe some day that will happen, but I think that — at this point, and in my humble opinion — an unnecessary expense." A major part of the effort to prevent a Kessler event is the Space Surveillance Network (SSN). The project, led by the US military, uses 30 different systems around the world to identify, track, and share information about objects in space. Many objects are tracked day and night via a networkof radar observatories around the globe. Optical telescopes on the ground also keep an eye out, but they aren't always run by the government. "The commercial sector is actually putting up lots and lots of telescopes," Gossner said. The government pays for their debris-tracking services. Gossner said one major debris-tracking company is called Exoanalytic. It uses about 150 small telescopes set up around the globe to detect, track, and report space debris to the SSN. Telescopes in space track debris, too. Far less is known about them because they're likely top-secret military satellites. Objects detected by the government and companies get added to a catalog of space debris and checked against the orbits of other known bits of space junk. New orbits are calculated with supercomputers to see if there's a chance of any collisions. Diana McKissock, a flight lead with the US Air Force's 18th Space Control Squadron, helps track space debris for the SSN. She said the surveillance network issues warnings to NASA, satellite companies, and other groups with spacecraft, based on two levels of emergency: basic and advanced. The SSN issues a basic emergency report to the public three days ahead of a 1-in-10,000 chance of a collision. It then provides multiple updates per day until the risk of a collision passes. To qualify for such reporting, a rogue object must come within a certain distance of another object. In low-Earth orbit, that distance must be less than 1 kilometer (0.62 mile); farther out in deep space, where the precision of orbits is less reliable, the distance is less than 5 kilometers (3.1 miles). Advanced emergency reports help satellite providers see possible collisions much more than three days ahead. "In 2017, we provided data for 308,984 events, of which only 655 were emergency-reportable," McKissock told Business Insider in an email. Of those, 579 events were in low-Earth orbit (where it's relatively crowded with satellites).

### AT: Space War

#### No miscalc from satellite disruptions, but terrestrial conflict turns it

Mazur 12 (Jonathan Mazur, Manager Engineering at Northrop Grumman, writing in Space & Defense, from the Eisenhower Center for Space and Defense Studies. Past U.S. Actions: Redlines in Space. Space & Defense, Volume 6, Number 1, Fall 2012. https://inss.ndu.edu/Portals/97/Space\_and\_Defense\_6\_1.pdf?ver=2018-09-06-135424-147)

U.S. Reactions To Foreign Disruption Of U.S. Capabilities

In the 1970s, it was suspected that a U.S. maritime communications satellite was turned off by the Soviets when it was outside of the range of U.S. tracking stations.25 There does not appear to be any documented U.S. reaction, and I suspect there was none. In the mid-1990s, satellite hackers in Brazil began hijacking U.S. military communication satellite signals to broadcast their own information, though it took until 2009 for Brazil to crack down on the illegal activity with the support of the DoD.26 In 1998, a U.S.-German satellite known as ROSAT was rendered useless after it turned suddenly toward the sun. NASA investigators later determined the accident was possibly linked to a cyber-intrusion by Russia.

The fallout? Though there was an ongoing criminal investigation as of 2008; NASA security officials have seemed determined to publicly minimize the seriousness of the threat.27 In 2003, a signal originating from Cuba—later determined to be coming from Iranian embassy property— was jamming a U.S. communications satellite that was transmitting Voice of America programming over Iran, which was publicly referred to as an “act of war” by a U.S. official. 28 Press reporting indicates the U.S. administration was [frozen]“paralyzed” about how to cope with the jamming that continued for at least a month, even after U.S. diplomatic protests to Cuba.29 In 2005, U.S. diplomats protested to the Libyan government after two international satellites were illegally jammed disrupting American diplomatic, military, and FBI communications.30 In 2006, press reporting indicates that China hit a U.S. spy satellite with a ground-based laser. This action was acknowledged by the then director of the NRO, though the DoD remained tight lipped about the incident.31

“We’re at a point where the technology’s out there, and the capability for people to do things to our satellites is there. I’m focused on it beyond any single event.” – Air Force Space Command Commander, General Chilton, 2006 32

In 2009, a U.S. commercial Iridium communications satellite—extensively used by the DoD—was accidently destroyed by a collision with a dead Russian satellite.33 The U.S. company, Iridium, was able to minimize any loss of service by implementing a network solution within a few days.34 As of early 2011, no legal action had been taken by the company either because it is not clear who was at fault or because it might be politically problematic for the United States, which is trying to enter into bi-lateral transparency and confidence-building measures (TCBM) with Russia regarding space activities.35 Since August of 2010, North Korea has been intermittently using GPS jamming equipment, which reportedly has been interfering with U.S. and South Korean military operations and civilian use south of the North Korean border.36 Reportedly, only South Korea and the United Nations International Telecommunications Union—at the request of South Korea—have issued letters to Pyongyang demanding the cessation of disruptive communications signals in South Korea.37

It appears that the only time the U.S. military has responded with force to a disruption in U.S. space capabilities was in 2003, a few days after the start of the Iraq war.38 According to U.S. officials, Iraq was using multiple GPS jammers—which supposedly did not affect military GPS functionality. However, the U.S. military bombed the jammers anyway after a diplomatic complaint to Russia.39 The use of military force against the GPS jamming threat was possibly because the United States was already intervening in Iraq, and the bombing probably would not have occurred if the United States was not at war.

### AT: Telehealth

#### Telehealth Fails

Godara and Nikore 17 Godara, Balwant, and Vipan Nikore. "7 What Are Health Informatics, eHealth, and mHealth?." Global Health Informatics: Principles of EHealth and MHealth to Improve Quality of Care 2011 (2017): 77. (consultant in the use of ICT for healthcare for WHO)//Elmer

These past two decades have seen an eruption of eHealth initiatives. As a discipline, eHealth is considered to be at a "tipping point" 119,201 between a multitude of small-scale pilots and scaled and long-term integration into health practice. The reality is that most eHealth initiatives fail to reach scale or create desired impacts. Some fear we are being plagued by "pilotitis," with many small initiatives sprouting up without any real coordina- tion or ability to scale. Several challenges prevent most eHealth initiatives from scaling up in numbers, scaling out across different settings, scaling in across different groups in a setting, and scaling across different disease areas 1211. One important challenge is interoperability. eHealth has to co-exist and cooperate with offline legacy systems (such as mandatory paper-based reporting and health surveillance). Moreover, technical interoperability is needed within the existing eHealth landscape in a given setting. The example of Kenya is telling: before the government decided to impose interoperability as a precondition to new initiatives, the eHealth landscape had become an "incompatible patchwork of solutions" 131. A second challenge is a lack of evidence regarding the impact of eHealth on health system performance and on individual health. The lack of formal evaluations of most eHealth initiatives prevents the formation of a solid evidence base, which is essential to gather interest (and investment) from the multiple stakeholders that are invariably needed for any eHealth initiative to scale. The 2009 GOe survey on eHealth found that only 7% of the countries with mHealth initiatives actually evaluated their impact 131. This evalu- ation is certainly very difficult, for several reasons. eHealth is often used in conjunction with other health initiatives, and it becomes difficult to ascertain the contribution of the eHealth element alone to any improvements in health care outcomes. Moreover, eHealth initiatives for behavioral change must be evaluated over very long periods of time to discern any palpable impact on the health behavior of individuals or the population. Further, evaluation is a challenge, because technology evolves rapidly and often outpaces the speed of our evaluation methods. For example, it may take months or years to rigor- ously evaluate a new system that uses a new technology, but by the end of the evaluation period the technology is obsolete. Evaluation is also a challenge because a technology could be successful in one environment, and then in a different environment with different users and workflow it could fail miserably. However, given that there exists a history of failed technology initiatives that have caused serious financial harm to many health systems, it is essential to conduct such evaluations, and indeed to build them into the initial design of the solution itself. Chapter 24 discusses evaluation of health information systems in more detail. The third major challenge is concern about the privacy and security of data, which are inherent to any system storing and exchanging digital data and exacerbated because of the critically private nature of health data. The confidentiality of data is even more neces- sary in the case of diseases with stigma attached to them (such as HIV), and in cases where the exchange of information takes place over commercial mobile networks and the storage takes place on off-site cloud platforms (which is increasingly the case). Other challenges arise from the physical infrastructure available in a particular setting, such as the availability of power supply and connectivity as well as physical devices like servers. User-centric design is also a major challenge, as an oft-overlooked concern is the acceptability of the solution by the destined users. Literacy and language barriers could significantly limit the technology options available for the design, and insufficient user training and perceived "ownership" of the solution by the user could lead to rejection of the solution altogether. Finally, the most recent, and least understood, challenge is the use of the data. As we see ever-larger stores of data about individuals, populations, and health systems, questions arise about the use of this data to inform decisions related to the health of persons and policies of health systems. Thus, these vast stores of data can and should also be converted into health intelligence. This, unfortunately, is not being done sufficiently.

#### No Disease Impact.

Ord 20 Dr. Toby Ord 20, Senior Research Fellow in Philosophy at Oxford University, DPhil in Philosophy from the University of Oxford, The Precipice: Existential Risk and the Future of Humanity, Hachette Books, Kindle Edition, p. 124-126

Are we safe now from events like this? Or are we more vulnerable? Could a pandemic threaten humanity’s future?10 The Black Death was not the only biological disaster to scar human history. It was not even the only great bubonic plague. In 541 CE the Plague of Justinian struck the Byzantine Empire. Over three years it took the lives of roughly 3 percent of the world’s people.11 When Europeans reached the Americas in 1492, the two populations exposed each other to completely novel diseases. Over thousands of years each population had built up resistance to their own set of diseases, but were extremely susceptible to the others. The American peoples got by far the worse end of exchange, through diseases such as measles, influenza and especially smallpox. During the next hundred years a combination of invasion and disease took an immense toll—one whose scale may never be known, due to great uncertainty about the size of the pre-existing population. We can’t rule out the loss of more than 90 percent of the population of the Americas during that century, though the number could also be much lower.12 And it is very difficult to tease out how much of this should be attributed to war and occupation, rather than disease. As a rough upper bound, the Columbian exchange may have killed as many as 10 percent of the world’s people.13 Centuries later, the world had become so interconnected that a truly global pandemic was possible. Near the end of the First World War, a devastating strain of influenza (known as the 1918 flu or Spanish Flu) spread to six continents, and even remote Pacific islands. At least a third of the world’s population were infected and 3 to 6 percent were killed.14 This death toll outstripped that of the First World War, and possibly both World Wars combined. Yet even events like these fall short of being a threat to humanity’s longterm potential.15 [FOONOTE] In addition to this historical evidence, there are some deeper biological observations and theories suggesting that pathogens are unlikely to lead to the extinction of their hosts. These include the empirical anti-correlation between infectiousness and lethality, the extreme rarity of diseases that kill more than 75% of those infected, the observed tendency of pandemics to become less virulent as they progress and the theory of optimal virulence. However, there is no watertight case against pathogens leading to the extinction of their hosts. [END FOOTNOTE] In the great bubonic plagues we saw civilization in the affected areas falter, but recover. The regional 25 to 50 percent death rate was not enough to precipitate a continent-wide collapse of civilization. It changed the relative fortunes of empires, and may have altered the course of history substantially, but if anything, it gives us reason to believe that human civilization is likely to make it through future events with similar death rates, even if they were global in scale. The 1918 flu pandemic was remarkable in having very little apparent effect on the world’s development despite its global reach. It looks like it was lost in the wake of the First World War, which despite a smaller death toll, seems to have had a much larger effect on the course of history.16 It is less clear what lesson to draw from the Columbian exchange due to our lack of good records and its mix of causes. Pandemics were clearly a part of what led to a regional collapse of civilization, but we don’t know whether this would have occurred had it not been for the accompanying violence and imperial rule. The strongest case against existential risk from natural pandemics is the fossil record argument from Chapter 3. Extinction risk from natural causes above 0.1 percent per century is incompatible with the evidence of how long humanity and similar species have lasted. But this argument only works where the risk to humanity now is similar or lower than the longterm levels. For most risks this is clearly true, but not for pandemics. We have done many things to exacerbate the risk: some that could make pandemics more likely to occur, and some that could increase their damage. Thus even “natural” pandemics should be seen as a partly anthropogenic risk.

### 1NC – Ozone

#### Dichloromethane emissions thump

Perkins 17 Perkins, S. (2017, June 27). New threat to ozone layer found. Science | AAAS. https://www.science.org/content/article/new-threat-ozone-layer-found

The ozone layer—a high-altitude expanse of oxygen molecules that protects us from the sun's ultraviolet rays—has been on the mend for the past decade or so. But a newly discovered threat could delay its recovery. Industrial emissions of a chemical commonly used in solvents, paint removers, and the production of pharmaceuticals have doubled in the past few years, researchers have found, which could slow the healing of the ozone layer over Antarctica anywhere between 5 and 30 years—or even longer if levels continue to rise.

The findings are "frightening" and "a big deal," says Robyn Schofield, an environmental scientist at the University of Melbourne in Australia who was not involved with the work.

The chemical in question is called dichloromethane (CH2Cl2). Natural sources of this substance are small, says Ryan Hossaini, an atmospheric chemist at Lancaster University in the United Kingdom. Thus, he notes, the increase in emissions seen in recent years likely stems from human sources. Between 2000 and 2012, low-altitude concentrations of CH2Cl2 vapor rose, on average, about 8% per year, he adds. Globally, concentrations of CH2Cl2 approximately doubled between 2004 and 2014. Current CH2Cl2 emissions are about 1 million metric tons per year, Hossaini and his team estimate.

Like chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) and several other ozone-destroying chemicals you may have heard of, CH2Cl2 breaks apart when struck by sunlight. The chlorine atoms that are released then dismantle any ozone molecules they interact with. In 1987, an international agreement known as the Montreal Protocol led to a ban on the production and use of CFCs and many related compounds in industrial nations, but it ignored CH2Cl2 because researchers thought it didn't stay intact in the atmosphere long enough to rise into the stratosphere. Recent evidence now suggests, however, that the molecules can reach the lower edge of the stratosphere, which includes the ozone layer, despite its height 8 kilometers above the poles.

To gauge the current and future threat to high-altitude ozone from CH2Cl2, Hossaini and his colleagues used computer simulations. In 2016, their analyses suggest, about 3% of the summer ozone loss in the Antarctic could be traced to CH2Cl2. That seems small, but in 2010 the substance was responsible for only 1.5% of the region's summer ozone loss, Hossaini says. If CH2Cl2 emissions continue to rise at the rate seen in the last decade, recovery of the ozone hole would be delayed about 30 years, the researchers estimate in *Nature Communications*.

But if emissions of CH2Cl2 are held to current levels, healing of the ozone hole would be delayed only 5 years or so, the team finds. Simulations that don't include the effect of CH2Cl2 suggest that high-altitude ozone in the Antarctic will return to pre-1980 levels, the concentration measured before CFCs and other ozone-destroying chemicals were recognized as a problem, in 2065.

The team's analyses "are quite important," says Björn-Martin Sinnhuber, an atmospheric scientist at Karlsruhe Institute of Technology in Germany. "It's clear that concentrations [of CH2Cl2] have increased quite a lot," he notes. But one critical question, he contends, is what will happen to emissions over the long term: "They've been quite variable in recent years, and it's difficult to say how they might evolve."

Although the rapid rise in CH2Cl2 emissions may one day level off, it's also possible that emissions of this multipurpose chemical may accelerate even further. Hossaini and his team also assessed what would happen to high-altitude ozone if CH2Cl2 emissions rose at twice the rate seen in the past decade. The answer? Not good. Antarctic ozone wouldn't recover to pre-1980 levels until well after the year 2100, the analyses suggest.

All this means that scientists now reviewing the Montreal Protocol should consider expanding the agreement to also regulate substances like CH2Cl2 that have atmospheric lifetimes of less than 6 months, Schofield says.

Possibly as important, however, the team's results might also help other researchers identify which sources of CH2Cl2 are contributing most to the recent rise in emissions. That sort of information, Hossaini admits, is sadly lacking as of now.

### 1NC---Debris good

#### Satellite loss shuts down global fracking

Les Johnson 13, Deputy Manager for NASA's Advanced Concepts Office at the Marshall Space Flight Center, Co-Investigator for the JAXA T-Rex Space Tether Experiment and PI of NASA's ProSEDS Experiment, Master's Degree in Physics from Vanderbilt University, Popular Science Writer, and NASA Technologist, Frequent Contributor to the Journal of the British Interplanetary Sodety and Member of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, National Space Society, the World Future Society, and MENSA, Sky Alert!: When Satellites Fail, p. 99-105

Energy, environment, farming, mining, land use. All of these areas and more are now inextricably linked to satellite data and would be devastated should that flow of data stop.

Environmental Monitoring

Oh how complacent we've become. We take for granted that we will have instant images from space showing a volcanic eruption somewhere in the South Pacific within hours of learning that it happened. When the BP oll spill happened in the Gulf of Mexico in 2010, satellite images were used in conjunction with aircraft and ships to monitor the extent and evolving nature of the spill (Figures 10.1 and 10.2).

The data were also used to direct the ships that were attempting to clean up the spill, to warn fishermen of areas in which it would be dangerous to fish, and to generally monitor the extent of the disaster. This is the type of data we get from space in a field known as remote sensing.

Remote sensing is, well, exactly what its name implies. With it, you gather data, or sense, usually in the form of electromagnetic radiation (light), remotely - that is, you are not physically touching what you are looking at. Satellite remote sensing began shortly after we began launching satellites and many industries are now totally dependent upon having the capability.

We use satellites, like the venerable Landsat series, to study the Earth m unprecedented detail. Since 1972, Landsat satellites have taken millions of high resolution images of the Earth's surface, allowing comprehensive studies of how the land has changed due to human intervention (deforestation, agriculture, settlement, etc.) and natural processes (desertification, floods, etc.).

The best way to understand how useful Landsat and similar data can be to governments at all levels is best illustrated by looking at 14then and now" photographs. For example, Africa's Lake Chad has been shrinking for 40 years, as the desert has encroached on this once plentiful inland freshwater lake. Forty years ago, there were about 15,000 square miles of water within the lake. Now, it is less than 500 square miles (Figure 10.3) [1].

And what is the practical side of this particular bit of information?

Governments use this type of satellite imagery to avoid human tragedy. Hundreds of thousands of people, if not millions, depend upon the waters of Lake Chad for agriculture, industry, and personal hygiene. With the lake going dry, how has this impacted on their livelihoods, their families, and their very lives?

The European Space Agency (ESA) is freely providing satellite data to developing countries as they search for new sources of drinking water. For example, ESA assessed data obtained from space over Nigeria to find over 90 new freshwater sources within that country. After ground teams visited the new sites, all were confirmed to contain fresh water. This was no accident. These were satellites with sensors developed for just such purposes in mind [2].

Desertification is but one example of changing climates affecting people's everyday lives. What about more direct observations of our impact on the planet? Figures 10.4 and 10.5 show the scarring of the Earth's surface as a result of surface mining in West Virginia. This is not a polemic against mining; rather, it is an observation that we can use satellite imagery to monitor such mining and be mindful of its impact on the environment.

Other than taking pictures of surface features, like lakes and open pit mines, how are satellites monitoring the Earth's changing climate? In just about every way, by: monitoring global land, sea, and atmospheric temperatures; measuring yearly average rainfall amounts just about everywhere on the globe; measuring glaciation rates; measuring sea surface heights; and more. Remote sensing is more than taking pictures of the Earth in the visible part of the spectrum. We can learn a great deal from looking at part of the spectrum that our eyes cannot see - but our instruments can.

Shown in Figure 10.6 is a composite image of the Earth's surface showing the average land-surface temperature at night. The data came from two NASA satellites, Terra and Aqua, as they orbit the Earth in a polar orbit. (This means that they circle the Earth from top to bottom, passing over both the North and South Poles with each complete orbit.) Terra's orbit is such that it passes from the north to the south across the equator in the morning; Aqua passes south to north over the equator in the afternoon. Taken together, they observe the Earth's surface in its entirety every two days. Data sets such as this exist for just about any day of the year and can show either night-time lows or daytime highs.

By looking in different parts of the spectrum, like the infrared light discussed above, we can make observations as described in Table 10.1.

Pollution Monitoring

As emerging countries industrialize, they also become polluters. Many of these countries are not exactly forthright about releasing air-pollution details to the media, so much of our awareness of the rising pollution there is anecdotal - typically m the form of stories told by people who have visited these countries and seen the extreme pollution at first hand. This, by the way, is not exactly scientific.

Using satellites, and not relying on either the governments in question or second-hand stories, we can accurately assess the pollution levels there and elsewhere. Using satellite images to measure the amount of light absorbed or blocked by fine particulates in the atmosphere, otherwise known as air pollution, you can determine not only what the airborne pollutant might be, but also its size. And, by looking at the overall light blockage, an accurate estimate of the amount of pollution in the air can also be made. Recent studies show that many of these countries are covered in a pollution cloud that countries in the developed world would deem extremely harmful. And how do we know this with scientific certainty? From satellite measurements.

Energy Production

The recent boom in the production of shale oil in the United States and elsewhere is due in large part to the identification and geolocation of promising geologic formations for test drilling and fracking. "Fracking" is a somewhat new term that comes from the phrase "hydraulic fracturing". In fracking, massive amounts of previously unusable reservoirs of oil and natural gas are released for capture, sale, and transport from deposits deep within the Earth - many located at least a mile below the surface. In the United States alone, there may be as much as 750 trillion cubic feet of natural gas within shale deposits releasable by fracking [3]. How do energy companies know where to look for these deposits? In large part, by analyzing satellite imagery.

According to Science Daily (26 February 2009), a new map of the Earth's gravitational field based on satellite measurements makes it much less resource intensive to find new oil deposits. The map will be particularly useful as the ice melts in the oil-rich Arctic regions. The easy-to-find oilfields have already been found. To fuel the growing world economy, those harder-to-find deposits must be located and tapped - which is why satellite imagery is so important. Take away this and other satellite-dependent techniques of oil and gas exploration and the world economy will feel the impact through higher oil and natural gas prices.

#### Fracking makes extinction inevitable---try-or die to shut it off

Rev. Mac Legerton 18, Co-Founder and Executive Director of the Center for Community Action, Member of the Board of Directors of the NC Climate Solutions Coalition, Member of the Board of Directors of the Windcall Institute, “Will The U.S. Blaze A Trail To Mass Extinction?”, APPPL News, 1/15/2018, https://www.apppl.org/news/will-the-u-s-blaze-a-trail-to-mass-extinction/

As an elder, I now realize that there is even a greater threat to humanity and life on Earth than nuclear war—though, unlike a nuclear exchange, this threat is a slow-motion catastrophe. Can you guess what it is? Here’s a clue: it is something with which most people don’t have a personal relationship. Tragically, some persons remain in total denial of its validity, much less its present danger. And that’s the problem – that’s why this threat needs to be more seriously addressed on the local, state, national, and international level.

What is it? It’s the slow-motion but rapidly growing catastrophe of climate change. There’s now good news amidst this seemingly overwhelming challenge. But the answer may surprise you. Today we know what is the #1 preventable cause of climate change. It’s not coal, it’s not nuclear, and it’s not oil and gasoline. It’s actually the use of the very fuel that is touted as being cleaner, greener, and cheaper than all the rest. This fuel is called “Natural Gas”.

Let’s start with its name – “Natural Gas”. What is “natural gas”? There’s actually nothing “natural” about it when it is forcibly extracted from the ground through hydraulic fracturing, commonly known as “fracking”. When something is forcibly ruptured from deep within the earth with the use of toxic chemicals, the last name you would use for it is “natural”.

Fracking disrupts the geologic fault lines causing earthquakes, uses millions of gallons of fresh water that becomes permanently poisoned by unknown, cancer-producing chemicals added to it, creates air pollution during the drilling process, increases the risk of injury and explosions, raises major health risks to both people and place in close proximity to it, and changes the nature of both neighborhoods and landscapes. Fracking also leaves a massive carbon footprint of drilling wells as deep as 8,000 feet and then drilling horizontally over 10,000 feet; On top of all this, it leaks major amounts of gas into the environment.

So, what is this gas? It is 90-95% methane gas which is a hydrocarbon compound made up of one carbon atom and four hydrogen atoms (CH4). It releases carbon into the atmosphere and produces carbon dioxide (C02) just like coal does when it is burned. Methane is not its trace element–it is its undisputed compound of this fossil fuel product. If a compound is 90-95% of a product, it makes sense to call it by that name. Doesn’t it? Well, actually not if you want people to believe and think that it is something that it is not. It is un-natural methane gas produced under massive and highly toxic pressure and hazardous conditions.

Now that we know what this gas is, what does it do to the atmosphere and climate that is so dangerous? This hydrocarbon has properties that block the radiation of heat from Earth’s surface 100 times more effectively than CO2 (released from burning coal) during its first 10 years of release and 86 times more effectively in its first 20 years. Because of the climate emergency underway, the first 10 or 20 years matter most.

When utility companies and the larger fossil fuel companies state that they are committed to lowering carbon emissions, this just isn’t true. They are radically escalating the most dangerous and worst of all fossil fuels in relation to its impact on the climate. Now the industry wants to expand production of methane gas all over the world by calling it “the most environmentally friendly fossil fuel”and a “bridge fuel” that we can safely use until we transition to 100% renewable energy sources.

Why would a major business industry want to call its product by another name? Perhaps for the same reason that the tobacco industry did not like the term “coffin nails” or “cancer sticks” for cigarettes. Honestly, there’s a striking similarity between what are called cigarettes and natural gas. When both were produced and named, their harm was not fully known. Once the industries promoting them learned of their significant harm, they did everything they could to hide this knowledge from the public. They even hired scientists to deny their dangers. The tobacco industry was eventually sued, the truth was acknowledged, and billions of dollars were paid out in the tobacco settlement.

This same scenario that occurred with the tobacco industry needs to occur with methane gas and the fossil fuel industry. The major difference in these two scenarios is that that this fossil fuel product doesn’t just threaten the lives of individuals who voluntarily breathe it in – it threatens the lives of not only every human being, but also all life on the planet. The outcome of this scenario needs to be a moratorium and eventual end to all use of methane gas as an energy source. For the sake of all of us, our communities, and world, the sooner the better. This abomination is different. There is no time to waste.

#### No extinction from Ozone – bounces back, in the meantime wear glasses and sunscreen!

Brian **Martin 82** [Brian Martin (Professor of Social Sciences @ the University of Wollongong) December 1982 “The global health effects of nuclear war” Current Affairs Bulletin, Vol. 59, No. 7, pp. 14-26, online @ http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/82cab/index.html, loghry]/recut TK

Another major threat to ozone comes from nuclear explosions. Nitric oxide is produced essentially by the 'burning' of nitrogen in the atmosphere, and this occurs whenever air temperatures are sufficiently hot: in automobile engines, in aircraft engines and in nuclear explosions. Studies of the creation of oxides of nitrogen by nuclear explosions were first undertaken as part of the SST debate, to determine whether the nuclear weapons tests in the 1950s and 1960s had reduced observed ozone levels.[28] It was only in 1974 that John Hampson made a point which had been overlooked, namely that large-scale nuclear war could cause a major and disastrous reduction in ozone levels.[29] Calculations made in the mid-1970s assuming large nuclear arsenals with many high-yield explosions concluded that reductions of ozone could reach 50 per cent or more in the northern hemisphere, with smaller reductions in the southern hemisphere.[30] But since the number of high-yield weapons in present nuclear arsenals is now smaller, much less oxides of nitrogen would be deposited in the stratosphere by nuclear war than assumed in earlier calculations, and so significant ozone reductions are unlikely.[31] This conclusion remains tentative. The actual behaviour of stratospheric ozone is quite complicated, involving many chemical compounds and numerous chemical reactions, the changing effects of temperature, the angle and intensity of sunlight, and the effect of air motions. Computer models of the effects of nuclear war on ozone are able to take into account only a part of this complexity, and new information about chemical reaction rates in particular have led in the past to periodic revisions in the calculated effects of added oxides of nitrogen. If significant ozone reduction did occur, the most important direct effect on humans would be an increase in skin cancer. However, this is seldom lethal, and could be avoided by reducing exposure to sunlight. Potentially more serious would be effects on crops.[32] Some of the important grains, for example, are sensitive to uv. Whether the net effects on crop yields would be significant is hard to estimate. But whatever the reduction in ozone, ozone levels would return pretty much to normal after a few years.[9] It seems unlikely that in the context of a major nuclear war the changes in uv alone would be of serious concern. In particular, the threat of human extinction raised by Jonathan Schell in The Fate of the Earth,[33] based mostly on effects of increased uv from ozone reduction, seems very small indeed. It is sometimes claimed that nuclear war could destroy ozone to such an extent that humans and animals would be blinded by excess uv. Even if large numbers of high-yield weapons were exploded, this possibility seems very unlikely except for a contribution to snow blindness in the far north. Stratospheric ozone can never be completely removed, but at most reduced greatly. Even if a 50 per cent or more reduction in ozone occurred - and as noted this seems improbable with present nuclear arsenals - protection from uv for humans could be obtained from sunglasses or just ordinary glasses, which absorb uv. For animals, the following considerations are relevant. Ozone levels vary considerably from place to place and from time to time, both seasonally and daily (sometimes by up to 50 per cent). Sunlight at the equator typically passes through only half as much ozone as at the mid-latitudes, yet animals at the equator are not known to go blind more often than elsewhere. Furthermore, most ozone reductions from a nuclear war would be in the mid and high latitudes, where ozone levels are higher to start with and where the 'path length' of sunlight through ozone is increased due to its oblique angle of incidence. But this does not mean complacency is warranted, as the concerns of John Hampson illustrate.

### More AT: space war

#### Legal norms, empirics, costs.

Pavur and Martinovic 19 [James Pavur, DPhil Researcher Cybersecurity Centre for Doctoral Training Oxford University, Ivan Martinovic, Professor of Computer Science Department of Computer Science Oxford University, “The Cyber-ASAT: On the Impact of Cyber Weapons in Outer Space,” 2019 11th International Conference on Cyber Conflict: Silent Battle, <https://ccdcoe.org/uploads/2019/06/Art_12_The-Cyber-ASAT.pdf>] lr

3. STABILITY IN SPACE Given the uncomfortable combination of high dependency and low survivability, one might expect to observe frequent attacks against critical military assets in orbit. However, despite decades of recurring prophesies of impending space war, no such conflict has broken out [14]–[18]. It is true that a handful of space security crises have occurred; most notably, the 2007 Chinese anti-satellite weapon (ASAT) test and the 2008 US ASAT demonstration in response [19]. Moreover, a recent Centre for Strategic and International Studies report suggests increasing interest in attacking US space assets, particularly among the Chinese, Russian, North Korean and Iranian militaries [20]. Overall, however, the space domain has remained puzzlingly peaceful. In this section, we outline three major contributors to this enduring stability: limited accessibility, attributable norms, and environmental interdependence. A. Limited Accessibility Space is difficult. Over 60 years have passed since the first Sputnik launch and only nine countries (ten including the EU) have orbital launch capabilities. Moreover, a launch programme alone does not guarantee the resources and precision required to operate a meaningful ASAT capability. Given this, one possible reason why space wars have not broken out is simply because only the US has ever had the ability to fight one [21, p. 402], [22, pp. 419–420]. Although launch technology may become cheaper and easier, it is unclear to what extent these advances will be distributed among presently non-spacefaring nations. Limited access to orbit necessarily reduces the scenarios which could plausibly escalate to ASAT usage. Only major conflicts between the handful of states with ‘space club’ membership could be considered possible flashpoints. Even then, the fragility of an attacker’s own space assets creates de-escalatory pressures due to the deterrent effect of retaliation. Since the earliest days of the space race, dominant powers have recognized this dynamic and demonstrated an inclination towards de-escalatory space strategies [23]. B. Attributable Norms There also exists a long-standing normative framework favouring the peaceful use of space. The effectiveness of this regime, centred around the Outer Space Treaty (OST), is highly contentious and many have pointed out its serious legal and political shortcomings [24]–[26]. Nevertheless, this status quo framework has somehow supported over six decades of relative peace in orbit. Over these six decades, norms have become deeply ingrained into the way states describe and perceive space weaponization. This de facto codification was dramatically demonstrated in 2005 when the US found itself on the short end of a 160-1 UN vote after opposing a non-binding resolution on space weaponization. Although states have occasionally pushed the boundaries of these norms, this has typically occurred through incremental legal re-interpretation rather than outright opposition [27]. Even the most notable incidents, such as the 2007-2008 US and Chinese ASAT demonstrations, were couched in rhetoric from both the norm violators and defenders, depicting space as a peaceful global commons [27, p. 56]. Altogether, this suggests that states perceive real costs to breaking this normative tradition and may even moderate their behaviours accordingly. One further factor supporting this norms regime is the high degree of attributability surrounding ASAT weapons. For kinetic ASAT technology, plausible deniability and stealth are essentially impossible. The literally explosive act of launching a rocket cannot evade detection and, if used offensively, retaliation. This imposes high diplomatic costs on ASAT usage and testing, particularly during peacetime. C. Environmental Interdependence A third stabilizing force relates to the orbital debris consequences of ASATs. China’s 2007 ASAT demonstration was the largest debris-generating event in history, as the targeted satellite dissipated into thousands of dangerous debris particles [28, p. 4]. Since debris particles are indiscriminate and unpredictable, they often threaten the attacker’s own space assets [22, p. 420]. This is compounded by Kessler syndrome, a phenomenon whereby orbital debris ‘breeds’ as large pieces of debris collide and disintegrate. As space debris remains in orbit for hundreds of years, the cascade effect of an ASAT attack can constrain the attacker’s long-term use of space [29, pp. 295– 296]. Any state with kinetic ASAT capabilities will likely also operate satellites of its own, and they are necessarily exposed to this collateral damage threat. Space debris thus acts as a strong strategic deterrent to ASAT usage.

### Ag

#### No Turns---Lack of ag broadband now – adoption key

United Soybean Board ‘19[United Soybean Board, 2019, Rural Broadband and The American Farmer, accessed 08/13/2021, <https://api.unitedsoybean.org/uploads/documents/58546-1-ruralbroadband-whitepages-final.pdf>] brett

Fast, reliable internet access is synonymous with getting work done throughout the United States. From email and finding information to processing data and understanding markets for goods and services — and even managing the estimated 1.1 billion industrial connections2 on the U.S. internet of things — online connectivity supports the $21.34 trillion3 U.S. economy. The U.S. internet penetration rate was 95% as of January 2019.4 Between wired infrastructure, wireless networks and 4G- or 5G-enabled smartphones, the internet can be accessed almost anytime, anywhere. Even airplanes have become more connected. When these connections are interrupted or slow, especially for work, the world seems to stop. Basic tasks take longer. Lack of information makes other jobs impossible. Water cooler conversations complain about dependence on technology. And, productivity — and profitability — plummet. A 2016 IHS study found that North American organizations lose about $700 billion per year5 due to server, application and network outages or degradations, mostly due to lost employee productivity. Most businesses and organizations quickly solve these problems and take steps to minimize the potential for downtime. But for one major data-intensive U.S. industry, slow, unreliable internet is the norm, regardless of device and connection type. Agriculture, food and related industries contributed $1.05 trillion, or 5.4%,1 to U.S. gross domestic product in 2017, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service. This industry segment depends on the productivity of America’s farms, which contribute nearly $133 billion1 of the GDP total. To better understand the realities of online connectivity for U.S. farmers, the United Soybean Board sponsored an in-depth quantitative and qualitative survey of more than 2,000 farmers and ranchers. Rural Broadband and the American Farmer: Connectivity Challenges Limit Agriculture’s Economic Impact and Sustainability investigated how and why farmers currently access the internet, and the implications that access has for farm business decisions, economic viability and overall sustainability. Nearly 60% do not believe they have adequate internet connectivity to run their businesses. How can that be? Federal Communications Commission data from 2017 shows that almost 110 million U.S. households6 had fixed broadband internet access, an increase of 4 million households in one year. And FCC broadband maps show the vast majority of the rural U.S. has access to at least one fixed residential broadband provider. Despite the U.S. reporting 132.9 mobile broadband subscriptions per 100 inhabitants,7 research acknowledges a gap between rural and nonrural connectivity. In 2019, rural residents were 12% less likely8 to have broadband access. Though that gap is narrowing, a 2018 survey found that 24% of rural adults9 say getting access to high-speed internet is a major local problem. While useful, this data doesn’t adequately delve into farm-level internet connection needs of the agriculture industry. In these studies, the definition of rural mimics the U.S. Census Bureau: any population, housing or territory not in an urban area, which is defined as less than 2,500 people.10 Farmers represent just a portion of rural residents. But as small-business owners, they use the internet differently than the average “household.” The $133 billion farmers contribute to the U.S. economy often serves as the economic lifeblood of their communities. Their business successes and struggles — including online connectivity — impact their regions and every link in the agricultural and food supply chain. With almost 60% not having adequate internet, that means farms that contribute nearly $80 billion to GDP run on limited internet connections. This study confirmed that, like any U.S. business managers, farmers rely on internet connections. “We use the internet for anything and everything,” said Alan H., an Illinois soybean and corn farmer who participated in the study. “We get online for information, parts ordering, filing tax forms and things like that. In the field we use GPS, autosteer and field mapping.” From the farm office, usually in their home or in a farm building, farmers get online for office tasks like banking, purchase research, taxes, payroll, recordkeeping and USDA reporting. But today’s farmers also use internet access in their fields, literally in the middle of nowhere. There, they rely on connectivity to share and process data like yield and soil fertility maps, identify and treat crop and livestock problems and find solutions to fix machinery. With technology like autosteer, drones, sensors and more, farmers also continue breaking ground in the internet of things. That’s why 67% of farmers believe it is at least moderately important to be able to transfer data wirelessly from the field. Both in their offices and fields, farmers want real-time access to commodity markets, weather, their historical and current production data, continuing education and other information that directly impacts daily business decisions. “My first source of information is to look online,” explained Wade W., a soybean, corn and beef cattle farmer from Nebraska. “We follow commodity markets to make sure we’re up to date on prices throughout the day. We monitor our soil moisture sensor data. Or, if something breaks or electronics stop working, we look online for solutions.”