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## 1

### T

#### Interpretation: Appropriation means use, exploitation, or occupation that is permanent and to the exclusion of others

Babcock 19 Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Cente. Babcock, Hope M. "The Public Trust Doctrine, Outer Space, and the Global Commons: Time to Call Home ET." Syracuse L. Rev. 69 (2019): 191.

Article II is one of those succeeding provisions that curtails “the freedom of use outlined in Article [I] by declaring that outer space, including the [m]oon and other celestial bodies, is not subject to national appropriation.”147 It flatly prohibits national appropriation of any celestial body in outer space “by means of use or occupation, or by any other means.”148 However, “many types of ‘use’ or ‘exploitation’. . . are inconceivable without appropriation of some degree at least of any materials taken,” like ore or water.149 If this view of Article II’s prohibitory language is correct, then “it is not at all farfetched to say that the OST actually installs a blanket prohibition on many beneficial forms of development.”150 However, the OST only prohibits an appropriation that constitutes a “long-term use and permanent occupation, to the exclusion of all others.”151

#### Violation: Megaconstellations do not appropriate – reject non-legal interpretations

Johnson 20 [Chris Johnson is the Space Law Advisor for Secure World Foundation and has nine years of professional experience in international space law and policy. He has authored and co-authored publications on international space law, national space legislation, international cooperation in space, human-robotic cooperative space exploration, and on the societal benefits of space technology for Africa. "The Legal Status of MegaLEO Constellations and Concerns About Appropriation of Large Swaths of Earth Orbit." https://swfound.org/media/206951/johnson2020\_referenceworkentry\_thelegalstatusofmegaleoconstel.pdf]

No, This Is Not Impermissible Appropriation An opposite conclusion can also be reasonably arrived at when approached along the following lines. The counter argument would assert that the deployment and operation of these global constellations, such as SpaceX’s Starlink, OneWeb, Kepler, etc., are aligned with and in full conformity with the laws applicable to outer space. These constellations are merely the exercise and enjoyment of the freedom of exploration and use of outer space and do not constitute any impermissible appropriation of the orbits that they transit. Freedom of Access and Use Permits Constellations Rather than being a violation of other’s rights to access and explore outer space, the deployment of these constellations is more correctly viewed as the exercise and enjoyment of the right to access and use outer space. Article I of the Outer Space Treaty establishes a right to access and use space without discrimination. Not allowing an actor to deploy spacecraft, regardless of their number or destination, would be infringing with the exercise of their freedom. It would be discriminatory. Additionally, actors do not need permission from any other State, or group of States, to access and explore outer space. Aligned with the Intentions of the Outer Space Treaty This use of outer space by constellations in LEO, while not explicitly mentioned by the drafters of the Outer Space Treaty or other space law, actually is the fulfillment of their visions for the use of outer space. The preamble to the Outer Space Treaty (which contains the subject matter and purpose of the treaty and can be used for interpreting the operative articles of the treaty) speaks of the aspirations of humanity in exploring and using outer space. It is easy to see constellations that will provide Internet access to the world as fulfilling the visions of the drafters: The States Parties to this Treaty, Inspired by the great prospects opening up before mankind as a result of man’s entry into outer space, Recognizing the common interest of all mankind in the progress of the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes, Believing that the exploration and use of outer space should be carried on for the benefit of all peoples irrespective of the degree of their economic or scientific development, Desiring to contribute to broad international cooperation in the scientific as well as the legal aspects of the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes, Believing that such cooperation will contribute to the development of mutual understanding and to the strengthening of friendly relations between States and peoples, As such, subsequent article of the Outer Space Treaty should be read in a permissive light, as permitting constellations, rather than a restrictive light which only sees potential negative aspects of constellations. Due Regard and Harmful Contamination Will be Addressed Operators in LEO are well aware of the challenges to space sustainability that their constellations will pose and will be taking efforts to mitigate the creation of debris. OneWeb is keenly focused on space sustainability and has even argued that the current norm, whereby spacecraft are not in space for longer than 25 years and are deorbited from lower orbits at the end of their lifetime (aka post mission disposal), is not sufficient to keep outer space clean and that shorter lifespan limits should be imposed on operators, especially operators in LEO, and operators of small satellites. Additionally, these systems will be able to cooperate with emerging space safety and space traffic management plans and can operate in ways that do not restrict or impinge on other users of the space domain. Because due regard is therefore displayed for the space domain, and to the interests of others, these constellations do not prejudice or infringe upon the freedoms of use and exploration of the space domain and are therefore not occupation, or possession, much less appropriation. This Does Not Constitute Possession, or Ownership, or Occupation The use of LEO by satellite constellations is substantially similar to the use of GSO, and therefore permissible. In each region, individual actors are given permission - either from a national administrator or from an international governing body (the ITU) via a national administer–to use precoordinated subsections of space. In a way that is overwhelmingly similar to the use of orbital slots in GSO, the placement of spacecraft into orbits in LEO or higher orbits does not constitute possession, ownership, or occupation of those orbits. This is because States (and their companies) have been occupying orbital slots in GSO for decades, and these uses of GSO have never been accused of “appropriating” GSO. The users have never claimed to be appropriating GSO, and their exercising of rights to use GSO is respected by other actors in the space domain. This is the same situation for other orbits, including LEO and other non-Geostationary orbits. And while GSO locations are relatively stable (subject to space weather and other perturbations, and require stationkeeping), spacecraft in LEO are actually moving through space and are not stationary, so it is even more difficult to see this use by constellations as occupation, much less appropriation. Moreover, Space Situational Awareness (SSA) and Space Traffic Management (STM) will allow other uses to use these orbits, and nothing about the use of any one user necessarily precludes others. Lastly, there is no intention by operators of constellations to exclusively occupy, must less possess or appropriate, these orbits. Would not the appropriation of outer space be an intentional, volutional act? No such intention can be found in the operators of global constellations.

#### Standards:

#### 1] Precision outweighs – non-topical affs violate tournament rules so the judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote on them and it controls the internal to pragmatic offense in a question of models.

#### 2] Predictable limits—including temporary occupation is a limits disaster—any aff about a single spaceship, satellite, or weapon would be T because they temporarily occupy space. Limits explodes neg prep and draws unreciprocal lines of debate.

#### 3] TVA – defend debris like strake – that’s what the core concern about megaconstellations are and is permanent.

#### Paradigm issues:

#### a] Topicality is Drop the Debater – it’s a fundamental baseline for debate-ability and deters future abuse.

#### b] Use Competing Interps – 1] Topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical and 2] Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation 3] Evaluate the theory debate after the 2NR because it ensures reciprocity and removes 2AR sandbagging.

#### c] No RVI’s - 1] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, 2] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and 3] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive.

#### d] Fairness is a voter – it’s a gateway issue to the ballot.

## 2

### T

#### Interp: the aff must only defend that the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

#### Violation: they’re extra topical – A] They defend public action through states that bans appropriation, B] They don’t specify only private appropriation

#### 1] Limits – Extra-topicality allows them to tack on infinite planks to artificially improve aff solvency and spike out of DAs, like fiating enforcement or random possible modifications to extraterrestrial property rights. The counter-interp sets a precedent that the scope of aff fiat doesn’t have to be bounded by the resolution, which outweighs on magnitude.

## 3

### DA

#### New Mega-Constellations are key to hypersonic defense and early warning systems.

**Dangwal 21** [Ashish Dangwal, Ashish Dangwal holds a Master's degree in East-Asian studies and has a deep interest in Defence and Geopolitics related issues. He is interested in the impact of technology on foreign policy objectives as well as geopolitical operationality in the Indo-Pacific. Contact: ashishmichel@gmail.com, 12-9-2021, Latest Asian, Middle-East, EurAsian, Indian News, "US Plans To Build 'Constellation Of Satellites' To Identify, Detect & Track Russian, Chinese Hypersonic Missiles", <https://eurasiantimes.com/us-plans-to-build-constellation-of-satellites-russian-chinese-hypersonic-missiles/?amp> accessed on 12-22-2021] Adam

The Pentagon’s Space Development Agency may acquire new satellites as part of a global missile-tracking space sensor array aimed at providing a defense shield against Russian and Chinese ballistic and hypersonic missiles. Current missile defense systems lack the capability required to effectively track and destroy hypersonic weapons. Due to its speed and hyper-maneuverability, hypersonic weaponry is designed to outmaneuver current detection systems. The growing capabilities of China and Russia in space have sparked concerns in the United States about potential threats to US assets. The precision attack capabilities of the US military are predominantly dependent on satellite technology. Infrared satellites also provide crucial intelligence for early warning systems that trace and identify nuclear warheads. In the last few years, the United States’ prime focus has been shifted to securing these assets. According to a new proposal [released](https://sam.gov/opp/c5d54373342944998cb78e0efd37aeb4/view) on December 6, the Space Development Agency plans to buy 28 satellites for a constellation known as Tracking Layer Tranche 1, which is expected to aid in the detection, identification, and tracking of hypersonic weapons and other advanced missile threats. SDA plans to award contracts to multiple vendors to build a constellation of up to 28 satellites divided into four orbital planes at an altitude of about 1,200 kilometers above Earth. Current Developments The launch of these 28 spacecraft is expected to begin in late 2024. It would increase the number of missile-detection satellites in the Tracking Layer Tranche 0, a batch of eight satellites currently being built by L3Harris and SpaceX for launch in 2023. The tracking layer would be used as a worldwide network of eyes to establish a defense shield against the ballistic and hypersonic missiles from Russia and China. The data acquired by missile-tracking satellites would be transferred through optical links to the [Transport Layer](https://www.sda.mil/transport/), a communications satellite constellation that SDA is also developing. If a missile threat is detected, the location and trajectory data can be securely relayed over space and downlinked to military command centers. The Transport Layer, which is the backbone of National Defense Space Architecture (NDSA), is responsible for ground and marine targets, while the Tracking Layer–the Next-Generation Overhead Persistent Reconnaissance (Next-Gen OPIR) constellation by Lockheed Martin and Northrop Grumman [NOC]–is to establish effective targeting of advanced missiles.

#### Hypersonics cause nuclear war

**Lamrani 18** [Omar Lamrani, Omar Lamrani is a reporter that focuses on air power, naval strategy, technology, logistics and military doctrine for a number of regions, including the Middle East and Asia. He studied international relations at Clark University and holds a master's degree from the Diplomatic Academy of Vienna, where his thesis centered on Chinese military doctrine and the balance of power in the Western Pacific. Mr. Lamrani previously worked as an intern with the U.N. Office on Drugs and Crime, where he was assigned to the Afghanistan desk. 2-20-2018, accessed on 12-17-2020, Stratfor, "An Arms Race Toward Global Instability", <https://worldview.stratfor.com/article/arms-race-toward-global-instability>] Adam

Further complicating matters are hypersonic missiles. The missiles' high speed — at least five times the speed of sound — facilitates their rapid use and boosts their rate of survival by making them difficult to intercept. In addition, some hypersonic weapons come equipped with a glide vehicle that extends their range, enabling forces to launch the weapons from beyond an enemy's reach. These factors offer militaries great incentive to incorporate hypersonic missiles into their arsenals. As more and more countries adopt hypersonic missiles, the weapons' offensive abilities may prove destabilizing. States may opt to strike first — perhaps with nuclear weapons — to take out an adversary's hypersonic missile caches before the enemy has a chance to use them. Losing Control While weapons technology is developing at a rapid clip, arms control treaties are deteriorating just as quickly. Key agreements between the United States and Russia were foundering well before Washington shifted its focus back to great power competition. The United States withdrew from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in 2002, and the critical Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty is showing signs of considerable strain, which is bound to increase as Washington bolsters its defenses. Alarmed by the United States' growing investment in missile defense and super-fuze technology, Russia and China will try to enhance their offensive capabilities in kind. The resulting arms race would probably drive the last nail into the INF's coffin and perhaps even jeopardize the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty. Beijing, meanwhile, will strive to keep its competitive edge in hypersonic weapons development in an effort to get ahead of Washington's advancing missile defense capabilities. Though the countries will try to craft new arms control agreements to accommodate their changing world, the challenges of striking a deal among three great powers with disparate strengths will get in the way. Coupled with the fall of critical arms control regimes and the rise of disruptive weapons technology, the next great power competition could erode global stability. Tightening arms races and moribund arms control agreements will undermine the trust between the great global powers and discourage cooperation. Instead, more discord and conflict will erupt between the United States on one side and Russia and China on the other.

## 4

### CP

#### Text – States should

#### Implement cooperative active debris removal measures aimed at mitigating debris from mega-constellations.

#### Implement collision avoidance systems

#### Increase cooperation and communication between private companies and space agencies

#### Substantially increase their research and deployment of a solar radiation management policy.

ESA 17 ( April 14, 2017 “Active Debris Removal” https://www.esa.int/Our\_Activities/Space\_Safety/Space\_Debris/Active\_debris\_removal)

ESA, as a space technology and operations agency, has identified active removal technologies as a strategic goal. Active Debris Removal (ADR) is necessary to stabilise the growth of space debris, but even more important is that any newly launched objects comply with post-mission disposal guidelines – especially orbital decay in less than 25 years. If this were not the case, most of the required ADR effort would go to compensate for the non-compliance of new objects. Studies performed with long-term evolution models like DELTA have shown that a ‘business as usual’ scenario will lead to a progressive, uncontrolled increase of object numbers in LEO, with collisions becoming the primary debris source. The IADC mitigation measures will reduce the growth, but long-term proliferation is still expected, even with full mitigation compliance, and even if all launch activities are halted. This is an indication that the population of large and massive objects has reached a critical concentration in LEO. But even in a future scenario in which no further objects are added to the space environment (no launches, no debris release, no explosions), the results of simulations by ESA and NASA show that the number of debris objects would continue to grow even under these idealised conditions – under which a collision rate of once every 10 years can be assumed. Furthermore, an IADC study with six different models from 2013 show that in an almost perfect scenario with 90% compliance with the mitigation guidelines and with no explosions on orbit, the population suffers a steady increase, and a collision could be expected every 5–9 years. All these studies are a clear indicator that the population of large and massive objects has reached a critical density in LEO, and that mitigation alone is not sufficient. It is necessary to introduce a programme of remediation measures as well: active debris removal, in order to reduce the number of large and massive (mostly physically intact) objects . The current LEO environment contains about 3200 intact objects. An ESA analysis shows that the (lower) level of around 2500 intact objects (the status in the mid-1990s) would have a 50% probability of decreasing the overall debris population. If this is considered to be a desirable goal for remediation, the number of intact objects has to be reduced even while the world’s spaceflight activities continue. Averaged over the eight years 2004–12, about 72 objects were placed into LEO per year. However, since 2012, there has been a steep increase in the number of satellites placed in LEO, with the count now running at 125 objects per year (average over the four years 2013–16), mainly due to the increased use of small satellites. In addition, in 2015, several companies announced their intention to deploy large constellations of more than around 1000 satellites in LEO to provide fast Internet around the world. Limiting launch rates neither feasible nor helpful Therefore, limiting the launch rate or a further reduction of the allowed lifetime in orbit after the end of the mission (which would be two options to reduce the overall number of intact objects in space) do not seem feasible, because they cannot be mandated. For all new objects, strong compliance with post-mission mitigation measures would allow maintaining the number of intact objects at a level similar to the current one, and avoid having to deal with more objects in addition to those already in orbit. Therefore, in order to reduce the number of big objects in LEO, the only option is to actively remove large objects now in orbit and having a long remaining lifetime in space. This would provide several benefits: The most critical objects (those that would generate the most fragments in case of any collision, and that have a higher collision risk) could be removed from the environment first; Decommissioned objects could also be removed; A controlled deorbit could be performed (as large removal targets typically are also most critical in terms of on-­ground risk). Studies at ESA and NASA show that with a removal sequence planned according to a target selection based on mass, area, or cumulative collision risk, the environment can be stabilised when on the order of 5–10 objects are removed from LEO per year (although the effectiveness of each removal decreases as more objects are removed). Active removal is efficient Active removal can be more efficient in terms of the number of collisions prevented versus objects removed when the following principles are applied for the selection of removal targets, which can be used to generate a criticality index and the according list: The selected objects should have a high mass (they have the largest environmental impact in case of collision); Should have high collision probabilities (e.g. they should be in densely populated regions and have a large cross-sectional area); Should be in high altitudes (where the orbital lifetime of the resulting fragments is long). Long­-term environment simulations can be used to analyse orbital regions that are hotspots for collisions. The most densely populated region in LEO is around 800–1000 km altitude at high inclinations. The collision hotspots can be ranked by the number of collisions predicted to occur under a business as usual scenario. Polar Hotspots High-ranking hotspot regions are at around: 1000 km and 82º inclination; 800 km and 98º inclination; 850 km and 71º inclination. The concentration of critical-size objects in these narrow orbital bands could allow multi-target removal missions. Such missions could be specifically designed for one orbit type were a number of objects of the same type are contained While removal targets should be selected from a global perspective, legal constraints dealing with the ownership of space debris objects, and the validation thereof, cannot be neglected. Also, it should be kept in mind that legal responsibility for a coupled remover/target stack (i.e. when a removal spacecraft attaches itself to a inoperative body for deorbiting) is shared. While removal technology should be generic, i.e. applicable to a wide range of removal targets, which may also include non­ESA objects, special emphasis on firm agreements with the owners of the object is required.

#### Specifically solves for Mega-constellations

Hardy 20, Brian Patrick. Long-term effects of satellite megaconstellations on the debris environment in low earth orbit. Diss. 2020. (Master of Science in Aerospace Engineering in the Graduate College of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)//Elmer

The results of this thesis demonstrate that satellite megaconstellations have the potential to leave a significant mark on the LEO debris environment, even centuries after they cease operations. Various test cases for the Starlink megaconstellation were analyzed in a new, medium-fidelity simulation for orbital debris evolution, and a variety of PMD and ADR rates for Starlink were considered. It was shown that if Starlink adheres only to the minimum regulatory requirement of 90% PMD for large constellations, then LEO debris levels will grow almost twice as fast as the baseline scenario with no megaconstellations. Improving Starlink’s PMD rate to 95% would lead to only 19% more debris, while 99% PMD is the preferred option that prevents any significant debris contributions at all. Importantly, Starlink’s choice of PMD strategy will affect its own collision risk very little over the short term, but the impact will be noticeable on multi-century timescales by the overall LEO environment. Finally, in scenarios with 90% and 95% PMD, active debris removal of non-operating Starlink satellites yields significant, if limited, benefits. The 90% PMD scenario combined with an ADR rate of 5 Starlink satellites per year, for example, is able to reduce debris levels to those seen for the 95% PMD scenario. This result suggests that active debris removal could be a viable mitigation strategy for megaconstellations with sub-optimal PMD rates.

#### Fourth plank solves warming and avoids the Impact Turns since it doesn’t reduce Carbon Emissions

Bickel 13, J. Eric. "Climate engineering and climate tipping-point scenarios." Environment Systems & Decisions 33.1 (2013): 152-167. (PhD in Engineering-Economic Systems @ Stanford University, Associate Professor @ the University of Texas at Austin School of Engineering)//Elmer

SRM differs from air capture in that it seeks to reverse the energy imbalance caused by increased greenhouse gas (GHG) concentrations. This is achieved by reflecting back into space some fraction of the incoming shortwave radiation from the Sun. Calculations show that reflecting one to two percent of the sunlight that strikes the Earth would cool the planet by an amount roughly equal to the warming that is likely from **doubling** the concentration of **GHGs** (Lenton and Vaughan 2009). Scattering this amount of sunlight appears to be possible (Novim 2009). SRM holds the possibility of acting on the climate system on a time-scale that could prevent the abrupt and harmful changes discussed above (Novim 2009). In fact, SRM may be the only human action **that can cool the planet** in an emergency. As Lenton and Vaughan (2009) note, “It would appear that only rapid, repeated, large-scale deployment of potent shortwave geoengineering options (e.g., stratospheric aerosols) could conceivably cool the climate to near its preindustrial state on the 2050 timescale.”

#### 1AC Boley & Byers concludes ADR and communication solves but just needs more states to follow on which the counterplan does best – we read blue

Boley & Byers 21 [Aaron C., Department of Physics and Astronomy @ The University of British Columbia\*, and Michael, Department of Political Science @ The University of British Columbia; Published: 20 May 2021; Scientific Reports; “Satellite mega-constellations create risks in Low Earth Orbit, the atmosphere and on Earth,” <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-021-89909-7>] brett

Companies are placing satellites into orbit at an unprecedented frequency to build ‘mega-constellations’ of communications satellites in Low Earth Orbit (LEO). In two years, the number of active and defunct satellites in LEO has increased by over 50%, to about 5000 (as of 30 March 2021). SpaceX alone is on track to add 11,000 more as it builds its Starlink mega-constellation and has already filed for permission for another 30,000 satellites with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC)1. Others have similar plans, including OneWeb, Amazon, Telesat, and GW, which is a Chinese state-owned company2. The current governance system for LEO, while slowly changing, is ill-equipped to handle large satellite systems. Here, we outline how applying the consumer electronic model to satellites could lead to multiple tragedies of the commons. Some of these are well known, such as impediments to astronomy and an increased risk of space debris, while others have received insufficient attention, including changes to the chemistry of Earth’s upper atmosphere and increased dangers on Earth’s surface from re-entered debris. The heavy use of certain orbital regions might also result in a de facto exclusion of other actors from them, violating the 1967 Outer Space Treaty. All of these challenges could be addressed in a coordinated manner through multilateral law-making, whether in the United Nations, the Inter-Agency Debris Committee (IADC), or an ad hoc process, rather than in an uncoordinated manner through different national laws. Regardless of the law-making forum, mega-constellations require a shift in perspectives and policies: from looking at single satellites, to evaluating systems of thousands of satellites, and doing so within an understanding of the limitations of Earth’s environment, including its orbits. Thousands of satellites and 1500 rocket bodies provide considerable mass in LEO, which can break into debris upon collisions, explosions, or degradation in the harsh space environment. Fragmentations increase the cross-section of orbiting material, and with it, the collision probability per time. Eventually, collisions could dominate on-orbit evolution, a situation called the Kessler Syndrome3. There are already over 12,000 trackable debris pieces in LEO, with these being typically 10 cm in diameter or larger. Including sizes down to 1 cm, there are about a million inferred debris pieces, all of which threaten satellites, spacecraft and astronauts due to their orbits crisscrossing at high relative speeds. Simulations of the long-term evolution of debris suggest that LEO is already in the protracted initial stages of the Kessler Syndrome, but that this could be managed through active debris removal4. The addition of satellite mega-constellations and the general proliferation of low-cost satellites in LEO stresses the environment further5,6,7,8. Results The overall setting The rapid development of the space environment through mega-constellations, predominately by the ongoing construction of Starlink, is shown by the cumulative payload distribution function (Fig. 1). From an environmental perspective, the slope change in the distribution function defines NewSpace, an era of dominance by commercial actors. Before 2015, changes in the total on-orbit objects came principally from fragmentations, with effects of the 2007 Chinese anti-satellite test and the 2009 Kosmos-2251/Iridium-33 collisions being evident on the graph. Figure 1 [Figure 1 omitted] Cumulative on-orbit distribution functions (all orbits). Deorbited objects are not included. The 2007 and 2009 spikes are a Chinese anti-satellite test and the Iridium 33-Kosmos 2251 collision, respectively. The recent, rapid rise of the orange curve represents NewSpace (see "Methods"). Full size image Although the volume of space is large, individual satellites and satellite systems have specific functions, with associated altitudes and inclinations (Fig. 2). This increases congestion and requires active management for station keeping and collision avoidance9, with automatic collision-avoidance technology still under development. Improved space situational awareness is required, with data from operators as well as ground- and space-based sensors being widely and freely shared10. Improved communications between satellite operators are also necessary: in 2019, the European Space Agency moved an Earth observation satellite to avoid colliding with a Starlink satellite, after failing to reach SpaceX by e-mail. Internationally adopted ‘right of way’ rules are needed10 to prevent games of ‘chicken’, as companies seek to preserve thruster fuel and avoid service interruptions. SpaceX and NASA recently announced11 a cooperative agreement to help reduce the risk of collisions, but this is only one operator and one agency. Figure 2 [Figure 2 omitted] Orbital distribution and density information for objects in Low Earth Orbit (LEO). (Left) Distribution of payloads (active and defunct satellites), binned to the nearest 1 km in altitude and 1° in orbital inclination. The centre of each circle represents the position on the diagram, and the size of the circle is proportional to the number of satellites within the given parameter space. (Right) Number density of different space resident objects (SROs) based on 1 km radial bins, averaged over the entire sky. Because SRO objects are on elliptical orbits, the contribution of a given object to an orbital shell is weighted by the time that object spends in the shell. Despite significant parameter space, satellites are clustered in their orbits due to mission requirements. The emerging Starlink cluster at 550 km and 55° inclination is already evident in both plots (Left and Right). Full size image When completed, Starlink will include about as many satellites as there are trackable debris pieces today, while its total mass will equal all the mass currently in LEO—over 3000 tonnes. The satellites will be placed in narrow orbital shells, creating unprecedented congestion, with 1258 already in orbit (as of 30 March 2021). OneWeb has already placed an initial 146 satellites, and Amazon, Telesat, GW and other companies, operating under different national regulatory regimes, are soon likely to follow. Enhanced collision risk Mega-constellations are composed of mass-produced satellites with few backup systems. This consumer electronic model allows for short upgrade cycles and rapid expansions of capabilities, but also considerable discarded equipment. SpaceX will actively de-orbit its satellites at the end of their 5–6-year operational lives. However, this process takes 6 months, so roughly 10% will be de-orbiting at any time. If other companies do likewise, thousands of de-orbiting satellites will be slowly passing through the same congested space, posing collision risks. Failures will increase these numbers, although the long-term failure rate is difficult to project. Figure 3 is similar to the righthand portion of Fig. 2 but includes the Starlink and OneWeb mega-constellations as filed (and amended) with the FCC (see “Methods”). The large density spikes show that some shells will have satellite number densities in excess of n=10−6 km−3. Figure 3 [Figure 3 omitted] Satellite density distribution in LEO with the Starlink and OneWeb mega-constellations as filed (and amended) with the FCC. Provided that the orbits are nearly circular, the number densities in those shells will exceed 10–6 km−3. Because the collisional cross-section in those shells is also high, they represent regions that have a high collision risk whenever debris is too small to be tracked or collision avoidance manoeuvres are impossible for other reasons. Full size image Deorbiting satellites will be tracked and operational satellites can manoeuvre to avoid close conjunctions. However, this depends on ongoing communication and cooperation between operators, which at present is ad hoc and voluntary. A recent letter12 to the FCC from SpaceX suggests that some companies might be less-than-fully transparent about events13 in LEO. Despite the congestion and traffic management challenges, FCC filings by SpaceX suggest that collision avoidance manoeuvres can in fact maintain collision-free operations in orbital shells and that the probability of a collision between a non-responsive satellite and tracked debris is negligible. However, the filings do not account for untracked debris6, including untracked debris decaying through the shells used by Starlink. Using simple estimates (see “Methods”), the probability that a single piece of untracked debris will hit any satellite in the Starlink 550 km shell is about 0.003 after one year. Thus, if at any time there are 230 pieces of untracked debris decaying through the 550 km orbital shell, there is a 50% chance that there will be one or more collisions between satellites in the shell and the debris. As discussed further in “Methods”, such a situation is plausible. Depending on the balance between the de-orbit and the collision rates, if subsequent fragmentation events lead to similar amounts of debris within that orbital shell, a runaway cascade of collisions could occur. Fragmentation events are not confined to their local orbits, either. The India 2019 ASAT test was conducted at an altitude below 300 km in an effort to minimize long-lived debris. Nevertheless, debris was placed on orbits with apogees in excess of 1000 km. As of 30 March 2021, three tracked debris pieces remain in orbit14. Such long-lived debris has high eccentricities, and thus can cross multiple orbital shells twice per orbit. A major fragmentation event from a single satellite could affect all operators in LEO. Even if debris collisions were avoidable, meteoroids are always a threat. The cumulative meteoroid flux15 for masses m > 10–2 g is about 1.2 × 10–4 meteoroids m−2 year−1 (see “Methods”). Such masses could cause non-negligible damage to satellites16. Assuming a Starlink constellation of 12,000 satellites (i.e. the initial phase), there is about a 50% chance of 15 or more meteoroid impacts per year at m > 10–2 g. Satellites will have shielding, but events that might be rare to a single satellite could become common across the constellation. One partial response to these congestion and collision concerns is for operators to construct mega-constellations out of a smaller number of satellites. But this does not, individually or collectively, eliminate the need for an all-of-LEO approach to evaluating the effects of the construction and maintenance of any one constellation.

#### 1AR theory is skewed towards the aff – a) the 2NR must cover substance and over-cover theory, since they get the collapse and persuasive spin advantage of the 3min 2AR, b) their responses to my counter interp will be new, which means 1AR theory necessitates intervention. Implications – a) reject 1AR theory since it can’t be a legitimate check for abuse, b) drop the arg to minimize the chance the round is decided unfairly

## 5

### Theory

#### Interp: If the affirmative defends anything other than “The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust”, they must provide a counter solvency advocate.

#### Violation: They didn’t

#### Prefer

#### 1. Limits – there are infinite things you could which pushes you to uncontestable arguments. Even if your interp, the only way to verify if it’s fair is proof of counter-arguments.

#### 2. Shiftiness- CSA conceptualizes what their advocacy is and how it’s implemented. Ambiguous affs we don’t know about can’t delink if they delineate these things.

#### 3. Research – Forces the aff to go to the other side of the library and contest their own view points and encourages more in-depth answers since I can find responses.

## Case

### 1NC – Debris

#### Collision risk is infinitesimally small

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

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

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

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

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

#### Uncertainty from debris collisions creates restraint not instability.

MacDonald 16, B., et al. "Crisis stability in space: China and other challenges." Foreign Policy Institute. Washington, DC (2016). (senior director of the Nonproliferation and Arms Control Project with the Center for Conflict Analysis and Prevention)//Elmer

In any crisis that threatens to escalate into major power conflict, political and military leaders will face uncertainty about the effectiveness of their plans and decisions. This uncertainty will be compounded when potential conflict extends to the space and cyber domains, where weapon effectiveness is largely untested and uncertain, infrastructure interdependencies are unclear, and damaging an adversary could also harm oneself or one’s allies. Unless the stakes become very high, no country will likely want to gamble its well-being in a “single cosmic throw of the dice,” in Harold Brown’s memorable phrase. 96 The novelty of space and cyber warfare, coupled with risk aversion and worst-case assessments, could lead space adversaries into a situation of what can be called “hysteresis,” where each adversary is restrained by its own uncertainty of success. This is conceptually shown in Figures 1 and 2 for offensive counter-space capabilities, though it applies more generally. 97 These graphs portray the hypothetical differences between perceived and actual performance capabilities of offensive counter-space weapons, on a scale from zero to one hundred percent effectiveness. Where uncertainty and risk aversion are absent for two adversaries, no difference would exist between the likely performance of their offensive counter-space assets and their confidence in the performance of those weapons: a simple, straight-line correlation would exist, as in Figure 1. The more interesting, and more realistic, case is notionally presented in Figure 2, which assumes for simplicity that the offensive capabilities of each adversary are comparable. In stark contrast to the case of Figure 1, uncertainty and risk aversion are present and become important factors. Given the high stakes involved in a possible large-scale attack against adversary space assets, a cautious adversary is more likely to be conservative in estimating the effectiveness of its offensive capabilities, while more generously assessing the capabilities of its adversary. Thus, if both side’s weapons were 50% effective and each side had a similar level of risk aversion, each may conservatively assess its own capabilities to be 30% effective and its adversary’s weapons to be 70% effective. Likewise, if each side’s weapons were 25% effective in reality, each would estimate its own capabilities to be less than 25% effective and its adversary’s to be more than 25% effective, and so on. In Figure 2, this difference appears, in oversimplified fashion, as a gap that represents the realistic worry that a country’s own weapons will under-perform while its adversary’s weapons will over-perform in terms of effectiveness. If both countries face comparable uncertainty and exhibit comparable risk aversion, each may be deterred from initiating an attack by its unwillingness to accept the necessary risks. This gap could represent an “island of stability,” as shown in Figure 2. In essence, given the enormous stakes involved in a major strike against the adversary’s space assets, a potential attacker will likely demonstrate some risk aversion, possessing less confidence in an attack’s effectiveness. It is uncertain how robust this hysteresis may prove to be, but the phenomenon may provide at least some stabilizing influence in a crisis. In the nuclear domain, the immediate, direct consequences of military use, including blast, fire, and direct radiation effects, were appreciated at the outset. Nonetheless, significant uncertainty and under-appreciation persisted with regard to the collateral, indirect, and climatological effects of using such weapons on a large scale. In contrast, the immediate, direct effects of major space conflict are not well understood, and potential indirect and interdependent effects are even less understood. Indirect effects of large-scale space and cyber warfare would be virtually impossible to confidently calculate, as the infrastructures such warfare would affect are constantly changing in design and technology. Added to this is a likely anxiety that if an attack were less successful than planned, a highly aggrieved and powerful adversary could retaliate in unanticipated ways, possibly with highly destructive consequences. As a result, two adversaries facing potential conflict may lack confidence both in the potential effectiveness of their own attacks and in the ineffectiveness of any subsequent retaliation. Such mutual uncertainty would ultimately be stabilizing, though probably not particularly robust. This is reflected in Figure 2, where each side shows more caution than the technical effectiveness of its systems may suggest. Each curve notionally represents one state’s confidence in its offensive counter-space effectiveness relative to their actual effectiveness. Until true space asset resilience becomes a trusted feature of space architectures, deterrence by risk aversion, and cross-domain deterrence, may be the only means for deterrence to function in space.

#### Physics and math proofs prove no impact.

Cairncross 17 [Duncan Cairncross, Retired Planetary Science Engineer, BSc in Mechanical Engineering from the University of Glasgow, Diploma in Management DMS, Business Administration and Management, General from Teeside University, Former Asset Management Officer for the Gore District Council, “Is the Kessler Syndrome Disputed By Some Scientists?”, Quora, 10/25/2017, https://www.quora.com/Is-the-Kessler-Syndrome-disputed-by-some-scientists

Lets look at some numbers - we are talking LEO - so anything very small will de-orbit itself quite fast from atmospheric drag These lumps are going the same direction - at similar speeds - as our satellites - so we are not talking about km/sec impacts - just rifle bullet speeds - 300 m/sec at maximum and the vast majority would have much much lower speeds Everything is in a torus Altitude 100 km to 300 km, - 1000 km North to 1000 km South - and about 40,000 km long 200 x 2000 x 40,000 = volume 16 billion cubic km - 18,000 Big bits - 100 mm - including 1,200 satellites 750,000 “bullets” - 10 mm 150 million bits 1 mm Small bits we will ignore as they will not be going fast enough relative to our satellite to cause damage - and they will de-orbit quite fast So one “bullet” for every 21,000 cubic km That does not sound like too dangerous a neighborhood! What happens if start some sort of cascade? There is not much to cascade - 18,000 - “big bits” - if each of them became 1000 “bullets” then we would have 18 million “bullets” + the existing 750,000 bullets And that is erring on the generous side - these bits are mostly metallic and metals don’t shatter into lots of 10 mm bits when hit by rifle bullets That would be one “bullet” for every 853 cubic km AND most of the “bullets” will not actually be going very fast Some time in the future when we have a lot mor,e as in a 100,000 times as much stuff in orbit then the Kessler Syndrome may be possible If you are worried about communication satellites way up there in geostationary orbit then the situation is even better - there is a LOT more space up there and we have boosted a lot less junk up to those orbits It is worth tracking the big bits and making sure that most satellites are safely de-orbited? - YES But worrying about a Kessler Syndrome? - no not really

### 1NC – Food Shortages

#### Mega-constellations solve better

Greensight 21 3-15-2021 "Can Starlink Save the World by Connecting Farms?" <https://www.greensightag.com/logbook/can-starlink-save-the-world-by-connecting-farms/> (Data Management Consulting Firm)//Elmer

GreenSight innovates in a number of different areas, but one of the areas we are most passionate about is in agriculture. We’ve deployed our drone intelligence systems all over the world at all sorts of different facilities. One of the most challenging has been deployments at farms, and one of the biggest challenges has been connectivity. Connected farms are a requirement to feed the world, and Starlink will make that happen. Most urban and suburban households in the United States have had easy and reasonably inexpensive access to high speed internet access for 20 years. It is easy to forget that the situation is not the same for rural areas of the country. Many areas have no access to high speed, “broadband”, internet access, with some having only dialup internet access in their homes. According to the 2015 FCC broadband report, only 53% of rural households have access to high speed internet, even using low standards for “high” speed. On average farms have even less access, and that doesn’t even include high speed connectivity out in their fields. Cellular service is spotty especially on large farms in primarily agricultural areas, and legacy satellite systems provide slow upload speeds at expensive prices. Utilizing modern internet connected technologies and cloud based systems that require constant, high speed access can be a challenge at best and potentially impossible. A 2016 research study by Goldman and Sachs projected that by 2050, the world’s food production efficiency needs to increase by 50% to support our growing population. This paper backs up this conclusion with a lot of research, but the fundamental conclusion is that farming land area is unlikely to increase nor will the number of farmers. Increased global food production increases must come from productivity boosts. Researchers feel that productivity improvements from chemistry and genomics are unlikely to yield significant increases as they have in the past. They predict that the most likely area for these improvements are with precision farming techniques, notably precision planting and precision application of chemicals and water. The term “Precision Agriculture” was coined in the late 1960s and 1970s in seminal research that projected that in the future farming would be driven by data with inputs and practices varied and optimized based on weather, measurements from the field, and accurate year over year yield measurements. Since then, many tools and technologies have been developed that have made true precision agriculture more and more practical. Precision RTK GPS can guide equipment with precision better than an inch. Drones and satellite mapping of fields using remote sensing can map out health and detect problems with the crops. In field IoT sensors will stream live data (such as our partners Soil Scout). Soil genomics and analysis can analyze macro and micro nutrient content of the soil and track the genetics of the soil microbiome (like our friends at Trace Genomics). Robotic and automated farming equipment (like our partners at Monarch Tractor and Husqvarna are building) can vary applications and planting according to precomputed variable rate application maps. Despite all these breakthroughs, precision farming techniques still have a low penetration. There are many reasons for this (more than could be discussed in this article!) but one of them is inadequate connectivity. Most of these modern technologies rely on access to the internet and in many cases it just isn’t possible. For decades subsidies and programs have been rolled out to improve rural connectivity but the reality is that connecting up far flung areas is expensive, often labor intensive, and consequently from a pure business standpoint does not make sense for the connectivity providers. Even as infrastructure expands to more remote areas, there will always remain large swaths of rural america where conventional connectivity infrastructure is highly impractical. Most of GreenSight’s data processing is done in the cloud. Several gigabytes of imagery data are uploaded from our aircraft after every flight to be processed and delivered to our customers. Our custom artificial intelligence analyses the data and informs farmers to problem areas. From many remote farm fields, uploading can be a slow process. We’ve invested heavily in the portability of our systems and our upcoming next generation aircraft will be capable of onboard processing, but despite this connectivity will still be needed to make data available for farmers and other automated agriculture systems. Advanced sensing systems like ours have to be able to integrate with connected robotic sprayers, harvesters and tractors, unlocking the productivity potential of precision agriculture. Humanity needs precision agriculture, and connected data-driven systems will be a big part of that revolution. Beyond the global necessity, the economics for farmers work too! A 2018 USDA studies indicate that connecting US farmland will unlock $50B in industry revenue. We are extremely excited about Starlink and its potential to bring cost effective internet connectivity to farms and rural areas. Starlink levels the playing field for rural areas, enabling high speed connectivity everywhere. No longer will farmers have to wait for high speed wired connectivity to come to their area or install a complex mesh network on their property. IoT data can be streamed from fields as easily as it now streams from urban homes. Starlink will be a catalyzing force for chance, advancing access to precision agriculture globally and contributing to solving global food challenges.

### 1NC – Warming

#### No Extinction from Warming – new studies prove over-hype and tech solves.

* Extinction Tipping Point is implausible – we’re on track for 3 degrees, not 4-5 degrees
* Tech and Energy Modernization Solve – Renewable Energy is replacing Fossil Fuels which reduces Climate Mortality by a rate of 5.

Nordhaus 20 Ted Nordhaus 1-23-2020 “Ignore the Fake Climate Debate” <https://www.wsj.com/articles/ignore-the-fake-climate-debate-11579795816>, found by BPS, (American author, environmental policy expert, and the director of research at The Breakthrough Institute, citing new climate change forecasts)//Re-cut by Elmer

Beyond the headlines and social media, where Greta Thunberg, Donald Trump and the online armies of climate “alarmists” and “deniers” do battle, there is a real climate debate bubbling along in scientific journals, conferences and, occasionally, even in the halls of Congress. It gets a lot less attention than the boisterous and fake debate that dominates our public discourse, but it is much more relevant to how the world might actually address the problem. In the real climate debate, no one denies the relationship between human emissions of greenhouse gases and a warming climate. Instead, the disagreement comes down to different views of climate risk in the face of multiple, cascading uncertainties. On one side of the debate are optimists, who believe that, with improving technology and greater affluence, our societies will prove quite adaptable to a changing climate. On the other side are pessimists, who are more concerned about the risks associated with rapid, large-scale and poorly understood transformations of the climate system. But most pessimists do not believe that runaway climate change or a hothouse earth **are plausible** scenarios, much less that human extinction is imminent. And most optimists recognize a need for policies to address climate change, even if they don’t support the radical measures that Ms. Thunberg and others have demanded. In the fake climate debate, both sides agree that economic growth and reduced emissions vary inversely; it’s a zero-sum game. In the real debate, the relationship is much more complicated. Long-term economic growth is associated with both rising per capita energy consumption and slower population growth. For this reason, as the world continues to get richer, higher per capita energy consumption is likely to be offset by a lower population. A richer world will also likely be more technologically advanced, which means that energy consumption should be less carbon-intensive than it would be in a poorer, less technologically advanced future. In fact, a number of the high-emissions scenarios produced by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change involve futures in which the world is relatively poor and populous and less technologically advanced. Affluent, developed societies are also much better equipped to respond to climate extremes and natural disasters. That’s why natural disasters kill and displace many more people in poor societies than in rich ones. It’s not just seawalls and flood channels that make us resilient; it’s air conditioning and refrigeration, modern transportation and communications networks, early warning systems, first responders and public health bureaucracies. New research published in the journal Global Environmental Change finds that global economic growth over the last decade has reduced climate mortality by a factor of five, with the **greatest benefits documented in the poorest nations.** In low-lying Bangladesh, 300,000 people died in Cyclone Bhola in 1970, when 80% of the population lived in extreme poverty. In 2019, with less than 20% of the population living in extreme poverty, Cyclone Fani killed just five people. “Poor nations are most vulnerable to a changing climate. The fastest way to reduce that vulnerability is through economic development.” So while it is true that poor nations are most vulnerable to a changing climate, it is also true that the fastest way to reduce that vulnerability is through economic development, which requires infrastructure and industrialization. Those activities, in turn, require cement, steel, process heat and chemical inputs, all of which are impossible to produce today without fossil fuels. For this and other reasons, the world is unlikely to cut emissions fast enough to stabilize global temperatures at less than 2 degrees above pre-industrial levels, the long-standing international target, much less 1.5 degrees, as many activists now demand. But recent forecasts also suggest that many of the worst-case climate scenarios produced in the last decade, which assumed unbounded economic growth and fossil-fuel development, are also very unlikely. There is still substantial uncertainty about how sensitive global temperatures will be to higher emissions over the long-term. But the best estimates now suggest that the world is on track for 3 degrees of warming by the end of this century, not 4 or 5 degrees as was once feared. That is due in part to slower economic growth in the wake of the global financial crisis, but also to decades of technology policy and energy-modernization efforts. “We have better and cleaner technologies available today because policy-makers in the U.S. and elsewhere set out to develop those technologies.” The energy intensity of the global economy continues to fall. **Lower-carbon natural gas has displaced coal as the primary source of new fossil energy**. The **falling cost of wind and solar energy** has begun to have an effect on the growth of fossil fuels. Even **nuclear energy** has made a modest comeback in Asia.

#### CO2 is key to agriculture – stops extinction

Ferrera 14 Peter Ferrera 2-24-2014 “The Period Of No Global Warming Will Soon Be Longer Than the Period of Actual Global Warming” <http://www.forbes.com/sites/peterferrara/2014/02/24/the-period-of-no-global-warming-will-soon-be-longer-than-the-period-of-actual-global-warming/#42cc9ebf8bf0> (J.D. Harvard Law, contributor to Forbes on climate and public policy, Director of Entitlement and Budget Policy for the Heartland Institute, Senior Advisor for Entitlement Reform and Budget Policy at the National Tax Limitation Foundation, General Counsel for the American Civil Rights Union, and Senior Fellow at the National Center for Policy Analysis, served in the White House Office of Policy Development under President Reagan, and as Associate Deputy Attorney General of the United States under President George H.W. Bush)//Elmer

In addition, CO2 is actually essential to all life on the planet. Plants need CO2 to grow and conduct photosynthesis, which is the natural process that creates **food for animals and fish** at the bottom of the food chain. The increase of CO2 in the atmosphere that has occurred due to human emissions has actually increased agricultural growth and output as a result, causing actually an increased greening of the planet. So has any warming caused by such human emissions, as minor warming increases agricultural growth. The report states, “CO2 is a vital nutrient used by plants in photosynthesis. Increasing CO2 in the atmosphere ‘greens’ the planet and helps feed the growing human population.”

#### Best studies prove

Ballonoff 14, Paul. "A fresh look at climate change." Cato J. 34 (2014): 113. (consultant, international energy development)//Elmer

While in fact heating has not occurred as the IPCC forecasted, greatly increased global biomass is indeed demonstrated. Well documented evidence shows that concurrently with the **increased CO2** levels, extensive, large, and continuing increase in **biomass is taking place globally**—reducing deserts, turning grasslands to savannas, savannas to forests, and expanding existing forests (Idso 2012). That survey covered 400 peer-reviewed empirical studies, many of which included surveys of dozens to hundreds of sources. Comprehensive study of global and regional relative greening and browning using NOAA data showed that shorter-term trends in specific locations may reflect either greening or browning, and also noted that the rapid pace of greening of the Sahel is due in part to the end of the drought in that region. Nevertheless, in nearly all regions and globally, the overall effect in recent decades is **decidedly toward greening** (de Jong et al. 2012). This result is also the opposite of what the IPCC expected.

#### Food Shortages case Extinction and outweigh – conceding **FDI**