# 1

#### Interpretation and violation – the affirmative must advocate for the hypothetical implementation of a topical plan – they didn’t.

#### Resolved” means enactment of a law.

Words and Phrases 64 Words and Phrases Permanent Edition (Multi-volume set of judicial definitions). “Resolved”. 1964.

Definition of the word **“resolve,”** given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It **is** of **similar** force **to the word “enact,”** which is defined by Bouvier as **meaning “to establish by law”.**

#### 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

**Outer space is at least 150 Km – that is consensus in the lit**

**King 16** [Lt Col Matt King is the Chief, Air and Space Law at the Headquarters Air Force Operations and International Law Directorate. "Sovereignty's Gray Area: The Delimitation of Air and Space in the Context of Aerospace Vehicles and the Use of Force." https://scholar.smu.edu/jalc/vol81/iss3/3/]

In conclusion, **there is a** **core**, **black-and-white understanding** **of outer space**: **it includes the space and vehicles in natural orbit around Earth** and **beyond**.1 7' **This limit can be safely read to extend at least down to 150 kilometers** (or 492,000 feet) **and likely down to** **100 kilometers** (328,000 feet) in the thoughts of most writers. **Further, outer space law establishes that it is the sovereign territory** **of no state, and instead its use and exploration is "the province of all mankind**. 172 Further, outer space law is a unified regime for state and civilian vehicles-there is no legal distinction between the two, at least with regard to international obligations.

**That is consensus in legal literature**

**King 16** [Lt Col Matt King is the Chief, Air and Space Law at the Headquarters Air Force Operations and International Law Directorate. "Sovereignty's Gray Area: The Delimitation of Air and Space in the Context of Aerospace Vehicles and the Use of Force." https://scholar.smu.edu/jalc/vol81/iss3/3/]

The zone known as **outer space** **has no** **outward boundaries**; it extends beyond Earth as far as exploration can take our law. **On the lower end**, however, **the** **widely accepted** **notion of outer space (and outer space law**) **extends at least to** **150 kilometers** (approximately 492,100 feet or 93 miles). In outer space, states cannot assert or exercise any territorial sovereignty over the space, the Moon, or other celestial bodies, but states are free to use and explore the domain. **This use and exploration is open to state and civil craft without distinction, though states are required to assert responsibility and control over the craft of their nationals and organizations in outer space.** This section discusses the nature of the outer space domain, its status regarding state sovereignty, and the lack of distinction between state and civil aircraft.

#### Obviously a better definition – it’s clear outer space is a term of art and not two separate words

#### TVA – discuss the relationship between outer space and queerness and how private appropriation by corporations would destroy outer space’s inclusivity.

Ruby Anderson 20 [Ruby Anderson is a former news writer at Thrillist], "Space Is Gay, and it Has an Important Lesson for Us," Thrillist, 6-30-2020 <span class="skimlinks-unlinked">https://www.thrillist.com/news/nation/space-is-gay-cosmos-model-of-inclusivity</span>

In May of this year, queer online advice columnist John Paul Brammer answered the question “What is the unspoken bond that LGBTQ people have with space?” with “we queers tend to know a lot about the ordeal of being perceived and then being negotiated into rigid taxonomies that weren’t built with us in mind.” Inspired by his answer and my personal experiences, I set out to find queer people who had an intense love for space and ask them if they thought space was gay, and from everyone I spoke to, I received a resounding YES. But the follow-up answers informed not only how queer people have learned to relate to the world at large, but these folks are working to bring more cosmo-like diversity and harmony into their communities and relationships. Space is inherently counterculture Emily Hunt, a queer trans woman studying star clusters for her PhD, told me that she first became interested in the stars when she was around 7 years-old, after her parents showed her Venus transiting across the sun. She says she is humbled by space, and believes the universe is gay because it’s inadvertently “counterculture.” “It’s a completely unassuming space,” she said, laughing at the accidental pun. “It’s such a blank slate. I feel like that to me is a part of being queer. I see society as kind as very kind of on rails, and everything is kind of normative, and then you have queer people off on their own doing their own thing.” Counterculture’s mainstream debut in the mid-‘60s, when the norms of the ‘50s were largely rejected by youth, was fueled by a theory of social justice that scholars refer to now as “the politics of authenticity.” This theory holds that liberation requires being completely, unforgivingly yourself, which is certainly the ethos of both space and queerness. But Hunt wanted to make it clear that her whiteness has made her career much easier, a sentiment I often hear from queer people who pay close attention to Pride’s evolving culture, and are aware that all LGBTQ+ marginalization is not the same. Critics of our present-day, corporate-sponsored celebrations urge the community to honor Pride’s history and work towards being more inclusive. They often refer back to the 1969 Stonewall Uprising that sparked the queer liberation movement and how the same people who facilitated the riots -- trans women of color -- are often forgotten during the largely cisgender, white-washed Pride parades of today. (The addition of a brown and black stripe to the Philadelphia rainbow flag three years ago is only one example of how public discourse is shifting.) Hunt said the same limitations are put on people of color within the astronomy field. To get a sense of queer history in astronomy, I talked to Tony Scupham-Bilton, an LGBTQ+ historian living in the United Kingdom, who grew up in a village with no light pollution and became fascinated by asteroids at a young age. “I remember copying out a list of asteroids from an encyclopedia when I was about 8 years-old,” he told me, and then leaped into a summary of astronomy’s rich queer history, from the BCs up to modern day. The queer community as a whole has made leaps and bounds within the last 100 years. Transgender astrophysicist Dr. Rebecca Oppenheimer discovered the first brown dwarf star, Dr. Sally Ride was the first American woman in space, transgender astrophysicist Dr. Jessica Mink discovered the rings around the planet Uranus, Dr. Nergis Mavalvala proved Einstein’s theory of gravitational waves, and Dr. James Pollack’s study of dust storms on Mars led to research into climate change on Earth, among others. But there’s still a lot of work to do in terms of inclusivity. “Many openly LGBT astronomers are involved in outreach work, popularizing astronomy, and working in public planetaria,” Scupham-Bilton said. “There is also an increasing number of openly LGBT students who are registering on LGBT science and university ‘out lists,’ and there are many LGBT astronomy professors.” The astronomy field could learn a thing or two from space, and the folks who study it PhD student KeShawn Ivory, who I contacted via the “Astro Twitter” network, is part of the welcoming committee for The Fisk-Vanderbilt Master's-to-PhD Bridge Program, the nation’s top producer of Black master's degrees in physics, and plans to become a planetarium director when he’s finished with his studies. Ivory says he became attracted to space after a lexicon activity wherein he was assigned the world “astronomy.” “I came home and looked it up like the assignment mandated and wrote down definition word for word… and it sounded kind of magical,” he said. “It was like ‘celestial bodies’ and planets and stars.” Ivory got back in touch with his initial passion for astronomy while planning his future; he wasn’t excited by the traditional academia path he saw laid out for him in the eyes of his professors. Ivory identifies as gay and aromantic, and tied his interests back to the thesis of my article to describe why he chose the planetarium path. “It’s funny that, you know, under the theme of ‘space is gay’... When I thought about what I really liked about [space], it came back to just imagery. I liked pictures. I like colors. I liked the image. And what’s the best way to present that image to the public and still get to use all of my specialized knowledge? Planetarium work.” I reached out to more astronomers via the “Astro Twitter” network, which Ivory says he stumbled into by accident, having initially made a Twitter account at age 13 to channel all of his Lady Gaga-loving energy. While his focus has shifted since then, he still talks openly about his personal life and opinions. When astronomers from school and conferences started following him, Ivory said he “wasn’t about to change his content.” In being unforgivingly Black and queer, Ivory is part of the astronomy counterculture working to change the narrative around who gets to study space. And he believes that, during the COVID-19 pandemic, astro Twitter is finally in a position to listen to criticism. We need to work harder to bring the queerness of space to our communities on Earth. Moiya McTier, a Black astrophysicist who identifies as bisexual and pansexual, said she didn’t have the typical “look up at the night sky” story, and only took an astronomy class in sophomore year because the professor promised free pizza each week. Then she was hooked. She told me about the American Astronomical Society, which comprises over 10,000 members and includes the Committee on the Status of Minorities in Astronomy, which she is a part of. She also has a podcast called “Exolor” wherein she talks to space experts about what life might be like on different kinds of alien planets. When I asked her to give me the gossip on “astro Twitter” right now, she echoed Ivory’s sentiments and said the focus has shifted. “A lot of the focus for me has been on racism in astronomy, which sort of bled into Pride Month as the focus has been ongoing.” Universal inclusion is a sentiment has been spreading among the white queer and ally communities since the Black Lives Matter protests began. Folks working towards a more inclusive Pride echo that there is simply no queer liberation without Black liberation. While the corporate Pride in my home city of New York was celebrated virtually due to COVID-19, the Dyke March and Queer Liberation March were altered to focus on the Black Lives Matter movement. And even though there were significantly less rainbow flags at this year’s Queer Liberation March, activists exuded the true queer, colorful, celestial spirit of the cosmos. Space has no orientation, literally McTier believes space is gay, because it has no technical orientation. “One of the most annoying things about working in space is that there’s no up and down,” she said. “Because there’s not a central gravity field, depending on where you are in space.”

**Disads to the TVA prove stable neg ground**

**Vote Neg –**

#### Offense

#### Limits – their interp is totally unworkable for debate – literally any person using any space would become topical, which is 7 billion actors and all combinations of them, and millions of spaces they could be in; it’s impossible for the neg to prep a case neg to all of those affs, and obviously no core neg generics like innovation or mining good apply. That impact is compounded by infinite aff prep time which makes negating on the fly impossible and debate unfair. Independently, unpredictability causes debaters to latch onto un-vetted ideals as political end-points—there are an infinite number of unintended pitfalls to the aff. A well-prepared negative is better able to identify those and create better advocacy skills

#### Ground – the resolution is divided for equal arguments on each side but their aff isn’t – that plus the inherent competitive incentive means that their model leads to affs which simply affirm truisms and are literally impossible to ethically negate. Any neg ground they list is concessionary and was not obvious after the 1ac.

#### Skills – keep in mind they’ve conceded that legal strategies are uniquely important because of republican politics

#### Space policy has no intrinsic quality – it’s porous and open to public pressure and even radical theories, but equipping students to engage is necessary for broader engagement that stops devastating social inequality AND solves the case

Weeks 12 [Adjunct Professor of International Relations Online Program, Webster University (Edythe, “OUTER SPACE DEVELOPMENT: THE SOLUTION FOR GLOBAL INEQUALITY,” *Outer Space Development, International Relations and Space Law: A Method for Elucidating Seeds*, Chapter 7, pg 171-174]

This is the time to discuss equality. Once societies in outer space are established it will be too late. The first wave of outer space development in the last half of the 20th century changed the world. This process included establishing a satellite telecommunications infrastructure in the geostationary orbit along with the globalization of new high-tech products and services. The retirement of the NASA space shuttle program symbolized the start of the second wave of outer space development, which is likely to be propelled by the privatization of space tourism and space mining. This type of space industrialization will undoubtedly result in extreme wealth for a few who know what is happening, while those who have no knowledge will be left behind. Decision makers, scholars, trouble-shooters, and others worry constantly about existing inequality gaps, lack of development, poverty, and economic hardship. This chapter suggests a method for preventative maintenance prior to humankind’s next development project. It argues that education, information, and sharing knowledge can become tools for generating perpetual equality as we embark on our journey to colonize the final frontier. Those historically disenfranchised can gain a fresh advantage through preparation and education to develop an expertise aimed at providing valuable knowledge useful for space endeavors. In addition, in these times of crashing economies, job loss, high unemployment rates, and school system failures, people are searching for ways to create prosperous futures for themselves and their families. Outer space could prove to be a way for many to find their answer. Newly Emerging Trends Relevant for Outer Space Development The passage of the NASA Authorization Act of 2010 demonstrates a willingness by the U.S. to fund a stepped-up phase of space activities. During bad economic times, this Act provides $58,400,000,000 for various space-related programs from 2011 to 2013. In 2010/2011, media reports constantly alerted the general public to be ready for the retirement of the NASA Space Shuttle program. This initiative complemented the New Vision for U.S. Space Exploration Policy (2004), as well as various other laws and policies initiated by the United States and discussed in previous chapters. When read together, it is fair to assume the newly emerging space industries will be related to achieving advanced space transportation systems, private spacecraft development, commercial space habitats, space stations, space settlements, commercial space mining, spacecraft trajectory optimization techniques for landing on near-Earth asteroids, commercial spaceport construction, interplanetary telecommunications, and space exploration missions. The thing for teachers, students, and members of the general public to do in order to prepare to take advantage of these linked opportunities is to imagine how these goals are likely to play out, and what types of goods, services, and skill-sets will be needed. Education as the Solution Outer space development historically has been the purview of skilled professionals in the science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) fields. The STEM-oriented opportunities for those proficient in physics, astrophysics, space medicine, engineering, calculus, etc., have always been limited to a few select students. But now global society is calling for something, more since the STEM fields have failed to attract diverse people on an equal footing.186 A bridge can be created by using social and behavioral sciences curricula, thereby to attract people from a wider range of backgrounds to learn about outer space development and newly emerging industries. New education paradigms can help ensure equity and enable wider citizen participation throughout the international community. Curricula using the new paradigm can be used to motivate and inspire a new generation of scholars who can play a key role in the process of outer space development. In effect, an educational system that unleashes human creativity and curiosity will empower students with the knowledge and competencies not only for the second wave of outer space development, but also for the global engagement necessary for the 21st century and beyond (Weeks and Tamashiro, 2011). It is never too early to begin cultivating a person’s intellectual and academic talents. Most children are naturally curious. As part of the curriculum, students of all ages can be shown how to do research, how to write a research paper, to compile and present data, perform critical analytical thinking, and to anticipate and develop relevant skill-sets for newly emerging industry trends. Learning these skills will enable more people to develop an expertise aimed at supplying talent that will be in demand as future industries emerge. This can change people’s lives. Students can learn how to anticipate and prepare for future emerging industries while they are at the K-12 level. Students can also learn at young ages how to get recognized by publishers, editors, the mass media, and others. In situations where the resources necessary for teaching science are unavailable, space studies can be introduced through the social and behavioral sciences and the arts. For many years, space studies has remained the exclusive purview of engineers, scientists, and technology experts. However, there is room at the table for social and behavioral sciences students to join in and develop a specialty area of expertise. Key actors within the outer space development community have expressed an interest in advancing space studies to a broader audience. Orchestrating such a process carries with it the power to improve international relations, education, inspiration, dreams, and creativity, and to boost the global economy by creating a myriad of new jobs and degree programs. We can open an additional door to allow a broader range of knowledge into the minds of more people by introducing outer space development studies through the social and behavioral sciences (Hammond and Weeks, 2011). Unlike engineering, an interdisciplinary social and behavioral sciences lens enables us to interpret the meaning behind sets and patterns of human behaviors—this includes the behavior of individuals, institutions, groups, presidents, members of congress, business and other organizations, mass media, international organizations, and lawmakers. Humankind can progress beyond the “STEMs = space studies” model by including, encouraging, involving, and preparing a new breed of social and behavioral sciences geniuses. These would be people who are naturals in international relations, conflict resolution, and peace studies, as well as versed in international law, politics, social psychology, critical analysis, discourse analysis, international communication, artistic architecture, race and ethnic studies, gender studies, religious studies, economics, finance, business and entrepreneurship, history, and political economy, while also being concerned with inequality gaps, oppression, subjugation, revolts, uprisings, revolutions, and various other social and behavioral phenomena. People who understand the issues concerning human beings now have a way of participating in future emerging space industries. The audience of learners scheduled to receive cutting-edge knowledge of fields relevant for outer space development will be expanded by online learning techniques and sharing of information through the open-source technologies of the Internet. Shaping Ideology Imagine teaching students about the newly emerging trends related to outer space development. This would give students permission to envision and carve out their role in designing future space societies. Students from all disciplines can be taught to see what’s coming next by learning to research and interpret economic policies, laws, and international relations. This will enable them to detect newly emerging industries and to anticipate the elements likely to be in demand. Students can then shape their skill-sets and prepare to satisfy these emerging needs. Students can be taught to perform this type of interdisciplinary analysis and to research combined dynamics—government hearings and transcripts, policy statements and speeches, laws, economic initiatives, and international treaties. They can also be taught to combine this type of primary data with theoretical understandings of historical, ideological, institutional, political, economic, psychological, and structural phenomena.

#### You will never remember a single round which means this debate has no impact on your subjectivity, but the iterative process of testing our ideas and considering their impacts creates better informed debaters who will grow up to be policymakers or citizens – a better informed populace solves their offense and more because it spills over to activism generally, but it requires predictable testing to be possible

#### Retooling debate to be about combatting one particular injustice like homophobia is inefficient – there are far too many injustices in the world for debate to address them one at a time. Instead, our model is that we gain the generic skills that give us the ability to address all of them

#### Even if combatting homophobia did outweigh the general advocacy skills our model creates they don’t do so because predictability mitigates their offense

#### Defense

#### Debates about space policy are uniquely good

#### Paradigm issues

#### Fairness

#### It’s intrinsic to debate – debaters put in hours of prep, go to camp, and pay to go to tournaments and take weekends to debate which is undergirded by the competitive incentive and the desire to win – the financial and time investments debaters put in and our adherence with speech times or ev ethics are only justified by a fair round in which the better debater wins. They can’t separate themselves from that competitive incentive because they rely on you to evaluate their arguments fairly – if they win fairness bad you can just vote neg on whatever your favorite K of this aff is whether we read it or not

#### b. Fairness also comes before substance—deciding any other argument in this debate cannot be disentangled from our inability to prepare for it—-any argument you think they’re winning is a link, not a reason to vote for them, because it’s just as likely that they’re winning it because we weren’t able to effectively prepare to defeat it.

#### c. It turns education offense because we only have an incentive to write better affs and create stronger research strategies if we think they’ll be judged fairly – research only happens because we want to win

#### They will say structural unfairness outweighs - we can agree that structural unfairness exists- but not being T doesn’t resolve those structural access barriers—even if other fairness disparities exist—we should hold onto the resolution because it’s the only thing everyone definitively has access to – no one got a head start with the topic and everyone eventually has to go neg

#### Competing interps – debates about debate are good because they create the best model which leads to more substantive debates in the long term, and reasonability is arbitrary, links to our predictability offense, and incentivizes the worst affs that are barely reasonable

# 2

#### Iran deal is imminent and key to prevent escalatory war- BUT PC is key to passage

Hounshell 3/23/22 [Blake Hounshell and Leah Askarinam, – New York Times On Politics. "The Democrat the White House Fears the Most," NY Times, 3-23-2022, https://www.nytimes.com/2022/03/23/us/politics/robert-menendez-biden-foreign-policy.html, accessed 3-27-2022]

One of the final obstacles, according to those who have attended the briefings, is Iran’s demand that the U.S. no longer designate the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps as a foreign terrorist organization. Doing so would mean little in a practical sense because other sanctions on the group still apply, proponents of a deal say. But the Biden administration would need to expend precious political capital defending the move at a time when it has little to spare. “I’d want to see what that means in practice,” said Representative Tom Malinowski, Democrat of New Jersey, who said he was waiting to see the text of an agreement. “But once Iran gets the bomb, our ability to confront their other malign activities will be diminished.” Senator Chris Murphy, a Democrat of Connecticut, said in an interview that he’d seen “bone-chilling” assessments of how close Iran is to producing weapons-grade uranium. Others who have been briefed on the U.S. intelligence assessments say Iran could produce enough fissile material for a nuclear weapon in as little as two weeks, escalating the risk that Israel might take military action. “The consequences of no deal are horrific,” Murphy said. “And there is no other practical path to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon other than diplomacy.” The main reason the crisis has reached this point, advocates of a deal say, is Donald Trump’s withdrawal from the original nuclear deal, which allowed Iran to keep enriching uranium past agreed-upon levels. But the Biden administration also moved too slowly to engage Tehran upon entering office, fearing Menendez-led blowback on Capitol Hill. “It didn’t want to lose fence-sitters in Congress,” said Ali Vaez, an Iran expert at the International Crisis Group. Now that a deal is close, administration officials are being cagey about whether they believe Congress must be allowed to review its terms. Under a bipartisan law passed in 2015, the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, the administration must submit the text of any “new” agreement to congressional oversight. Menendez, who opposed the original nuclear agreement in 2015 and has criticized the current deal under discussion, has signaled he will insist on the Senate having its say. In February, he teamed up with Senator Lindsey Graham, a Republican of South Carolina, to propose his own diplomatic solution to the nuclear standoff. “There is no chance in bringing Senator Menendez on board, and the alternative that he offers is unworkable for the administration,” Vaez said. “I think it’s a lost cause.” State Department officials caution that “an agreement is neither imminent nor certain,” as one put it. The administration is also still examining its legal options regarding congressional review of a potential deal, which might not technically qualify as “new.” If an Iran deal is put to a vote in the Senate, Menendez’s reaction will be crucial. Republicans most likely will uniformly oppose it. The administration can still afford to lose a handful of Democrats, because only 41 votes would be needed to allow a revived agreement to proceed. But it might take some arm twisting to round up enough votes to win. Ben Cardin, the hawkish Maryland senator, has already expressed concerns about delisting the Revolutionary Guards. Other influential Democrats on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, such as Chris Coons of Delaware, have said little in support of a fresh deal. A defeat in the Senate could deal the president a damaging blow on one of his signature foreign policy initiatives, supporters of the talks warn. And given Iran’s rapid advance toward producing weapons-grade uranium, should diplomacy fail, the president could be facing the prospect of a new conflict in the Middle East on top of a grinding war in Ukraine. If there is no deal, Vaez said, “I think this will escalate very quickly and the specter of war will emerge as soon as the spring.”

#### Space policies nuke PC.

Dreier 16 [Casey Dreier, Chief Advocate & Senior Space Policy Adviser for The Planetary Society, April 13, 2016. “Does Presidential Intervention Undermine Consensus for NASA?” https://www.planetary.org/blogs/casey-dreier/2016/0413-does-a-strong-president-help-or-hurt-consensus-on-NASA.html]

To see how this happens, I recommend reading the book “[Beyond Ideology](http://smile.amazon.com/Beyond-Ideology-Politics-Principles-Partisanship/dp/0226470768/ref=smi_www_rco2_go_smi_g2243582042?_encoding=UTF8&*Version*=1&*entries*=0&ie=UTF8)” by Frances Lee. The author’s larger premise is that issues having no intrinsic relation to stated party ideology have become increasingly polarized in recent years. This is a function of the two party nature of our political system. If your party coalition wins, the other one loses. It’s [It is] zero-sum. Your party can win in one of two ways: you can make a better pitch to voters by demonstrating the superiority of your agenda; or you can undermine and stymie the agenda of the opposition party, making them unpopular with voters, and pick up the seats that they lose. Since you’re the only other political party, you gain in either scenario. I’m not sure if you’ve noticed, but the “undermine and stymie” approach has been popular for quite some time now in the U.S. Congress. Given this situation, the President and their policies naturally become the symbolic target of the opposition party. Anything promoted by the President effectively induces opposition by association. Lee demonstrates the magnitude of this induced polarization on various types of issues. For highly polarized issues like the role of government in the economy, or social issues, the impact is minimal—the opposition has already been clearly defined and generally falls into clearly defined ideologies of the Republican and Democratic parties. But for issues that do not fit readily into a predefined political ideology—like space—the induced polarization by the President can be significant. In fact, Lee showed that space, science, and technology issues incur the greatest increase in partisanship based on their inclusion in the Presidential agenda. One need only look to at the responses by political operatives of the opposing party to the strong human spaceflight proposals by [Barack Obama in 2010](http://www.shelby.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/mobile/newsreleases?ID=25F3AD2E-802A-23AD-4960-F512B9E205D2), [George W. Bush in 2004](http://www.nbcnews.com/id/3950099/ns/technology_and_science-space/t/bush-sets-new-course-moon-beyond/#.Vw3UMRMrKHo), and [George H.W. Bush in 1989](http://www.nytimes.com/1989/07/21/us/president-calls-for-mars-mission-and-a-moon-base.html) to see this reflected in recent history. This isn’t to say that Presidents can’t have a significant impact on the space program. Clearly they can. But the broad consensus needed for stability after their departure from office may be undermined by the very priority they gave it during their tenure. It what amounts to a mixed blessing for NASA, the U.S. space program does have an unusually strong bipartisan group of politicians who support the program due to NASA centers in a variety of states throughout the union. Berger notes this throughout his article, and it does, in a way, act as force that is resistant to change for good and bad. This mitigates somewhat the pure polarization seen on other science and technology issues. But for a Journey to Mars—a major effort that would, at best, require stability and significant funding over many Presidential administrations—that may not be enough. Perhaps the solution is for the next President to maintain a light touch on space. Maybe they should speak softly through the budget process, and avoid the Kennedyesque speeches and declarations to Congress that induce the types of partisanship we so dearly need to avoid.

#### Iran conflict escalates to great power nuclear war

Lin, 20 [SAIS-Johns Hopkins University Center for Transatlantic Relations fellow [Dr. Christina, she was a Visiting Academic Fellow at the Mercator Institute for China Studies (MERICS) in Berlin and a former Transatlantic Academy Fellow at the German Marshall Fund of the United States, Dr. Lin has extensive US government experience working on China security issues, including policy planning at the US Department of Defense, the National Security Council, and US Department of State, "China might take Iran’s side in a war with US," Asia Times, 1-5-20, https://asiatimes.com/2020/01/could-china-take-irans-side-in-a-war-with-us/, accessed 2-3-21]

China might take Iran’s side in a war with US Beijing's ties with Tehran are crucial to its energy and geopolitical strategies, and with Moscow also in the mix, a broader conflagration is a real possibility After the US assassination of Iran’s General Qasem Soleimani on Friday, Germany’s Spiegel Online observed that this is akin to a declaration of war on Iran. Now the US Congress is scrambling for a debate on a formal declaration of war, although it will unlikely block the Trump White House’s march toward the battlefield. Last March, President Donald Trump reviewed the Pentagon’s plan to send 120,000 US troops to counter Iran, and the current military buildup of deploying 3,500 more US troops to the region may be part of that plan. Also, in 2017, a think-tank that enjoys close ties with Secretary of State Mike Pompeo and the Trump White House, sent a seven-page memo outlining plans for regime change in Iran, and the current scenario seems to be taken out of this playbook. The next question is, how will regional powers react to a US-Iran war? China and Russia already seem to have answered that question via their war games in the Gulf of Oman last week, and the signal to the US is that Iran is not isolated and has powerful allies. Indeed, last year retired US Army Colonel Douglas Macgregor already warned that a war with Iran could draw in China and Russia. Currently, China’s reaction is to urge both Iran and the US to maintain calm and de-escalate tensions, and closely monitor the situation. Beijing does not want war and needs Mideast stability to pursue the Belt and Road Initiative Eurasian integration plan. It has large stakes in Iran’s stability: It is the largest buyer of Iranian oil, China is Iran’s largest trading partner, and Iran is a key geographic node for the BRI. Up to now, China has tried to balance its relationship with Saudi Arabia and Iran in the Middle East and set up a firewall between the two, although Iran is more significant in China’s strategic calculus given the fact Saudi Arabia and other Arab Gulf countries are still under the US security umbrella and host US military bases. China is also against further Western-sponsored regime change in the region, and Iran is an important partner in counterbalancing US hegemony and the drive toward a multipolar world. ‘It’s about China’ Should a US-Iran war break out and the Iranian government is overthrown, it would be devastating for China’s regional interests. As Robert Kaplan wrote in a New York Times article titled “This isn’t about Iran. It’s about China,” the current US-Iran standoff is about something much vaster. Geography matters in geopolitics and the Gulf of Oman separates not only Oman and Iran but also Oman and Pakistan, where China has completed a state-of-the-art port at Gwadar. It is a hinge uniting the Middle East, the South Asian subcontinent and East Asia in China’s BRI. China is also a net importer of oil and obtains half its supply from the Persian Gulf. Yet the US Navy maintains control of the sea lines of communications. As such, China is worried about, first, US restriction of China’s oil imports over a clash across the Taiwan Strait or in the South China Sea and, second, events abroad that might lead to price volatility hurting the Chinese economy. Most important, China needs Iran in the “east flank” of the Persian Gulf to prevent a full blockade by the US Navy. This insurance plan against a remote contingency was spelled out in a 2000 article published by the prestigious Chinese Society for Strategy and Management (CSSM) in its influential Strategy and Management Journal. The article’s author Tang Shiping, an associate research fellow at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS), argued that the US already controls the west bank of the oil-rich Persian Gulf via its pro-American proxies (Saudi Arabia and smaller Gulf states), in effect rendering it an “internal sea” for the US, and challenges to that position are likely to fail. Yet if China and Russia expand relations with Iran, they could maintain a “minimum balance” to thwart US moves. Since securing oil imports from the Gulf requires both US-controlled west bank and the China-and-Russia-supported Iranian east bank, this axis would prevent the US from implementing oil embargoes against other countries, and Washington would not shut off China’s Gulf oil supplies, since China, Russia and Iran control the Gulf’s “east bank.” A great power conflict? In the past, China’s Mideast posture was a balancing act of engaging Iran while simultaneously not alienating the US. However, what has changed now is the rapid deterioration of Sino-US relations and decoupling over the past year in a new Cold War. With US hostility and “maximum pressure” toward Beijing, Moscow and Tehran (all under US sanctions), Washington is driving all three to coalesce, as evidenced in the recent joint military exercise in the Gulf of Oman and the Indian Ocean. Thus as Colonel Douglas Macgregor and Dr Lydia Wilson of Oxford University caution, should the US attack Iran in a full-scale war, it could herald the additional entry of two nuclear powers to the theater, and transform the bilateral war into one of great-power conflict.

# Case

### Case

#### HUGE PLAN FLAW – THE AFF PLAN TEXT BANS GAY PEOPLE FROM BARS AS WELL BECAUSE GAY PPL ALSO CONSTITUTE PRIVATE ENTITIES – THIS IS GAME OVER FOR THE AFF BECAUSE IT MEANS THEY BAN ALL PRIVATE HUMAN BEINGS FROM GAY BARS WHICH MEANS GAY PPL CANT ENJOY THOSE SPACES ANYMORE – IRONICALLY, THE ONLY ENTITIES LEFT THAT COULD USE GAY BARS WOULD BE THE GOVERNMENT AND THEY’VE READ EVIDENCE THAT SAYS THE GOVERNMENT IS ANTIQUEER WHICH TURNS ALL THEIR OFFENSE BECAUSE THE GOVERNMENT WILL VIOLENTLY APPROPRIATE GAY BARS