## OFF

#### Interpretation – the affirmative must defend that the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust. Violation – they also defend the PDT

#### Extra-T is a voting issue for fairness and education it makes being negative impossible

#### A) Infinitely regressive – they can attach literally anything onto the resolution – that lets them fiat out of Kritik links and any disad by attaching as many words onto the plan as they want B) Predictable limits – infinite options means we can’t predict advantage areas – this leads to terrible debates where we’re forced to go for generics – that crushes topic education C) Clash – they circumvent clash by justifying adding on anything onto the resolution – its not what they do its what they justify – clash is the most portable skill in debate because it’s the only unique advantage to the activity that can’t be solved anywhere else. Our interp is key to third and fourth level testing of the aff which results in more rigorous and nuanced debates

## OFF

#### Interpretation: appropriation involves permanent, exclusive use of land and resource extraction. The aff must defend that appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

Stephen Gorove, Stephen Gorove (1917-2001) was a space law education pioneer. He served as a professor of space law and director of space studies and policy, from 1991-1998, at the University of Mississippi., 1969 " Interpreting Article II of the Outer Space Treaty" Fordham Law Review, https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1966&context=flr

With respect to the concept of appropriation the basic question is **what constitutes "appropriation,"** as used in the Treaty, especially in contradistinction to casual or temporary use. The term "appropriation" is used most frequently to denote the taking of property for one's own or exclusive use with a sense of permanence. Under such interpretation the establishment of a permanent settlement or the carrying out of commercial activities by nationals of a country on a celestial body may constitute national appropriation if the activities take place under the supreme authority (sovereignty) of the state. Short of this, if the state wields no exclusive authority or jurisdiction in relation to the area in question, the answer would seem to be in the negative, unless, the nationals also use their individual appropriations as cover-ups for their state's activities.5 In this connection, it should be emphasized that the word "appropriation" indicates a taking which involves something more than just a casual use. Thus a temporary occupation of a landing site or other area, just like the **temporary or nonexclusive use of property, would not constitute appropriation**. By the same token, any use involving consumption or **taking with intention of keeping for one's own exclusive use would amount to appropriation.**

#### Violation – application of PTD to space isn’t permanent, it’s context dependent and depends on cost benefit analysis

**WEF n.d.** -- (“Public Trust Doctrine.” Water Education Foundation, The Water Education Foundation is a nonprofit organization whose goal is to provide unbiased, balanced information on water issues in California and the Southwestern United States. The Foundation's mission, since its founding in 1977, has been "to create a better understanding of water resources and foster public understanding and resolution of water resource issues through facilitation, education and outreach,” <https://www.watereducation.org/aquapedia/public-trust-doctrine>, HKR-AS)

Rooted in Roman law, the public trust doctrine recognizes the public right to many natural resources including “the air, running water, the sea and its shore.”

The public trust doctrine requires the sovereign, or state, to hold in trust designated resources for the benefit of the people. Traditionally, the public trust applied to commerce and fishing in navigable waters, but its uses were expanded in California in 1971 to include fish, wildlife, habitat and recreation.

At that time, the California Supreme Court in Marks v. Whitney broadened the definition of public trust because “public trust uses are sufficiently flexible to **encompass changing public needs**.” This definition would be first applied in a legal case in the 1980s (see below). [See also California water rights.]

Mono Lake Case

In California, public trust was most notably invoked in a landmark case involving water use at Mono Lake.

In a landmark case filed to protect the Mono Lake Basin from 40 years of water diversions by the city of Los Angeles, California’s Supreme Court ruled in 1983 that reasonable and beneficial uses of water **must be interpreted in accordance with public trust needs**. This was the first case in California where the public trust doctrine was applied.

Significantly, the Mono Lake decision held that the state retains jurisdiction over these rights and may reconsider the impact on public trust, which in addition to the traditional commerce, navigation and fishing, includes wildlife habitat. The necessity of protecting the public trust was to be determined by balancing the value and cost of instream water needs against the benefits and costs of diversions. [Purchase the Layperson’s Guide to Water Rights to learn more about public trust.]

#### Plan text in a vacuum bad for fairness because it allows for incongruency between 99% of the aff and 1% of the aff – the worst version of their model is that the plan text is different from the advantage, so it makes no sense – hold them to reading a plan text defined contextually with the advantage

#### Vote neg –

#### 1] Ground – allowing affs to not defend permanent appropriation kills negative ground – we can’t read the innovation DA, since they can say innovative appropriation efforts are allowed, we can’t read asteroid mining or disads to specific types of appropriation since they can defend an exemption for that, etc. – Since the government gets to interpret whether or not the PTD applies to appropriation in specific instances, the negative can’t reasonably predict what the aff defends restricting and what it doesn’t. Ground controls the internal link to clash and fairness since the aff makes being neg impossible.

#### T is a voting issue that should be evaluated through competing interps – it tells the negative what to prepare for and reasonability invites judge intervention

## OFF

#### States should declare that public guardianship obligations created by the non-ownership doctrine necessitate a reduction in private actor appropriation of Outer Space.

#### The public trust doctrine is inseparable from an anthropocentric politics of human chauvinism – further application can only strengthen exploitative relationships to nature – guardianship asserts the doctrine of non-ownership, which solves better and competes

Adler 05, Dean College of Law at Utah (Robert, The Law at the Water's Edge: Limits to ""Ownership"" of Aquatic Ecosystems, in Wet Growth: Should Water Law Control Land Use?, pg. 244)

I argue instead that the idea of a public “trust” should be replaced by one of public “guardianship.” In a classic trust, legal and equitable title are held by different persons, and the person with legal title has “equitable duties to deal with the property for the benefit of another person.” The trust duty is fiduciary and typically requires the trustee to maximize the income or other economic value of the trust assets for the beneficiary. This principle implies that if the trustee believes that a particular asset is better used for another purpose, or that certain trust values are more valuable than others from the perspective of the beneficiary, the trustee can manage the trust assets accordingly or even eliminate the resource entirely. Viewed again according to the underlying theory or property ownership, that landowners will make decisions that maximize the welfare value of the holding, public trust ownership solves some, but not all, of the market failure problems of private ownership. Under the expanded version of the public trust doctrine as interpreted by some courts, the trustee is now supposed to ensure that all common public values, including noncommodified environmental values that benefit the public in some way, are considered fully and appropriately and weighed against values that might benefit a subset of society or even an individual landowner disproportionately. If private market participants exert undue influence on the government’s decision process in the exercise of its trust, however, those decisions may not necessarily maximize overall welfare. Give the deference usually enjoyed by trustees absent clear violations of the trust duty, many courts are not likely to interfere with those judgements. Even absent such biasing of the trustee’s decision, a trustee may simply, in the exercise of its fiduciary judgement, determine that the commercial value of a particular piece of trust property is more valuable to the beneficiary than its environmental value, a decision more likely to be reviewed by courts from a procedural, rather than a substantive, perspective. Moreover, to the extent that trust resources provide ecosystem or other values or benefits that transcend the welfare of human societies, the public trust doctrine, - and trust law in general - is not even designed to incorporate those values. In fact, a public trustee arguably would violate its fiduciary duty to the public beneficiary if it considered environmental values at the expense of the immediate (current generation) public beneficiaries. One solution to that dilemma would be to consider the beneficiaries to include future as well as current generations of humans, but the inherently anthropocentric focus of the trust duty remains. Thus, while some courts have upheld government regulation and even prohibition of private development of land at the water's edge, under interpretations of the public trust doctrine and police power that affirm environmental stewardship duties; others have applied the doctrine as one that merely ensures that the trustee makes rational decisions after properly considering all trust values. 174 Other courts have ap­plied the doctrine to sanction the very economic development activities at the water's edge that cause such extensive aquatic ecosystem harm, such as the use of trust property for transportation systems, public utilities, oil production, and urban and commercial expansion. So long as the law considers aquatic species and other components of aquatic eco­systems to be "trust assets" to be managed entirely for the benefit of human economic and other welfare, aquatic ecosystems will remain vulnerable to continued impairment. A potentially more satisfying model, as discussed in the next section, is suggested by the evolution of wildlife law from one in which wildlife was similarly viewed as being "owned" by the state in trust for the people in common to one of "non­ownership." The non-ownership doctrine implies a corollary principle that the government is a guardian, rather than a trustee, of the resource and must exercise its legal responsibilities accordingly.

#### That human-centric ethic ensures escalating cycles of ecological collapse and exclusion – ethical obligation to reject

**Ahkin ‘10** (Melanie Ahkin, Monash University, 2010, “Human Centrism, Animist Materialism, and the Critique of Rationalism in Val Plumwood’s Critical Ecological Feminism,” Emergent Australian Philosophers, a peer reviewed journal of philosophy,http://www.eap.philosophy-australia.com/archives.html)  
  
These five features provide the basis for hegemonic centrism insofar as they promote certain conceptual and perceptual distortions of reality which universalise and naturalise the standpoint of the superior relata as primary or centre, and deny and subordinate the standpoints of inferiorised others as secondary or derivative. Using standpoint theory analysis, Plumwood's reconceptualisation of human chauvinist frameworks locates and dissects these logical characteristics of dualism, and the conceptual and perceptual distortions of reality common to centric structures, as follows. Radical exclusion is found in the rationalist emphasis on differences between humans and non-human nature, its valourisation of a human rationality conceived as exclusionary of nature, and its minimisation of similarities between the two realms. Homogenisation and stereotyping occur especially in the rationalist denial of consciousness to nature, and its denial of the diversity of mental characteristics found within its many different constituents, facilitating a perception of nature as homogeneous and of its members as interchangeable and replaceable resources. This definition of nature in terms of its **lack** of human rationality and consciousness means that its identity remains relative to that of the dominant human group, and its difference is marked as deficiency, permitting its inferiorisation. Backgrounding and denial may be observed in the conception of nature as extraneous and inessential background to the foreground of human culture, in the human denial of dependency on the natural environment, and denial of the ethical and political constraints which the unrecognised ends and needs of non-human nature might otherwise place on human behaviour. These features together create an ethical discontinuity between humans and non-human nature which denies nature's value and agency, and thereby promote its instrumentalisation and exploitation for the benefit of humans.11 This dualistic logic helps to universalise the human centric standpoint, making invisible and seemingly inevitable the conceptual and perceptual distortions of reality and oppression of non-human nature it enjoins. The alternative standpoints and perspectives of members of the inferiorised class of nature are denied legitimacy and subordinated to that of the class of humans, ultimately becoming invisible once this master standpoint becomes part of the very structure of thought.12 Such an anthropocentric framework creates a variety of serious injustices and prudential risks, making it highly ecologically irrational.13 The hierarchical value prescriptions and epistemic distortions responsible for its biased, reductive conceptualisation of nature strips the non-human natural realm of non-instrumental value, and impedes the fair and impartial treatment of its members. Similarly, anthropocentrism creates distributive injustices by restricting ethical concern to humans, admitting partisan distributive relationships with non-human nature in the forms of commodification and instrumentalisation. The prudential risks and **blindspots** created by anthropocentrism are problematic for nature and humans alike and are of especial concern within our current context of radical human dependence on an irreplaceable and increasingly degraded natural environment. These prudential risks are in large part consequences of the centric structure's promotion of illusory human disembeddedness, self-enclosure and insensitivity to the significance and survival needs of non-human nature: The logic of centrism naturalises an illusory order in which the centre appears to itself to be disembedded, and this is especially dangerous in contexts where there is real and radical dependency on an Other who is simultaneously weakened by the application of that logic.14 Within the context of human-nature relationships, such a logic must inevitably lead to failure, either through the catastrophic extinction of our natural environment and the consequent collapse of our species, or more **hopefully** by the abandonment and transformation of the human centric framework.15

#### Our evidence is explicitly comparative – ptd will be applied arbitrarily and cases will drag on – non-ownership is key to uniformity and broad ecological benefits, but the plan permanently sells away the environment

Adler 05, Dean College of Law at Utah (Robert, The Law at the Water's Edge: Limits to ""Ownership"" of Aquatic Ecosystems, in Wet Growth: Should Water Law Control Land Use?, pg. 244)

There are several other ways in which the non-ownership doctrine as applied to aquatic ecosystem resources and values differs from the existing public trust doctrine and is likely to be a superior tool to protect those resources and values. First, while some courts have endeavored to "unshackle" the public trust doctrine from its historic limits, the doctrine is, for the most part, constrained by those artificial geographic boundaries, and litigants seeking to enforce the public trust face a significant burden to overcome those presumed boundaries. The non-ownership doctrine and its implied government guardianship is defined not by artificial geographic limits but by actual determinations of the degree to which aquatic ecosystem values and services exist. Second, as explained above, the nature of the guardianship duty is a more logical model for government control of resources that cannot be owned and suggests that those resources must be protected and cannot be conveyed either for private economic gain or for public economic gain at the expense of ecological harms. Third, and most importantly, relative to the public trust doctrine the burden of proof should be flipped. Rather than requiring the government to prove that it owns or otherwise controls a resource under the public trust doctrine in order to justify protection, a landowner presumptively has no rights to impair ecosystem components, values, or services in a significant way, meaning the burden of proof is on the landowner to demonstrate ownership rights, and not vice versa. Like the public trust doctrine, of course, the "non-ownership" doctrine could suffer the fate of other efforts to develop rules of resource protection through a state-by-state and case-by-case approach, with the possibility of the same type of doctrinal fragmentation among states. For several reasons, however, the legal doctrine of "non-ownership" could avoid this common-law odyssey. First, the non-ownership doctrine was pronounced by the Court in Hughes as a matter of federal law in the context of a constitutional ruling. If the Court were to apply that same doctrine in the context of a constitutional takings challenge, it could achieve national status without the need for an uncertain crosscountry journey. While the public trust doctrine often is attributed to the Court's rulings in cases like Illinois Central and Shively v. Bowlby, in fact it had its origins in earlier state cases, and the Court has ruled that the geographic reach and other aspects of the public trust doctrine are a matter of state law. It was this perhaps unfortunate conclusion that has relegated the public trust doctrine to such an uncertain fate. Second, with due respect to the tremendous innovation and influence of the modern rejuvenation of the public trust doctrine, in addition to the inherent limitations discussed above, its application to a larger geography and a broader scope of trust resources relies heavily on a somewhat subjective, amorphous set of judgments about what advances public trust values and how those values should be balanced against other resources and values, both public and private. To be sure, application of the "non-ownership" doctrine will require sometimes difficult case by case judgments, as do virtually all efforts to protect ecological resources, whether judicial or regulatory in method. The core governing principle of non-ownership, however, is amenable to a far greater degree of uniformity. As a matter of law, once it is recognized that private-property rights do not include the right to destroy or degrade aquatic ecosystem resources, the role of government as guardian of those resources, whether through judicial or regulatory action, is less open to the type of discretion that characterizes the public trust doctrine. Under the guardianship principle, the government's role is to protect, not to choose from among a large number of potentially competing uses.

#### Conflicting decisions ensure the permutation has no force of law

Arnold and Porter 10 [2010, Arnold and Porter is a Preeminent International Law Firm, “Reforming the Immigration System”, new.abanet.org/Immigration/PublicDocuments/aba\_complete\_full\_report.pdf]

Consequently, there is now a convoluted labyrinth of case law construing the exceptions (and constitutionally required carve-outs to these exceptions) to judicial review of removal orders. [Petitioners and the courts of appeals spend valuable time wending their way through this jurisdictional thicket. As a result, judicial resources are not conserved, and it is questionable whether the objective of executing removal orders with dispatch has been achieved. Instead, the exceptional scope of the restrictions on judicial review undermines confidence in the entire adjudication system, as these restrictions are perceived as a mechanism to insulate dysfunctional administrative processes and questionable exercise of executive discretion.

## OFF

#### Expanding PTD shatters the entire legal-regulatory balance

Huffman 15 [James L. Huffman is Dean Emeritus of Lewis & Clark Law School and a Visiting Fellow at the Hoover Institution. He holds degrees from Montana State University (BS), The Fletcher School of Tufts University (MA) and the University of Chicago (JD). "WHY LIBERATING THE PUBLIC TRUST DOCTRINE IS BAD FOR THE PUBLIC." https://law.lclark.edu/live/files/19611-45-2huffman]

Since the beginning of the modern environmental movement in the 1960s, environmental advocates have been in search of ways to circumvent the twin obstacles of political compromise and vested property rights. In a 1970 article, Professor Joseph Sax suggested that the common law public trust doctrine might provide an avenue for judicial intervention in the name of claimed public rights in a wide array of natural resources. Because the traditional doctrine was narrowly limited in terms of both public rights and affected resources, Sax published a second article ten years later, calling for courts to liberate the public trust doctrine from its historical parameters. While a few judges responded with generally limited extensions of the doctrine, Sax’s plea has been ignored by most courts—but not by academics. A flood of law review articles have resorted to shoddy history, retrospective theorizing about the origins and purposes of the doctrine, appeals to higher law and moral imperatives, and confusion of the idea of public trust in representative government with the public rights protected by the public trust doctrine in efforts to persuade courts to liberate the doctrine. Implicit, if not explicit, in all of these arguments is the claim that the common law origins of American law and the American judicial system vest courts with authority to amend old law and make new law. At risk in this vast and imaginative effort to liberate the public trust doctrine from its common law confines are the constitutional separation of powers, the rule of law, due process and secure property rights, and the economic prosperity on which environmental protection ultimately depends.

#### Expanding PTD beyond precedent allows for unchecked judicial activism across the law – the plan applies it everywhere on earth, which ensures circumvention, authoritarianism, and shocks global rule of law

Huffman 15 [James L. Huffman is Dean Emeritus of Lewis & Clark Law School and a Visiting Fellow at the Hoover Institution. He holds degrees from Montana State University (BS), The Fletcher School of Tufts University (MA) and the University of Chicago (JD). "WHY LIBERATING THE PUBLIC TRUST DOCTRINE IS BAD FOR THE PUBLIC." https://law.lclark.edu/live/files/19611-45-2huffman]

Modern progressives, like their early twentieth century predecessors, tend to be skeptical of democratic policymaking. They prefer to rely on experts, scientific management and expeditious executive action to implement policies they know to be right and good. Democracy, the separation of powers, constitutional rights, and the rule of law all get in the way. It was early frustration with these traditional American principles that led Professor Sax to call for liberating the public trust doctrine from its historical shackles. He recognized that if courts could be persuaded to expand and extend the doctrine, environmentalists could revolutionize American property law while claiming the mantle of the rule of law. Courts would rule for environmentalist claims not because it was the right thing to do but because the law required it.

That barely a handful of courts have even acknowledged Sax’s invitation to liberate the public trust doctrine underscores that most judges, most of the time, do their best to interpret and apply the law as those affected by the law would reasonably expect them to. Most judges understand that people rely on those expectations in their interactions with others and in the risks they assume and to which they expose others. If it were otherwise, people would soon lose confidence in the courts as objective arbiters of disputes.

This does not mean that the law is stuck in the past. The common law has always evolved. But it has evolved in a way that respects rather than undermines expectations. One of the great strengths of the common law method is in “serving the rule of law by adapting legal rules to the demonstrated needs and wishes of those who rely on law to bring at least a degree of certainty to their day-to-day lives.”226

Perhaps the best indication of widespread commitment to the rule of law is that judges seduced into lawmaking of the kind urged by public trust liberationists, like the liberationists themselves, invariably appeal to precedent in seeking to justify their rulings. This does not mean that the lawmaking judges shy away from explaining the policy benefits of their decisions, but one would be hard pressed to find a case in which a court acknowledges that its new rule has no basis in preexisting law. Rather, lawmaking judges follow the path advocated by Judge Richard Posner in his commentary on the Supreme Court’s decision in Bush v. Gore.227 Posner explains that what he calls pragmatic judges should cover their lawmaking tracks by providing “legal-type judgment” as justification.228

Anyone who believes in the rule of law as a necessary principle of government in every free society should be troubled by this ends-driven, whatever-it-takes approach to judging in particular, and government in general. Even accepting, for the sake of argument, that we face a global environmental crisis as Professor Wood and many others assert,229 experience demonstrates that compromising the rule of law will harm rather than help efforts to meet any serious challenge. Saving a failing planet will require innovative thinking and creativity of the highest sort. History demonstrates that individual liberty and the rule of law are essential to such innovation and problem solving. Absent the rule of law, many a nation has failed to solve much lesser challenges.230

#### Rule of law solves war

Feldman ‘8 [Noah; September 28; Professor of Law at Harvard University School of Law; New York Times, “When Judges Make Foreign Policy,” lexis]

Why We Need More Law, More Than Ever

So what do we need the Constitution to do for us now? The answer, I think, is that the Constitution must be read to help us remember that while the war on terror continues, we are also still in the midst of a period of rapid globalization. An enduring lesson of the Bush years is the extreme difficulty and cost of doing things by ourselves. We need to build and rebuild alliances — and law has historically been one of our best tools for doing so. In our present precarious situation, it would be a terrible mistake to abandon our historic position of leadership in the global spread of the rule of law.

Our leadership matters for reasons both universal and national. Seen from the perspective of the world, the fragmentation of power after the cold war creates new dangers of disorder that need to be mitigated by the sense of regularity and predictability that only the rule of law can provide. Terrorists need to be deterred. Failed states need to be brought under the umbrella of international organizations so they can govern themselves. And economic interdependence demands coordination, so that the collapse of one does not become the collapse of all.

From a national perspective, our interest is less in the inherent value of advancing individual rights than in claiming that our allies are obligated to help us by virtue of legal commitments they have made. The Bush administration’s lawyers often insisted that law was a tool of the weak, and that therefore as a strong nation we had no need to engage it. But this notion of “lawfare” as a threat to the United States is based on a misunderstanding of the very essence of how law operates.

Law comes into being and is sustained not because the weak demand it but because it is a tool of the powerful — as it has been for the United States since World War II at least. The reason those with power prefer law to brute force is that it regularizes and legitimates the exercise of authority. It is easier and cheaper to get the compliance of weaker people or states by promising them rules and a fair hearing than by threatening them constantly with force. After all, if those wielding power really objected to the rule of law, they could abolish it, the way dictators and juntas have often done the world over.

Law comes into being and is sustained not because the weak demand it but because it is a tool of the powerful — as it has been for the United States since World War II at least. The reason those with power prefer law to brute force is that it regularizes and legitimates the exercise of authority. It is easier and cheaper to get the compliance of weaker people or states by promising them rules and a fair hearing than by threatening them constantly with force. After all, if those wielding power really objected to the rule of law, they could abolish it, the way dictators and juntas have often done the world over.

#### SOP decline causes global nuke war

Dr. G. John Ikenberry 15, PhD in Political Science from the University of Chicago, Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University in the Department of Politics and the Princeton School of Public and International Affairs, “Getting Hegemony Right”, in Korean Attitudes Toward the United States: Changing Dynamics, Ed. Steinberg, p. 17-18

A critical ingredient in stabilizing international relations in a world of radical power disparities is the character of America itself. The United States is indeed a global hegemon, but because of its democratic institutions and political traditions it is--or can be--a relatively benign one. Joseph Nye's arguments on "soft power" of course come to mind here, and there is much to his point. But, in fact, there are other, more significant aspects of the American way in foreign policy that protect the United States from the consequences of its own greatness.

When other major states consider whether to work with the United States or resist it, the fact that it is an open, stable democracy matters. The outside world can see American policymaking at work and can even find opportunities to enter the process and help shape how the overall order operates. Paris, London, Berlin, Moscow, Tokyo and even Beijing--in each of these capitals officials can readily find reasons to conclude that an engagement policy toward the United States will be more effective than balancing against U.S. power.

America in large part stumbled into this open, institutionalized order in the 1940s, as it sought to rebuild the postwar world and to counter Soviet communism. In the late 1940s, in a pre-echo of today's situation, the United States was the world's dominant state--constituting 45 percent of world GNP, leading in military power, technology, finance and industry, and brimming with natural resources. But America nonetheless found itself building world order around stable and binding partnerships. Its calling card was its offer of Cold War security protection. But the intensity of political and economic cooperation between the United States and its partners went well beyond what was necessary to counter the Soviet threat. As the historian Geir Lundestad has observed, the expanding American political order in the half century after World War II was in important respects an "empire by invitation." The remarkable global reach of American postwar hegemony has been at least in part driven by the efforts of European and Asian governments to harness U.S. power, render that power more predictable, and use it to overcome their own regional insecurities. The result has been a vast system of America-centered economic and security partnerships.

Even though the United States looks like a wayward power to many around the world today, it nonetheless has an unusual ability to co-opt and reassure. Three elements matter most in making U.S. power more stable, engaged and restrained. First, America's mature political institutions organized around the rule of law have made it a relatively predictable and cooperative hegemon. The pluralistic and regularized way in which U.S. foreign and security policy is made reduces surprises and allows other states to build long-term, mutually beneficial relations. The governmental separation of powers creates a shared decision-making system that opens up the process and reduces the ability of any one leader to make abrupt or aggressive moves toward other states. An active press and competitive party system also provide a service to outside states by generating information about U.S. policy and determining its seriousness of purpose. The messiness of a democracy can, indeed, frustrate American diplomats and confuse foreign observers. But over the long term, democratic institutions produce more consistent and credible policies--policies that do not reflect the capricious and idiosyncratic whims of an autocrat.

## Case

### Underview

#### 1] 2nr has to split between substance and over-cover theory b/c of the 7/6, 2 speech aff advantage and they get 2ar collapse and persuasiveness advantage and no 3nr to check

#### 2] Responses to the counter-interp will inevitably be new- implications-

#### A] Evaluate the theory debate after the 2nr- means you have to draw a strict line between 1ar and 2ar args- if they didn’t do the weighing, it’s their fault since it should’ve been in the 1ar

#### B] If intervention happens on theory, intervene to reduce theory and just vote on substance

### Advantage

#### Accidental war or miscalc is impossible

--self-deterrence – basic assumption of survival interest doesn’t require assumption of broader rationality

--opportunity for revising judgments – can “undo” escalation

--physical safeguards – Permissive Action Locks

--organizational checks – layers of communication and control double-checks

--overwhelming empirics – hundreds of near-accidents demonstrate safety, not risk

Michael **Quinlan 9**. Distinguished Former British Defence Strategist and Former Permanent Under-Secretary of State. 2009. “Thinking About Nuclear Weapons.” p. 63-69

Even if initial nuclear use did not quickly end the fighting, the supposition of inexorable momentum in a developing exchange, with each side rushing to overreaction amid confusion and uncertainty, is implausible. It fails to consider what the situation of the decisionmakers would really be. Neither side could want escalation. Both would be appalled at what was going on. Both would be desperately looking for signs that the other was ready to call a halt. Both, given the capacity for evasion or concealment which modern delivery platforms and vehicles can possess, could have in reserve significant forces invulnerable enough not to entail use-or-lose pressures. (It may be more open to question, as noted earlier, whether newer nuclear-weapon possessors can be immediately in that position; but it is within reach of any substantial state with advanced technological capabilities, and attaining it is certain to be a high priority in the development of forces.) As a result, neither side can have any predisposition to suppose, in an ambiguous situation of fearful risk, that the right course when in doubt is to go on copiously launching weapons. And none of this analysis rests on any presumption of highly subtle or pre-concerted rationality. The rationality required is plain. The argument is reinforced if we consider the possible reasoning of an aggressor at a more dispassionate level. Any substantial nuclear armoury can inflict destruction outweighing any possible prize that aggression could hope to seize. A state attacking the possessor of such an armoury must therefore be doing so (once given that it cannot count upon destroying the armoury pre-emptively) on a judgement that the possessor would be found lacking in the will to use it. If the attacked possessor used nuclear weapons, whether first or in response to the aggressor's own first use, this judgement would begin to look dangerously precarious. There must be at least a substantial possibility of the aggressor leaders' concluding that their initial judgement had been mistaken—that the risks were after all greater than whatever prize they had been seeking, and that for their own country's survival they must call off the aggression. Deterrence planning such as that of NATO was directed in the first place to preventing the initial misjudgement and in the second, if it were nevertheless made, to compelling such a reappraisal. The former aim had to have primacy, because it could not be taken for granted that the latter was certain to work. But there was no ground for assuming in advance, for all possible scenarios, that the chance of its working must be negligible. An aggressor state would itself be at huge risk if nuclear war developed, as its leaders would know. It may be argued that a policy which abandons hope of physically defeating the enemy and simply hopes to get him to desist is pure gamble, a matter of who blinks first; and that the political and moral nature of most likely aggressors, almost ex hypothesis, makes them the less likely to blink. One response to this is to ask what is the alternative—it can only be surrender. But a more positive and hopeful answer lies in the fact that the criticism is posed in a political vacuum. Real-life conflict would have a political context. The context which concerned NATO during the cold war, for example, was one of defending vital interests against a postulated aggressor whose own vital interests would not be engaged, or would be less engaged. Certainty is not possible, but a clear asymmetry of vital interest is a legitimate basis for expecting an asymmetry, credible to both sides, of resolve in conflict. That places upon statesmen, as page 23 has noted, the key task in deterrence of building up in advance a clear and shared grasp of where limits lie. That was plainly achieved in cold-war Europe. 11 vital interests have been defined in a way that is clear, and also clearly not overlapping or incompatible with those of the adversary, a credible basis has been laid for the likelihood of greater resolve in resistance. It was also sometimes suggested by critics that whatever might be indicated by theoretical discussion of political will and interests, the military environment of nuclear warfare—particularly difficulties of communication and control—would drive escalation with overwhelming probability to the limit. But it is obscure why matters should be regarded as inevitably so for every possible level and setting of action. Even if the history of war suggested (as it scarcely does) that military decision-makers are mostly apt to work on the principle 'When in doubt, lash out', the nuclear revolution creates an utterly new situation. The pervasive reality, always plain to both sides during the cold war, is 'If this goes on to the end, we are all ruined'. Given that inexorable escalation would mean catastrophe for both, it would be perverse to suppose them permanently incapable of framing arrangements which avoid it. As page 16 has noted, NATO gave its military commanders no widespread delegated authority, in peace or war, to launch nuclear weapons without specific political direction. Many types of weapon moreover had physical safeguards such as PALs incorporated to reinforce organizational ones. There were multiple communication and control systems for passing information, orders, and prohibitions. Such systems could not be totally guaranteed against disruption if at a fairly intense level of strategic exchange—which was only one of many possible levels of conflict— an adversary judged it to be in his interest to weaken political control. It was far from clear why he necessarily should so judge. Even then, however, it remained possible to operate on a general fail-safe presumption: no authorization, no use. That was the basis on which NATO operated. If it is feared that the arrangements which a nuclear-weapon possessor has in place do not meet such standards in some respects, the logical course is to continue to improve them rather than to assume escalation to be certain and uncontrollable, with all the enormous inferences that would have to flow from such an assumption. The likelihood of escalation can never be 100 per cent, and never zero. Where between those two extremes it may lie can never be precisely calculable in advance; and even were it so calculable, it would not be uniquely fixed—it would stand to vary hugely with circumstances. That there should be any risk at all of escalation to widespread nuclear war must be deeply disturbing, and decision-makers would always have to weigh it most anxiously. But a pair of key truths about it need to be recognized. The first is that the risk of escalation to large-scale nuclear war is inescapably present in any significant armed conflict between nuclear-capable powers, whoever may have started the conflict and whoever may first have used any particular category of weapon. The initiator of the conflict will always have physically available to him options for applying more force if he meets effective resistance. If the risk of escalation, whatever its degree of probability, is to be regarded as absolutely unacceptable, the necessary inference is that a state attacked by a substantial nuclear power must forgo military resistance. It must surrender, even if it has a nuclear armoury of its own. But the companion truth is that, as page 47 has noted, the risk of escalation is an inescapable burden also upon the aggressor. The exploitation of that burden is the crucial route, if conflict does break out, for managing it to a tolerable outcome—the only route, indeed, intermediate between surrender and holocaust, and so the necessary basis for deterrence beforehand. The working out of plans to exploit escalation risk most effectively in deterring potential aggression entails further and complex issues. It is for example plainly desirable, wherever geography, politics, and available resources so permit without triggering arms races, to make provisions and dispositions that are likely to place the onus of making the bigger and more evidently dangerous steps in escalation upon the aggressor who wishes to maintain his attack, rather than upon the defender. (The customary shorthand for this desirable posture used to be 'escalation dominance'.) These issues are not further discussed here. But addressing them needs to start from acknowledgement that there are in any event no certainties or absolutes available, no options guaranteed to be risk-free and cost-free. Deterrence is not possible without escalation risk; and its presence can point to no automatic policy conclusion save for those who espouse outright pacifism and accept its consequences. Accident and Miscalculation Ensuring the safety and security of nuclear weapons plainly needs to be taken most seriously. Detailed information is understandably not published, but such direct evidence as there is suggests that it always has been so taken in every possessor state, with the inevitable occasional failures to follow strict procedures dealt with rigorously. Critics have nevertheless from time to time argued that the possibility of accident involving nuclear weapons is so substantial that it must weigh heavily in the entire evaluation of whether war-prevention structures entailing their existence should be tolerated at all. Two sorts of scenario are usually in question. The first is that of a single grave event involving an unintended nuclear explosion—a technical disaster at a storage site, for example, or the accidental or unauthorized launch of a delivery system with a live nuclear warhead. The second is that of some event—perhaps such an explosion or launch, or some other mishap such as malfunction or misinterpretation of radar signals or computer systems—initiating a sequence of response and counter-response that culminated in a nuclear exchange which no one had truly intended. No event that is physically possible can be said to be of absolutely zero probability (just as at an opposite extreme it is absurd to claim, as has been heard from distinguished figures, that nuclear-weapon use can be guaranteed to happen within some finite future span despite not having happened for over sixty years). But human affairs cannot be managed to the standard of either zero or total probability. We have to assess levels between those theoretical limits and weigh their reality and implications against other factors, in security planning as in everyday life. There have certainly been, across the decades since 1945, many known accidents involving nuclear weapons, from transporters skidding off roads to bomber aircraft crashing with or accidentally dropping the weapons they carried (in past days when such carriage was a frequent feature of readiness arrangements—it no longer is). A few of these accidents may have released into the nearby environment highly toxic material. None however has entailed a nuclear detonation. Some commentators suggest that this reflects bizarrely good fortune amid such massive activity and deployment over so many years. A more rational deduction from the facts of this long experience would however be that the probability of any accident triggering a nuclear explosion is extremely low. It might be further noted that the mechanisms needed to set off such an explosion are technically demanding, and that in a large number of ways the past sixty years have seen extensive improvements in safety arrangements for both the design and the handling of weapons. It is undoubtedly possible to see respects in which, after the cold war, some of the factors bearing upon risk may be new or more adverse; but some are now plainly less so. The years which the world has come through entirely without accidental or unauthorized detonation have included early decades in which knowledge was sketchier, precautions were less developed, and weapon designs were less ultra-safe than they later became, as well as substantial periods in which weapon numbers were larger, deployments more widespread and diverse, movements more frequent, and several aspects of doctrine and readiness arrangements more tense. Similar considerations apply to the hypothesis of nuclear war being mistakenly triggered by false alarm. Critics again point to the fact, as it is understood, of numerous occasions when initial steps in alert sequences for US nuclear forces were embarked upon, or at least called for, by indicators mistaken or misconstrued. In none of these instances, it is accepted, did matters get at all near to nuclear launch—extraordinary good fortune again, critics have suggested. But the rival and more logical inference from hundreds of events stretching over sixty years of experience presents itself once more: that the probability of initial misinterpretation leading far towards mistaken launch is remote. Precisely because any nuclear-weapon possessor recognizes the vast gravity of any launch, release sequences have many steps, and human decision is repeatedly interposed as well as capping the sequences. To convey that because a first step was prompted the world somehow came close to accidental nuclear war is wild hyperbole, rather like asserting, when a tennis champion has lost his opening service game, that he was nearly beaten in straight sets. History anyway scarcely offers any ready example of major war started by accident even before the nuclear revolution imposed an order-of-magnitude increase in caution. It was occasionally conjectured that nuclear war might be triggered by the real but accidental or unauthorized launch of a strategic nuclear-weapon delivery system in the direction of a potential adversary. No such launch is known to have occurred in over sixty years. The probability of it is therefore very low. But even if it did happen, the further hypothesis of its initiating a general nuclear exchange is far-fetched. It fails to consider the real situation of decision-makers, as pages 63-4 have brought out. The notion that cosmic holocaust might be mistakenly precipitated in this way belongs to science fiction.

#### Space systems are distributed and resilient---the U.S. knows that and won’t jump straight to the nuclear rung of the escalation ladders

Zack Cooper 18, Senior Fellow for Asian Security at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, and Thomas G. Roberts, Research Assistant and Program Coordinator for the Aerospace Security Project at CSIS, “DETERRENCE IN THE LAST SANCTUARY”, War on the Rocks, 1/2/2018, https://warontherocks.com/2018/01/deterrence-last-sanctuary/

Until recently, resilience in space was largely an afterthought. It was assumed that a conflict in space would likely lead to or precede a major nuclear exchange. Therefore, the focus was on cost-effective architectures that maximized satellite capabilities, often at the cost of resilience. Recently, however, some have hoped that new architectures could enhance resilience and prevent critical military operations from being significantly impeded in an attack. Although resilience can be expensive, American investments in smaller satellites and more distributed space architectures could minimize adversary incentives to carry out first strikes in space.

In the late 20th century, minor escalations against space systems were treated as major events, since they typically threatened the superpowers’ nuclear architectures. Today, the proliferation of counter-space capabilities and the wide array of possible types of attacks means that most attacks against U.S. space systems are unlikely to warrant a nuclear response. It is critical that policymakers understand the likely break points in any conflict involving space systems. Strategists should explore whether the characteristics of different types of attacks against space systems create different thresholds, paying particular attention to attribution, reversibility, the defender’s awareness of an attack, the attacker’s ability to assess an attack’s effectiveness, and the risks of collateral damage (e.g., orbital debris). Competitors may attempt to use non-kinetic weapons and reversible actions to stay below the threshold that would trigger a strong U.S. response. The 2017 National Security Strategy warns:

Any harmful interference with or an attack upon critical components of our space architecture that directly affects this vital U.S. interest will be met with a deliberate response at a time, place, manner, and domain of our choosing.

In order to fulfill this promise, the United States will want to ensure that it has capabilities to respond both above and below various thresholds to ensure a full-spectrum of deterrence options for the full range of potential actors.

#### No miscalc or escalation

James Pavur 19, Professor of Computer Science Department of Computer Science at Oxford University and Ivan Martinovic, DPhil Researcher Cybersecurity Centre for Doctoral Training at Oxford University, “The Cyber-ASAT: On the Impact of Cyber Weapons in Outer Space”, 2019 11th International Conference on Cyber Conflict: Silent Battle T. Minárik, S. Alatalu, S. Biondi, M. Signoretti, I. Tolga, G. Visky (Eds.), <https://ccdcoe.org/uploads/2019/06/Art_12_The-Cyber-ASAT.pdf>

A. Limited Accessibility Space is difficult. Over 60 years have passed since the first Sputnik launch and only nine countries (ten including the EU) have orbital launch capabilities. Moreover, a launch programme alone does not guarantee the resources and precision required to operate a meaningful ASAT capability. Given this, one possible reason why space wars have not broken out is simply because only the US has ever had the ability to fight one [21, p. 402], [22, pp. 419–420]. Although launch technology may become cheaper and easier, it is unclear to what extent these advances will be distributed among presently non-spacefaring nations. Limited access to orbit necessarily reduces the scenarios which could plausibly escalate to ASAT usage. Only major conflicts between the handful of states with ‘space club’ membership could be considered possible flashpoints. Even then, the fragility of an attacker’s own space assets creates de-escalatory pressures due to the deterrent effect of retaliation. Since the earliest days of the space race, dominant powers have recognized this dynamic and demonstrated an inclination towards de-escalatory space strategies [23]. B. Attributable Norms There also exists a long-standing normative framework favouring the peaceful use of space. The effectiveness of this regime, centred around the Outer Space Treaty (OST), is highly contentious and many have pointed out its serious legal and political shortcomings [24]–[26]. Nevertheless, this status quo framework has somehow supported over six decades of relative peace in orbit. Over these six decades, norms have become deeply ingrained into the way states describe and perceive space weaponization. This de facto codification was dramatically demonstrated in 2005 when the US found itself on the short end of a 160-1 UN vote after opposing a non-binding resolution on space weaponization. Although states have occasionally pushed the boundaries of these norms, this has typically occurred through incremental legal re-interpretation rather than outright opposition [27]. Even the most notable incidents, such as the 2007-2008 US and Chinese ASAT demonstrations, were couched in rhetoric from both the norm violators and defenders, depicting space as a peaceful global commons [27, p. 56]. Altogether, this suggests that states perceive real costs to breaking this normative tradition and may even moderate their behaviours accordingly. One further factor supporting this norms regime is the high degree of attributability surrounding ASAT weapons. For kinetic ASAT technology, plausible deniability and stealth are essentially impossible. The literally explosive act of launching a rocket cannot evade detection and, if used offensively, retaliation. This imposes high diplomatic costs on ASAT usage and testing, particularly during peacetime. C. Environmental Interdependence A third stabilizing force relates to the orbital debris consequences of ASATs. China’s 2007 ASAT demonstration was the largest debris-generating event in history, as the targeted satellite dissipated into thousands of dangerous debris particles [28, p. 4]. Since debris particles are indiscriminate and unpredictable, they often threaten the attacker’s own space assets [22, p. 420]. This is compounded by Kessler syndrome, a phenomenon whereby orbital debris ‘breeds’ as large pieces of debris collide and disintegrate. As space debris remains in orbit for hundreds of years, the cascade effect of an ASAT attack can constrain the attacker’s long-term use of space [29, pp. 295– 296]. Any state with kinetic ASAT capabilities will likely also operate satellites of its own, and they are necessarily exposed to this collateral damage threat. Space debris thus acts as a strong strategic deterrent to ASAT usage.