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#### Interpretation: the affirmative must only defend that the appropriation of space by private entities is unjust.

#### Violation – China's "private" sector companies aren't private

Olson 20 [Stephen Olson, research fellow at the Hinrich Foundation. "Are Private Chinese Companies Really Private?" The Diplomat, 9-30-2020, accessed 1-14-2022, https://thediplomat.com/2020/09/are-private-chinese-companies-really-private/] HWIC

China has often been criticized for a lack of transparency, especially with regard to its economic and trade policies. While in many cases these criticisms are valid, it belies the fact that in other instances, China is remarkably open and transparent about its intentions and ambitions.

Such is the case with China’s “Opinion on Strengthening the United Front Work of the Private Economy in the New Era,” recently released by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party (and further elaborated on by President Xi Jinping himself). This document tells us in no uncertain terms that Chinese private companies will be increasingly called upon to conduct their operations in tight coordination with governmental policy objectives and ideologies. The rest of the world should take note.

A Different Vision of “Private” Business

The 5,000 word “opinion” aims to ratchet-up the role and influence of the CCP within the private sector in order “to better focus the wisdom and strength of the private businesspeople on the goal and mission to realize the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation.” The objective is to establish a “united front” between business and government and facilitate the “enhancement of the party’s leadership over the private economy.” According to the plan, “private economic figures are to be more closely united around the party,” thereby achieving “a high degree of consistency with the Party Central Committee on political stand, political direction, political principles, and political roads.”

All of this stands in stark contrast to long-accepted concepts of how private companies function in a free market. The overriding purpose of business, according to these traditional precepts, is to earn profits through the provision of value-added products and services, in response to marketplace signals and under the constraint of basic economic realities. Government ideology plays no role in that equation.

But China has a very different vision. Government officials and government ideologies are directly infused into business operations. Private sector employees are “educated” on government policies and ideologies, with the expectation that this “enlightenment” will help inform their business decisions. This government-business symbiosis is further cemented by the provision of massive government subsidies (estimated to be about 3 percent of China’s GDP) to Chinese companies.

#### 1AC Swinhoe 21 proves it’s government led – Lex reads green

Swinhoe 21 – Editor at Datacenter Dynamics. Previously he was at IDG in roles including UK Editor at CSO Online and Senior Staff Writer at IDG Connect. [Dan, “China’s moves into mega satellite constellations could add to space debris problem,” 4/20/2021, <https://www.datacenterdynamics.com/en/analysis/chinas-moves-into-mega-satellite-constelations-could-add-to-space-debris-problem/>]

Of the 3,000-odd operational satellites currently in orbit, a little over 400 belong to China or Chinese companies. The number of commercial companies in the West launching satellites has skyrocketed in recent years, and SpaceX now operates more satellites than any other company or government. But refusing to be left behind, China is planning both state and commercial deployments of constellation satellites in huge numbers in the coming years, which could post an increased risk to in-orbit operations if Chinese companies don’t take due care in how they behave. The new commercial space race A report by the Secure World Foundation says a 2014 document from the Chinese Government known as “Document 60” (Official English Language Title: Guiding Opinions of the State Council on Innovating the Investment and Financing Mechanisms in Key Areas and Encouraging Social Investment) was the start of China’s modern commercial space sector. And in 2020, satellite Internet was included in the scope of China’s New Infrastructure policy initiative. Space is also part of China’s expansive Belt and Road initiative, which all combined have led to an explosion in the country’s commercial space ambitions. China is beginning to “get its act together” around commercial use of space, Jonathan McDowell of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics tells DCD. Whereas in previous years he says China has had many government satellites and some quasi-commercial satellites with strong ties to government, but now there are true commercial Chinese companies in space. “We have the same phenomenon as the US companies in that they're moving fast and they're innovative and doing new things.” But as Chinese companies look to follow the likes of SpaceX and OneWeb in deploying large numbers of satellites, he warns their lack of care in operations could potentially damage space for everyone. China’s commercial space industry blasts off A number of private space companies including LinkSpace, OneSpace, iSpace, LandSpace, and ExPace, have all launched in recent years. As well developing their own rockets, these companies are launching satellites of all shapes and sizes into Low Earth Orbit (LEO) with the aim of forming their own constellations to rival those of Western companies. Bao Weimin, member of the National Committee of the Chinese People’s Political Consultative Conference and director of the Science and Technology Committee of the Aerospace Science and Technology Group, recently announced plans to establish a national satellite network company to be responsible for “coordinating the planning and operation of space satellite Internet network construction.” The China Aerospace Science and Industry Corporation (CASIC), a state-owned enterprise, outlined its plans to preliminarily finish the construction of the Xingyun project, an 80-satellite LEO narrowband Internet of Things constellation, by 2025 in addition to 320 Hongyan communications satellites. China Telecom’s satellite communications reportedly has plans to launch 10,000 satellites in the next five to ten years under the name ‘China StarNet’. Spacety is also launching a constellation of imagery satellites and has launched at least 20 so far. Another company called GW has filed for spectrum allocation from the International Telecommunication Union for two broadband constellations called GW-A59 and GW-2 that would include almost 13,000 satellites. A report from IDA into China’s commercial space industry found others including Zhuhai Orbita, GalaxySpace, MinoSpace, LaserFleet, Head Aerospace and numerous others are also developing constellations from which, like US counterparts, these companies aim to provide satellite broadband, 5G, IoT, and various data services. Though many are in the early stages of development, most plan to launch the first of what could be hundreds or even thousands of satellites within the next few years. While most companies can’t boast the same level of funding as US space companies – VC funding for Chinese space companies was up to $516 million in 2018 compared to the $2.2 billion US companies raised – they are bringing in investment; earlier this year Beijing Commsat received more than $4.5 billion in funding from the China Internet Investment fund, with more than $10 billion in additional funding promised in the future. Xie Tao, founder of Beijing Commsat Technology Development Co., Ltd, told China Money Network he expects the country to launch 30,000 to 40,000 Satellites in the future, compared to 40,000 to 60,000 launched by the US. “Space in the orbit is allocated on a first-come, first-served basis and the onus will be on these latecomers to ensure their satellites will not collide with existing ones,” Commsat’s Xie previously said. “The low-Earth orbit is becoming increasingly crowded and the space land grab is on.” China isn’t up to speed in orbital norms While the UN tightly controls GEO orbits, offering countries licenses for a set number of slots in the closely-packed and highly valuable planes, there is no such limit at lower orbits. The number of satellites that companies can launch at LEO is limited only by what local regulators will permit, despite the machines circling the entire planet in around 90 minutes. And space is becoming increasingly crowded. The number of satellites being launched annually is beginning to reach the thousands, leftovers parts from previous launches and satellites can mount up if not properly disposed of, and debris from previous in-orbit incidents means LEO is full of thousands of pieces of potentially satellite-destroying junk and debris. Around 28,200 pieces of space junk and debris are currently being tracked in orbit but ESA estimates there could be up to hundreds of thousands of potentially harmful pieces in orbit. At its most extreme, Kessler syndrome predicts a scenario where the space around Earth is so full of satellites and debris that it becomes unmanageable and collisions begin to cascade, causing a chain reaction of collisions which render many orbits out of use for generations. China has as much right to operate satellites as Western companies, but the current lack of adherence to ‘space norms’ could increase risks further. McDowell warns the ‘explosion’ of Chinese activity could have a massive impact on the usability of space.“Chinese adherence to things like space debris norms and registration norms is, I would say, about 10 years behind everybody else, if not more” he says. “In UN registration of satellites, they're being very incomplete. They're not registering a lot of their CubeSats and things like that. They're not really being as careful, and they're not as transparent in what's going on.” Chinese commercial satellites are subject the same risks as Western ones in space; extreme temperatures, crowded operating environment, and new companies seeing large numbers of failures as they go through rapid development. But a lack of proper registration can create more risk of collisions, which can have catastrophic effects, especially with larger satellites at higher orbits.

#### Negate – they skirt the core controversy of the topic which is national vs private space activities – kills stasis point and pre-round prep and means we lose access to generics that rely on the motives of private companies differing from national interest proven by the fact that their advantage is functionally China space good/bad – competing interps and DTD on T, it's a question of models and we indict their advocacy
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### OFF

#### Interpretation: “Private entities” is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend that a subset of nations ban the appropriation of outer space.

#### Bare plurals imply a generic “rules reading” in the context of moral statements

Cohen 1 — (Ariel Cohen, Professor of Linguistics @ Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, PhD Computational Linguistics from Carnegie Mellon University, “On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars”. Journal of Semantics 18: 183-209, Oxford University Press, 2001, accessed 12-7-20, HKR-AM) \*\*BP = bare plurals

According to the rules and regulations view, on the other hand, generic sentences do not get their truth or falsity as a consequence of properties of individual instances. Instead, generic sentences are evaluated with regard to rules and regulations, which are basic, irreducible entities in the world. Each generic sentence denotes a rule; if the rule is in effect, in some sense (different theories suggest different characterizations of what it means for a rule to be in effect), the sentence is true, otherwise it is false. The rule may be physical, biological, social, moral, etc. The paradigmatic cases for which this view seems readily applicable are sentences that refer to conventions, i.e. man-made, explicit rules and regulations, such as the following example (Carlson 1995: 225):

(40) Bishops move diagonally.

Carlson describes the two approaches as a dichotomy: one has to choose one or the other, but not both. One way to decide which approach to choose is to consider a case where the behavior of observed instances conflicts with an explicit rule. Indeed, Carlson discusses just such a case. He describes a supermarket where bananas sell for $0.49/lb, so that (41a) is true. One day, the manager decides to raise the price to $1.00/lb. Immediately after the price has changed, claims Carlson, sentence (41a) becomes false and sentence (41b) becomes true, although the overwhelming majority of sold bananas were sold for $0.49/lb.

(41) a. Bananas sell for $0.49/lb.

b. Bananas sell for $1.00/lb.

Consequently, Carlson reaches the conclusion that the rules and regulations approach is the correct one, whereas the inductivist view is wrong.

While I share Carlson’s judgements, I do not accept the conclusion he draws from them. Suppose the price has, indeed, changed, but the supermarket employs incompetent cashiers who consistently use the old price by mistake, so that customers are still charged $0.49/lb. In this case, I think there is a reading of (41a) which is true, and a reading of (41b) which is false. These readings are more salient if the sentence is modified by expressions such as actually or in fact:

(42) a. Bananas actually sell for $0.49/lb.

b. In fact, bananas sell for $1.00/lb.

BP generics, I claim, are ambiguous: on one reading they express a descriptive generalization, stating the way things are. Under the other reading, they carry a normative force, and require that things be a certain way. When they are used in the former sense, they should be analysed by some sort of inductivist account; when they are used in the latter sense, they ought to be analysed as referring to a rule or a regulation. The respective logical forms of the two readings are different; whereas the former reading involves, in some form or another, quantification, the latter has a simple predicate-argument structure: the argument is the rule or regulation, and the predicate holds of it just in case the rule is ‘in effect’.

#### Violation—they specified China private entities

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Precision –any deviation justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 2] Predictable limits—specifying states offers huge explosion in the topic since they get permutations of hundreds of states. Innovation DA, generic mining case turns, US-Russia huge part of the topic mooted

#### Topicality is a voting issue that should be evaluated through competing interpretations – it tells the negative what they do and do not have to prepare for
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### OFF

#### Debate is structured as a marketplace for information where we fetishize notions of “pedagogy” and is an extension of semiocapitalist logic through immaterial manors. Communication within the university isn’t one that develops subjectivities and psychic identity rather a system geared towards fragmentation and futuristic productivity.

**Berardi 12** [David Hugill and Elise Thorburn, 9-26-2012, "Interview with 'Bifo': Reactivating the Social Body in Insurrectionary Times," Critical Legal Thinking, [https://criticallegalthinking.com/2012/09/26/interview-with-bifo-reactivating-the-social-body-in-insurrectionary-times //](https://criticallegalthinking.com/2012/09/26/interview-with-bifo-reactivating-the-social-body-in-insurrectionary-times%20//) JB]

* TW – mentions of suicide
* Impact turns fiat and notions of “the aff is a good idea”
* Debate bad and communication gets coopted

A: First of all because **students are increasingly learning in** small parcels, **small fragments**, small fractals **of knowledge**, and they are becoming **more** and more **accustomed to think** of their **knowledge not as knowledge but** as **intellectual availability to exploitation**.  In North American forms of education this is already well established, it is nothing new. It is new in much of Europe and it has begun to provoke some reactions. But it is also a **fact of a networked and globalized world**.  What does precariousness mean today? What is the relationship between precariousness and globalization? It means that you can **buy a fragment of labor** in Bangkok, a fragment in Buenos Aires, and **a fragment in Milan** and that these three **fragments become** the **same product from** the point of view of **capital**.  **Knowledge is** headed the **same** way. You no longer need – from the point of view of capital – to know in the **humanistic sense**, the meaning, the finality, the **intimate contradictions of knowledge**, you just need to know how **particular parcels of knowledge** can be made **functional**. There is something new and something old in this. Herbert Marcuse’s (1964) One Dimensional Man already identified this problem of the functionalization of knowledge but in his time it was only a kind of prediction about how capitalism would be transformed. Today, this functional consideration is the dominant form of our **relationship to knowledge**. So, we should question people about **what is happening to our knowledge**. Are we really learning things, knowing things? Or are we simply learning how to **become part of** the **productive machine**? Additionally, I think we need to ask people, especially young people, **about** their **suffering in the relationship with knowledge**, with communication and so on. I think that the problem of psychic suffering is of central importance our time. Problems of depression, panic, massive suicide, are **very real**.  Do you know that suicide has become the main cause of death among people between 18-25 years old? **Suicide is** becoming a **political weapon**. I’m not only thinking of Columbine or of Mohamed Bouazizi, the man who killed himself and started the Tunisian revolution.  Suicide has something to do with knowledge.  When your **knowledge** is becoming **more and more something** that does **not belong to you**, this is a problem of personal identity, of **psychic identity**.

#### The new dawn of capitalism has created an age of constant information and signifiers floating through our phones and computers as media. This creates a dyslexia – reduced attention spans, no time for true human interaction – this leads to information overload, which is too fast for our organic minds to keep up with – that causes depression and drug use. It’s no coincidence that the rise of tech in the 80s was complimented with a drug epidemic. These signifiers come prior to action, thus debate should disrupt semiocapitalism.

**Berardi 09** [Franco Berardi, Italian communist theorist and activist in the autonomist tradition, whose work mainly focuses on the role of the media and information technology within post-industrial capitalism Precarious Rhapsody, by Franco Bifo Berardi et al., AK Press, 2009. P. 40-42 // LEX JB]

* TW – mentions of suicide, not read, but it’s in the card if you chose to read it after the round

The acceleration of information exchange has produced and is producing an effect of a pathological type on the individual human mind and even more on the collective mind. Individuals are not in a position to consciously process the immense and always growing mass of information that enters their computers, their cell phones, their television screens, their electronic diaries and their heads. However, it seems indispensable to follow, recognize, evaluate, process all this information if you want to be efficient, competitive, victorious. The practice of multitasking, the opening of a window of hypertextual attention, the passage from one context to another for the complex evaluation of processes, tends to deform the sequential modality of mental processing. According to Christian Marazzi, who has concerned himself in various books with the relations between economics, language and affectivity, the latest generation of economic operators is affected by a real and proper form of dyslexia, incapable of reading a page from the beginning to the end according to sequential procedures, incapable of maintaining concentrated attention on the same object for a long time. And dyslexia spreads to cognitive and social behaviors, leading to rendering the pursuit of linear strategies nearly impossible. Some, like Davenport and Beck , speak of an attention economy. But when a cognitive faculty enters into and becomes part of economic discourse this means that it has become a scarce resource. The necessary time for paying attention to the fluxes of information to which we are exposed and which must be evaluated in order to be able to make decisions is lacking. The consequence is in front of our eyes: political and economic decisions no longer respond to a long term strategic rationality and simply follow immediate interests. On the other hand, we are always less available for giving our attention to others gratuitously. We no longer have the attention time for love, tenderness, nature, pleasure and compassion. Our attention is ever more besieged and therefore we assign it only to our careers, to competition and to economic decisions. And in any case our temporality cannot follow the insane speed of the hypercomplex digital machine. Human beings tend to become the ruthless executors of decisions taken without attention. The universe of transmitters, or cyberspace, now proceeds at a superhuman velocity and becomes untranslatable for the universe of receivers, or cybertime, that cannot go faster than what is allowed by the physical material from which our brain is made, the slowness of our body, the need for caresses and affection. Thus opens a pathological gap and mental illness spreads as testified by the statistics and above all our everyday experience. And just as pathology spreads, so too do drugs. The flourishing industry of psychopharmaceuticals beats records every year, the number of packets of Ritalin, Prozac, Zoloft and other psychotropics sold in the pharmacies continually increases, while dissociation, suffering, desperation, terror, the desire not to exist, to not have to fight continuously, to disappear grows alongside the will to kill and to kill oneself. When, towards the end of the 1970s, an acceleration of the productive and communicative rhythms in occidental metropolitan centers was imposed, a gigantic epidemic of drug addiction made its appearance. The world was leaving its human epoch to enter the era of machinic posthuman acceleration: many sensitive organisms of the human variety began to snort cocaine, a substance that permits the acceleration of the existential rhythm leading to transforming oneself into a machine. Many other sensitive organisms of the human kind injected heroin in their veins, a substance that deactivates the relation with the speed of the surrounding atmosphere. The epidemic of powders during the 1970s and the 1980s produced an existential and cultural devastation with which we still haven’t come to terms with. Then illegal drugs were replaced by those legal substances which the pharmaceutical industry in a white coat made available for its victims and this was the epoch of anti-depressants, of euphorics and of mood regulators. Today psychopathy reveals itself ever more clearly as a social epidemic and, more precisely, a socio-communicational one. If you want to survive you have to be competitive and if you want to be competitive you must be connected, receive and process continuously an immense and growing mass of data. This provokes a constant attentive stress, a reduction of the time available for affectivity. These two tendencies, inseparably linked, provoke an effect of devastation on the individual psyche: depression, panic, anxiety, the sense of solitude and existential misery. But these individual symptoms cannot be indefinitely isolated, as psychopathology has done up until now and as economic power wishes to do.

#### Post digital infosphere, the notion of “private entities” appropriating is overdetermined by capitalist desire – the network economy means that privatization is static and collapses to the semiotic economy.

**Berardi 09** [Franco Berardi, Italian communist theorist and activist in the autonomist tradition, whose work mainly focuses on the role of the media and information technology within post-industrial capitalism Precarious Rhapsody, by Franco Bifo Berardi et al., AK Press, 2009. P. 59-60 // JB]

Capital reacted, following the dictates of liberalist ideology, with the **coercive privatization** of the products of collective knowledge and the submission of **experimentation** to **economic competition**. The **privatization** of collective knowledge has **encountered resistance** and opposition everywhere, and cognitive **laborers** have started to **realize** that their **potential is superior to the** power of the **merchant**. Since **intellectual labor is** at the center of the **productive** scene, **the merchant no longer possesses** the juridical or material **instruments to impose** the principle of **private property**. Given that the most precious **goods in** social **production have** an immaterial and **reproducible character**, we have discovered that the **private appropriation of goods makes no sense**, while the reasons sustaining the **privatization of material goods** in industrial society have weakened. In the sphere of **semiotic-capital** and **cognitive labor**, when a product is consumed, **instead of disappearing** it remains available, while **its value increases** the more its use is shared. **This is** how the **network economy** works, and this **contradicts** the very principle of **private property** on which capitalism was founded until now.

#### Hegemonic models of politics rely on conceptions of semiotic accumulation where images of success and war fuel the fire of military spending and economic control.

Bifo 12 [Franco Berardi, Italian communist theorist and activist in the autonomist tradition, whose work mainly focuses on the role of the media and information technology within post-industrial capitalism, “After the Future”, Published: 2012, DOA: 7/5/19 // JB]

As soon as the economic breakdown began, as if by miracle, three planes flew through the skies of Washington and New York. After the events of September 11, 2001 (S11), miraculously, the capitalism on the verge of bankruptcy could 59 invest the energies of the whole society (that displayed signs of exhaustion) in the direction of war. **The general** **mobilization of these energies began with a call to a Holy War** **of the West** **against the** **evils of the** **world**. Here begins the great Manichean campaign of **Good versus Evil**. The **Good is represented by a group of oil magnates** who have notoriously **robbed public funds that led to the collapse of giant companies**. Since the **war on** the **Afghan** **population** **failed to produce any of the promised results**, i.e. the arrest of the heads of the Al Qaida organisation accused of being responsible for the S11 attacks, **the war must be re-launched**. A new target is chosen: the former ally and accomplice Saddam Hussein is the target. The motivations for a war on Iraq are ridiculous. “Saddam is an enemy of humanity”. Of course, he was one already when he acted on behalf of the American administration and occupied Iran, as are many of the American allies such as Sharon and the Saudi dynasty. “He used illegal weapons”. As he did in 1988 with the financial and political support of the US. “He can make nuclear weapons”. Which is improbable. Anyway, the violations of the nonproliferation treaty are multiple, starting from Israel. “We need to bring democracy to the Middle East”. Nothing could be more hypocritical. Democracy in the Middle East would require the departure of Israeli forces from the occupied territories, the recognition of the political rights of the Kurdish people, and a reduction of the role of the large oil corporations that for fifty years have been robbing the resources of those countries whilst influencing their political life in a direct and authoritarian manner ever since they sponsored a military coup in 1953 against Premier Mohammed Mossadeq for trying to nationalize the Iranian oil industry. **The ideology of** **security is the product of** **a paranoia** **fuelled** **by** **the** **media and geared to** **create** **an economic system of global security that** **can** **always feed on new paranoia**. “We need to protect our quality of life”. **This is the only sentence that corresponds to truth in the whole of the war propaganda**: 20% of humanity does not wish to give up the consumption of 80% of the world resources. What are the possible scenarios of war in Iraq? One is that of a rapid victory for the aggressors, the capture and trial of Baghdad’s criminal, the imposition of a relatively peaceful protectorate, the American democratization of the Middle East, the progressive clearance of conflict zones, the imposition of a planetary military dictatorship for good purposes. But does anyone believe this to be possible? The **more realistic scenario entails the possibility of a fall of the Pakistani regime with** the gain of **two hundred nuclear warheads** for the Islamic fundamentalists. The most probable consequence of aggression against Iraq is the explosion of Empire, the inauguration of the Empire of Chaos. Meanwhile, something came to change the whole scenario: in the framework of a paranoid **clash between fundamentalist and nationalist fanaticism and nazi-capitalist fanaticism**, a third actor has finally emerged, that we have been 60 waiting for since S11, which has been built with the stubborn labor of the global movement against corporations. The third actor came into being on February 15th, 2003 as millions upon millions marched in cities around the globe in protest against the war in Iraq. It is the movement of global everyday life that rebels against war mongering dementia. What we saw on F15 is a movement that is destined to expand and radicalize. **But at that stage it will be a matter of working towards pushing the process of exiting the war to coincide with that of dissolving of the neoliberal domination of global capitalism, in order to repose the dynamic of anti-capitalist conflict in society. Capitalism brings war as clouds bring storms, but in the course of the war the conditions for a re-dislocation of capitalism are created. The question of subverting the forces that produced the war will emerge. Then it will not be sufficient to eliminate the criminal class that produced the war. It will be necessary to clarify that war is only the continuation of liberalist devastation by other means, hence, it will be necessary to cut the roots of the process that led to catastrophe.**

#### Thus, the vote affirmative to symbolically take the system hostage through it’s own method of exhaustion. It’s a reimagination of the status quo through the lens of a radically passive Wu Wei society. T-Framework is just uniqueness and a move towards passivity – the only way to escape the infosphere which proves contradictions affirm because it confuses productivity in debate.

**Berardi 11** [Franco Berardi, Italian communist theorist and activist in the autonomist tradition, whose work mainly focuses on the role of the media and information technology within post-industrial capitalism “Chapter 4 Exhastion and Subjectivity.” After the Future, by Franco Bifo Berardi et al., AK Press, 2011. P. 107-108 // LEX JB]

* TW – mentions of suicide, not read, but it’s in the card if you chose to read it after the round

The process of collective subjectivation (i.e. social recomposition) implies the development of a common language-affection which is essentially happening in the temporal dimension. The semiocapitalist acceleration of time has destroyed the social possibility of sensitive elaboration of the semio-flow. The proliferation of simulacra in the info-sphere has saturated the space of attention and imagination. Advertising and stimulated hyper-expression (“just do it”), have submitted the energies of the social psyche to permanent mobilization. Exhaustion follows, and exhaustion is the only way of escape: Nothing, not even the system, can avoid the symbolic obligation, and it is in this trap that the only chance of a catastrophe for capital remains. The system turns on itself, as a scorpion does when encircled by the challenge of death. For it is summoned to answer, if it is not to lose face, to what can only be death. The system must itself commit suicide in response to the multiplied challenge of death and suicide. So hostages are taken. On the symbolic or sacrificial plane, from which every moral consideration of the innocence of the victims is ruled out the hostage is the substitute, the alter-ego of the terrorist, the hostage’s death for the terrorist. Hostage and terrorist may thereafter become confused in the same sacrificial act. (Baudrillard 1993a: 37) In these impressive pages Baudrillard outlines the end of the modern dialectics of revolution against power, of the labor movement against capitalist domination, and predicts the advent of a new form of action which will be marked by the sacrificial gift of death (and self-annihilation). After the destruction of the World Trade Center in the most important terrorist act ever, Baudrillard wrote a short text titled The Spirit of Terrorism where he goes back to his own predictions and recognizes the emergence of a catastrophic age. When the code becomes the enemy the only strategy can be catastrophic: all the counterphobic ravings about exorcizing evil: it is because it is there, everywhere, like an obscure object of desire. Without this deep-seated complicity, the event would not have had the resonance it has, and in their symbolic strategy the terrorists doubtless know that they can count on this unavowable complicity. (Baudrillard 2003: 6) This goes much further than hatred for the dominant global power by the disinherited and the exploited, those who fell on the wrong side of global order. This malignant desire is in the very heart of those who share this order’s benefits. An allergy to all definitive order, to all definitive power is happily universal, and the two towers of the World Trade Center embodied perfectly, in their very double-ness (literally twin-ness), this definitive order: No need, then, for a death drive or a destructive instinct, or even for perverse, unintended effects. Very logically – inexorably – the increase in the power heightens the will to destroy it. And it was party to its own destruction. When the two towers collapsed, you had the impression that they were responding to the suicide of the suicide-planes with their own suicides. It has been said that “Even God cannot declare war on Himself.” Well, He can. The West, in position of God (divine omnipotence and absolute moral legitimacy), has become suicidal, and declared war on itself. (Baudrillard 2003: 6-7) In Baudrillard’s catastrophic vision I see a new way of thinking subjectivity: a reversal of the energetic subjectivation that animates the revolutionary theories of the 20th century, and the opening of an implosive theory of subversion, based on depression and exhaustion. In the activist view exhaustion is seen as the inability of the social body to escape the vicious destiny that capitalism has prepared: deactivation of the social energies that once upon a time animated democracy and political struggle. But exhaustion could also become the beginning of a slow movement towards a “wu wei” civilization, based on the withdrawal, and frugal expectations of life and consumption. Radicalism could abandon the mode of activism, and adopt the mode of passivity. A radical passivity would definitely threaten the ethos of relentless productivity that neoliberal politics has imposed. The mother of all the bubbles, the work bubble, would finally deflate. We have been working too much during the last three or four centuries, and outrageously too much during the last thirty years. The current depression could be the beginning of a massive abandonment of competition, consumerist drive, and of dependence on work. Actually, if we think of the geopolitical struggle of the first decade – the struggle between Western domination and jihadist Islam – we recognize that the most powerful weapon has been suicide. 9/11 is the most impressive act of this suicidal war, but thousands of people have killed themselves in order to destroy American military hegemony. And they won, forcing the western world into the bunker of paranoid security, and defeating the hyper-technological armies of the West both in Iraq, and in Afghanistan. The suicidal implosion has not been confined to the Islamists. Suicide has became a form of political action everywhere. Against neoliberal politics, Indian farmers have killed themselves. Against exploitation hundreds of workers and employees have killed themselves in the French factories of Peugeot, and in the offices of France Telecom. In Italy, when the 2009 recession destroyed one million jobs, many workers, haunted by the fear of unemployment, climbed on the roofs of the factories, threatening to kill themselves. Is it possible to divert this implosive trend from the direction of death, murder, and suicide, towards a new kind of autonomy, social creativity and of life? I think that it is possible only if we start from exhaustion, if we emphasize the creative side of withdrawal. The exchange between life and money could be deserted, and exhaustion could give way to a huge wave of withdrawal from the sphere of economic exchange. A new refrain could emerge in that moment, and wipe out the law of economic growth. The self-organization of the general intellect could abandon the law of accumulation and growth, and start a new concatenation, where collective intelligence is only subjected to the common good. The global recession started officially in September 2008 and lasted officially until the summer of 2009. Since the summer of 2009 the official truth in the media, in political statements, in economic talk was: recovery. The stock exchange began to rise again and the banks started again paying huge bonuses to their managers and so on. Meanwhile, unemployment was exploding everywhere, salaries were falling, welfare was curtailed, 90 million more are expected to join the army of poverty in the next year. Is this recovery? Our conditional reflex (influenced by the Keynesian knowledge that recovery is the recovery of the “real economy”) answered: no, this is not recovery, capitalism cannot recover only by financial means. But we should reframe our vision. Finance is no longer a mere tool of capitalist growth. The financialization of capitalism has made finance the very ground of accumulation, as Christian Marazzi (2010) has explained in recent works such as The Violence of Financial Capitalism. In the sphere of semiocapitalism, financial signs are not only signifiers pointing to some referents. The distinction between sign and referent is over. The sign is the thing, the product, the process. The “real” economy and financial expectations are no longer distinct spheres. In the past, when riches were created in the sphere of industrial production, when finance was only a tool for the mobilization of capital to invest in the field of material production, recovery could not be limited to the financial sphere. It took also employment and demand. Industrial capitalism could not grow if society did not grow. Nowadays we must accept the idea that financial capitalism can recover and thrive without social recovery. Social life has become residual, redundant, irrelevant.

### Framing

#### The K OW and turns the aff –

#### (1) Form v Content – the K indicts the rhetoric or the pedagogical way that the aff is exported to fit in the debate space and is also the best model for clash because you clash with our theory of power instead of plan focus which we’ve indicted. It’s not unfair to expect you to defend your epistemological consequences anything else is academically irresponsible.

#### (2) Epistemology – neoliberalism imposes that our knowledge is formed through an endless cycle of production which means the 1AC “skills” are irrelevant and the exportation of their pedagogy is flawed

#### (3) Neoliberalism controls the value to life through affectivity which presupposes evaluation of body counts. Extinction has already happened and the criticism controls that value.

#### (4) Fiat is illusory none of their policymaking offense is solved but our representations can be rectified with a rejection which outweighs on ballot proximity

greene 15 - 1] we ar emore specific bc we talk about yoru role as an educator and you don't deploy pleasure in the right way which we critiqu

pummer 1] it's just the capitalist drive to retain the squo and reject radical ideals

2] value to life don't exist which was done above

3] if we win the debate we are certain - fiat doesnt solve uncertainty either

modesty 1] same answers above apply - framework isnt sliding scale if we prove that your violence outweighs

### Adv 1

#### No collisions – it’s overhyped

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

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

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

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

In any crisis that threatens to escalate into major power conflict, political and military leaders will face uncertainty about the effectiveness of their plans and decisions. This uncertainty will be compounded when potential conflict extends to the space and cyber domains, where weapon effectiveness is largely untested and uncertain, infrastructure interdependencies are unclear, and damaging an adversary could also harm oneself or one’s allies. Unless the stakes become very high, no country will likely want to gamble its well-being in a “single cosmic throw of the dice,” in Harold Brown’s memorable phrase. 96 The novelty of space and cyber warfare, coupled with risk aversion and worst-case assessments, could lead space adversaries into a situation of what can be called “hysteresis,” where each adversary is restrained by its own uncertainty of success. This is conceptually shown in Figures 1 and 2 for offensive counter-space capabilities, though it applies more generally. 97 These graphs portray the hypothetical differences between perceived and actual performance capabilities of offensive counter-space weapons, on a scale from zero to one hundred percent effectiveness. Where uncertainty and risk aversion are absent for two adversaries, no difference would exist between the likely performance of their offensive counter-space assets and their confidence in the performance of those weapons: a simple, straight-line correlation would exist, as in Figure 1. The more interesting, and more realistic, case is notionally presented in Figure 2, which assumes for simplicity that the offensive capabilities of each adversary are comparable. In stark contrast to the case of Figure 1, uncertainty and risk aversion are present and become important factors. Given the high stakes involved in a possible large-scale attack against adversary space assets, a cautious adversary is more likely to be conservative in estimating the effectiveness of its offensive capabilities, while more generously assessing the capabilities of its adversary.

#### No Escalation over Satellites:

#### 1] Planning Priorities

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

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

### Adv 2

#### A. Empirics go neg – most qualified studies disprove hegemonic stability theories.

Fettweis 17 –Christopher J. Fettweis is an American political scientist and the Associate Professor of Political Science at Tulane University. “Unipolarity, Hegemony, and the New Peace, Security Studies” 26:3, 423-451; EG)

Even the most ardent supporters of the hegemonic-stability explanation do not contend that US influence extends equally to all corners of the globe. The United States has concentrated its policing in what George Kennan used to call “strong points,” or the most important parts of the world: Western Europe, the Pacific Rim, and Persian Gulf.64 By doing so, Washington may well have contributed more to great power peace than the overall global decline in warfare. If the former phenomenon contributed to the latter, by essentially providing a behavioral model for weaker states to emulate, then perhaps this lends some support to the hegemonic-stability case.65 During the Cold War, the United States played referee to a few intra-West squabbles, especially between Greece and Turkey, and provided Hobbesian reassurance to Germany’s nervous neighbors. Other, equally plausible explanations exist for stability in the first world, including the presence of a common enemy, democracy, economic interdependence, general war aversion, etc. The looming presence of the leviathan is certainly among these plausible explanations, but only inside the US sphere of influence. Bipolarity was bad for the nonaligned world, where Soviet and Western intervention routinely exacerbated local conflicts. Unipolarity has generally been much better, **but whether or not this was due to US action is again unclear.** Overall US interest in the affairs of the Global South has dropped markedly since the end of the Cold War, as has the level of violence in almost all regions. There is less US intervention in the political and military affairs of Latin America compared to any time in the twentieth century, for instance, and also less conflict. Warfare in Africa is at an all-time low, as is relative US interest outside of counterterrorism and security assistance.66 **Regional peace and stability exist where there is US active intervention, as well as where there is not**. No direct relationship seems to exist across regions. If intervention can be considered a function of direct and indirect activity, of both political and military action, a regional picture might look like what is outlined in Table 1. These assessments of conflict are by necessity relative, because there has not been a “high” level of conflict in any region outside the Middle East during the period of the New Peace. Putting aside for the moment that important caveat, some points become clear. The great powers of the world are clustered in the upper right quadrant, where US intervention has been high, but conflict levels low. **US intervention is imperfectly correlated with stability, however. Indeed, it is conceivable that the relatively high level of US interest and activity has made the security situation in the Persian Gulf and broader Middle East worse.** In recent years, substantial hard power investments (Somalia, Afghanistan, Iraq), moderate intervention (Libya), and reliance on diplomacy (Syria) have been equally ineffective in stabilizing states torn by conflict. While it is possible that the region is essentially unpacifiable and no amount of police work would bring peace to its people, it remains hard to make the case that the US presence has improved matters. **In this “strong point,” at least, US hegemony has failed to bring peace.** In much of the rest of the world, the United States has not been especially eager to enforce any particular rules. Even rather incontrovertible evidence of genocide has not been enough to inspire action. Washington’s intervention choices have at best been erratic; Libya and Kosovo brought about action, but much more blood flowed uninterrupted in Rwanda, Darfur, Congo, Sri Lanka, and Syria. The US record of peacemaking is not exactly a long uninterrupted string of successes. During the turn-of-the-century conventional war between Ethiopia and Eritrea, a highlevel US delegation containing former and future National Security Advisors (Anthony Lake and Susan Rice) made a half-dozen trips to the region, but was unable to prevent either the outbreak or recurrence of the conflict. Lake and his team shuttled back and forth between the capitals with some frequency, and President Clinton made repeated phone calls to the leaders of the respective countries, offering to hold peace talks in the United States, all to no avail.67 The war ended Table 1. Post-Cold War US intervention and violence by region. High Violence Low Violence High US Intervention Middle East Europe South and Central Asia Pacific Rim North America Low US Intervention Africa South America Former Soviet Union in late 2000 when Ethiopia essentially won, and it controls the disputed territory to this day. The Horn of Africa is hardly the only region where states are free to fight one another today without fear of serious US involvement. Since they are choosing not to do so with increasing frequency, something else is probably affecting their calculations. Stability exists even in those places where the potential for intervention by the sheriff is minimal. Hegemonic stability can only take credit for influencing those decisions that would have ended in war without the presence, whether physical or psychological, of the United States. It seems hard to make the case that the relative peace that has descended on so many regions is primarily due to the kind of heavy hand of the neoconservative leviathan, or its lighter, more liberal cousin. Something else appears to be at work.

#### B. Hegemony is unsustainable and crumbling – polarization, apathy, and deference to the executive is supercharged by the disaster of Trump.

Drezner, PhD, 4-16-19

(Daniel W., PoliSci@Stanford, ProfInternationalPolitics@Tufts, Fellow@Brookings, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2019-04-16/time-different, May/June Issue) BW

Despite the remarkable consistency of U.S. foreign policy, behind the scenes, some elements of American power were starting to decline. As measured by purchasing power parity, the United States stopped being the largest economy in the world a few years ago. Its command of the global commons has weakened as China’s and Russia’s asymmetric capabilities have improved. The accumulation of “forever wars” and low-intensity conflicts has taxed the United States’ armed forces.

Outward consistency also masked the dysfunction that was afflicting the domestic checks on U.S. foreign policy. For starters, public opinion has ceased to act as a real constraint on decision-makers. Paradoxically, the very things that have ensured U.S. national security—geographic isolation and overwhelming power—have also led most Americans to not think about foreign policy, and rationally so. The trend began with the switch to an all-volunteer military, in 1973, which allowed most of the public to stop caring about vital questions of war and peace. The apathy has only grown since the end of the Cold War, and today, poll after poll reveals that Americans rarely, if ever, base their vote on foreign policy considerations.

The marketplace of ideas has broken down, too. The barriers to entry for harebrained foreign policy schemes have fallen away as Americans’ trust in experts has eroded. Today, the United States is in the midst of a debate about whether a wall along its southern border should be made of concrete, have see-through slats, or be solar-powered. The ability of experts to kill bad ideas isn’t what it used to be. The cognoscenti might believe that their informed opinions can steady the hands of successive administrations, but they are operating in hostile territory.

To be fair, the hostility to foreign policy experts is not without cause. The interventions in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Libya were massive screwups. Despite what the experts predicted, globalization has not transformed China into a Jeffersonian democracy. The supposedly infallible advice enshrined in the Washington consensus ended up triggering multiple financial crises. Economists and foreign affairs advisers advocated austerity, despite the pain it caused the poor and the middle class, and consistently cried wolf about an increase in interest rates that has yet to come. No wonder both Barack Obama and Trump have taken such pleasure in bashing the Washington establishment.

Institutional checks on the president’s foreign policy prerogatives have also deteriorated—primarily because the other branches of government have voluntarily surrendered them. The passage of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, which exacerbated the Great Depression, showed that Congress could not responsibly execute its constitutional responsibilities on trade. With the 1934 Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, it delegated many of those powers to the president, marking the beginning of a sustained decline in congressional oversight. More recently, political polarization has rendered Congress a dysfunctional, petulant mess, encouraging successive administrations to enhance the powers of the executive branch. Nor has the judicial branch acted as much of an impediment. The Supreme Court has persistently deferred to the president on matters of national security, as it did in 2018 when it ruled in favor of the Trump administration’s travel ban.

Foreign policy analysts largely celebrated this concentration of power in the executive branch, and prior to Trump, their logic seemed solid. They pointed to the public’s ignorance of and Congress’ lack of interest in international relations. As political gridlock and polarization took hold, elected Democrats and Republicans viewed foreign policy as merely a plaything for the next election. And so most foreign policy elites viewed the president as the last adult in the room.

What they failed to plan for was the election of a president who displays the emotional and intellectual maturity of a toddler. As a candidate, Trump gloried in beating up on foreign policy experts, asserting that he could get better results by relying on his gut. As president, he has governed mostly by tantrum. He has insulted and bullied U.S. allies. He has launched trade wars that have accomplished little beyond hurting the U.S. economy. He has said that he trusts Russian President Vladimir Putin more than his own intelligence briefers. His administration has withdrawn from an array of multilateral agreements and badmouthed the institutions that remain. The repeated attacks on the EU and NATO represent a bigger strategic mistake than the invasion of Iraq. In multiple instances, his handpicked foreign policy advisers have attempted to lock in decisions before the president can sabotage them with an impulsive tweet. Even when his administration has had the germ of a valid idea, Trump has executed the resulting policy shifts in the most ham-handed manner imaginable.

Most of these foreign policy moves have been controversial, counterproductive, and perfectly legal. The same steps that empowered the president to create foreign policy have permitted Trump to destroy what his predecessors spent decades preserving. The other branches of government endowed the White House with the foreign policy equivalent of a Ferrari; the current occupant has acted like a child playing with a toy car, convinced that he is operating in a land of make-believe.

After Trump, a new president will no doubt try to restore sanity to U.S. foreign policy. Surely, he or she will reverse the travel ban, halt the hostile rhetoric toward long-standing allies, and end the attacks on the world trading system. These patches will miss the deeper problem, however. Political polarization has eroded the notion that presidents need to govern from the center. Trump has eviscerated that idea. The odds are decent that a left-wing populist will replace the current president, and then an archconservative will replace that president. The weak constraints on the executive branch will only make things worse. Congress has evinced little interest in playing a constructive role when it comes to foreign policy. The public is still checked out on world politics. The combination of worn-down guardrails and presidents emerging from the ends of the political spectrum may well whipsaw U.S. foreign policy between “America first” and a new Second International. The very concept of a consistent, durable grand strategy will not be sustainable.

In that event, only the credulous will consider U.S. commitments credible. Alliances will fray, and other countries will find it easier to flout global norms. All the while, the scars of the Trump administration will linger. The vagaries of the current administration have already forced a mass exodus of senior diplomats from the State Department. That human capital will be difficult to replace. For the past two years, the number of international students who have enrolled in U.S. university degree programs has fallen as nativism has grown louder. It will take a while to convince foreigners that this was a temporary spasm. After the Trump administration withdrew from the Iran nuclear deal, it forced SWIFT, the private-sector network that facilitates international financial transactions, to comply with unilateral U.S. sanctions against Iran, spurring China, France, Germany, Russia, and the United Kingdom to create an alternative payment system. That means little right now, but in the long run, both U.S. allies and U.S. rivals will learn to avoid relying on the dollar.

Perhaps most important, the Trump administration has unilaterally surrendered the set of ideals that guided U.S. policymakers for decades. It is entirely proper to debate how much the United States should prioritize the promotion of human rights, democracy, and the rule of law across the world. What should be beyond debate, however, is that it is worthwhile to promote those values overseas and enshrine them at home. Trump’s ugly rhetoric makes a mockery of those values. Although a future president might sound better on these issues, both allies and rivals will remember the current moment. The seeds of doubt have been planted, and they will one day sprout.

The factors that give the United States an advantage in the international system—deep capital markets, liberal ideas, world-class higher education—have winner-take-all dynamics. Other actors will be reluctant to switch away from the dollar, Wall Street, democracy, and the Ivy League. These sectors can withstand a few hits. Excessive use of financial statecraft, alliances with overseas populists, or prolonged bouts of anti-immigrant hysteria, however, will force even close allies to start thinking about alternatives. The American advantage in these areas will go bankrupt much like Mike Campbell in The Sun Also Rises did: “gradually and then suddenly.” Right now, the United States’ Jenga tower is still standing. Remove a few more blocks, however, and the wobbling will become noticeable to the unaided eye.

What would collapse look like? The United States would remain a great power, of course, but it would be an ordinary and less rich one. On an increasing number of issues, U.S. preferences would carry minimal weight, as China and Europe coordinated on a different set of rules. Persistent domestic political polarization would encourage Middle Eastern allies, such as Israel and Saudi Arabia, to line up with Republicans and European allies, such as Germany and the United Kingdom, to back Democrats. The continued absence of any coherent grand strategy would leave Latin America vulnerable to a new Great Game as other great powers vied for influence there. Demographic pressures would tax the United States, and the productivity slowdown would make those pressures even worse. Trade blocs would sap global economic growth; reduced interdependence would increase the likelihood of a great-power war. Climate change would be mitigated nationally rather than internationally, leaving almost everyone worse off.

WHAT, ME WORRY?

It would be delightful if, ten years from now, critics mocked this essay’s misplaced doom and gloom. The state of U.S. foreign policy seemed dire a decade ago, during the depths of the financial crisis and the war in Iraq. That turned out to be more of a blip than a trend. It remains quite possible now that Trump’s successor can repair the damage he has wreaked. And it is worth remembering that for all the flaws in the U.S. foreign policy machine, other great powers are hardly omnipotent. China’s and Russia’s foreign policy successes have been accompanied by blowback, from pushback against infrastructure projects in Asia to a hostile Ukraine, that will make it harder for those great powers to achieve their revisionist aims.

The trouble with “after Trump” narratives, however, is that the 45th president is as much a symptom of the ills plaguing U.S. foreign policy as he is a cause. Yes, Trump has made things much, much worse. But he also inherited a system stripped of the formal and informal checks on presidential power. That’s why the next president will need to do much more than superficial repairs. He or she will need to take the politically inconvenient step of encouraging greater congressional participation in foreign policy, even if the opposing party is in charge. Not every foreign policy initiative needs to be run through the Defense Department. The next president could use the bully pulpit to encourage and embrace more public debate about the United States’ role in the world. Restoring the norm of valuing expertise, while still paying tribute to the wisdom of crowds, would not hurt either. Nor would respecting democracy at home while promoting the rule of law abroad.

All these steps will make the political life of the next president more difficult. In most Foreign Affairs articles, this is the moment when the writer calls for a leader to exercise the necessary political will to do the right thing. That exhortation always sounded implausible, but now it sounds laughable. One hopes that the Church of Perpetual Worry does not turn into an apocalyptic cult. This time, however, the sky may really be falling.

#### C. Transitioning spurs peaceful retrenchment and is the only way to guarantee restored credibility with allies.

Macdonald and Parent 11

(Paul K., Joseph M., Spring, Assistant Professor, Political Science, Willians College Assistant Professor, Political Science, University of Miami,"Resurrecting Retrenchment: The Grand Strategic Consequences of U.S. Decline," POLICY BRIEF, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard University, <http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/macdonald-parent-may-2011-is-%20brief.pdf>, JKS)

¶ CURRENT U.S. DECLINE AND THE UNPOPULARITY OF RETRENCHMENT Many policymakers and pundits contend that U.S. relative power is declining and that this decline will have negative consequences for international politics. They justify this pessimism on the belief that great powers have few options for dealing with acute relative decline. Critics say that retrenchment, a policy of retracting grand strategic commitments in response to a decline in relative power, is a contemptible policy that demoralizes allies and emboldens potential adversaries. Furthermore, domestic interest groups and lobbies look like immovable obstacles with regard to policies designed to harmonize ends with means. There is little evidence, however, to justify the pervasive pessimism about retrenchment. The historical record suggests that not only is great power retrenchment common; it is also effective. Retrenching states shift burdens to allies, constrain military budgets, and avoid militarized disputes to preserve their position in the hierarchy of nations. In contrast, states that fail to retrench never recover their rank among the great powers. The competitive nature of the international system explains the success of retrenchment. If states shoulder disproportionate burdens, pamper private interests, become bogged down in costly conflicts, and generally masquerade as more powerful than they are, they will tend to be exploited by more disciplined and realistic adversaries. Great powers have a considerable incentive, therefore, to moderate their ambitions in the face of sustained declines in relative power. KEY FINDINGS To date, there has been no comprehensive study of great power retrenchment and no study that defends retrenchment as a probable or practical policy. Using historical data on gross domestic product, we identify eighteen cases of "acute relative decline" since 1870. Acute relative decline happens when a great power loses an ordinal ranking in global share of economic production, and this shift endures for five or more years. A comparison of these periods yields the following findings: Retrenchment is the most common response to decline. Great powers suffering from acute decline, such as the United Kingdom, used retrenchment to shore up their fading power in eleven to fifteen of the eighteen cases that we studied (61–83 percent). The rate of decline is the most important factor for explaining and predicting the magnitude of retrenchment. The faster a state falls, the more drastic the retrenchment policy it is likely to employ. The rate of decline is also the most important factor for explaining and predicting the forms that retrenchment takes. The faster a state falls, the more likely it is to renounce risky commitments, increase reliance on other states, cut military spending, and avoid starting or escalating international disputes. In more detail, secondary findings include the following: Democracy does not appear to inhibit retrenchment. Declining states are approximately equally likely to retrench regardless of regime type. Wars are infrequent during ordinal transitions. War broke out close to the transition point in between one and four of the eighteen cases (6–22 percent). Retrenching states rebound with some regularity. Six of the fifteen retrenching states (40 percent) managed to recapture their former rank. No state that failed to retrench can boast similar results. Declining great powers cut their military personnel and budgets significantly faster than other great powers. Over a five-year period, the average nondeclining state increased military personnel 2.1 percent—as compared with a 0.8 percent decrease in declining states. Likewise, the average nondeclining state increased military spending 8.4 percent—compared with 2.2 percent among declining states. Swift declines cause greater alliance agreements. Over a five-year period, the average great power signs 1.75 new alliance agreements—great powers undergoing large declines sign an average of 3.6 such agreements. Declining great powers are less likely to enter or escalate disputes. Compared to average great powers, they are 26 percent less likely to initiate an interstate dispute, 25 percent less likely to be embroiled in a dispute, and markedly less likely to escalate those disputes to high levels. IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICYMAKERS From the analysis above, three main implications follow for U.S. policy. First, we are likely to see retrenchment in U.S. foreign policy. With a declining share of relative power, the United States is ripe to shift burdens to allies, cut military expenditures, and stay out of international disputes. This will not be without risks and costs, but retrenchment is likely to be peaceful and is preferable to nonretrenchment. In short, U.S. policymakers should resist calls to maintain a sizable overseas posture because they fear that a more moderate policy might harm U.S. prestige or credibility with American allies. A humble foreign policy and more modest overseas presence can be as (if not more) effective in restoring U.S. credibility and reassuring allies. Second, any potential U.S.-Sino power transition is likely to be easier on the United States than pessimists have advertised. If the United States acts like a typical retrenching state, the future looks promising. Several regional allies—foremost India and Japan—appear capable of assuming responsibilities formerly shouldered by the United States, and a forward defense is no longer as valuable as it once was. There remains ample room for cuts in U.S. defense spending. And as China grows it will find, as the United States did, that increased relative power brings with it widening divisions at home and fewer friends overseas. In brief, policymakers should reject arguments that a reduction in U.S. overseas deployments will embolden a hostile and expansionist China. Sizable forward deployments in Asia are just as likely to trap the United States in unnecessary clashes as they are to deter potential aggression. Third, the United States must reconsider when, where, and how it will use its more modest resources in the future. A sensible policy of retrenchment must be properly prepared for—policymakers should not hastily slash budgets and renounce commitments. A gradual and controlled policy of reprioritizing goals, renouncing commitments, and shifting burdens will bring greater returns than an improvised or imposed retreat. To this end, policymakers need to engage in a frank and serious debate about the purposes of U.S. overseas assets. Our position is that the primary role of the U.S. military should be to deter and fight conventional wars against potential great power adversaries, rather than engage in limited operations against insurgents and other nonstate threats. This suggests that U.S. deployments in Iraq and Afghanistan should be pared down; that the United States should resist calls to involve itself in internal conflicts or civil wars, such as those in Libya and elsewhere in North Africa; and that the Asia-Pacific region should have strategic priority over Europe and the greater Middle East. Regardless of whether one accepts these particular proposals, the United States must make tough choices about which regions and threats should have claim to increasingly scarce resources. CONCLUSION Retrenchment is probable and pragmatic. Great powers may not be prudent, but they tend to become so when their power ebbs. Regardless of regime type, declining states routinely renounce risky commitments, redistribute alliance burdens, pare back military outlays, and avoid ensnarement in and escalation of costly conflicts. Husbanding resources is simply sensible. In the competitive game of power politics, states must unsentimentally realign means with ends or be punished for their profligacy. Attempts to maintain policies advanced when U.S. relative power was greater are outdated, unfounded, and imprudent. Retrenchment policies—greater burden sharing with allies, less military spending, and less involvement in militarized disputes—hold the most promise for arresting and reversing decline.

#### D. Pursuit isn’t inevitable- it’s a choice. Moving towards retrenchment now will create stability, but the aff results in endless military interventions.

Glaser 18

(John Glaser, director of Foreign Policy Studies at the Cato Institute, (2018) Status, Prestige, Activism and the Illusion of American Decline, The Washington Quarterly, 41:1, 173-197, DOI: 10.1080/0163660X.2018.1445903, JKS)

Some observers link the prospect of retrenchment with the decline of America. Others insist hegemony is inherently cyclical and, given the decrease in relative U.S. economic and geopolitical dominance, decline is inevitable.107 Fears of U.S. decline, however, reflect a preoccupation more with the shadow of power than the substance of it.108 Though not without its problems, the U.S. economy continues to grow and Americans continue to enjoy a per capita income well above the global average. Roughly nine-in-ten Americans enjoy a standard of living higher than the global middle-income standard.109 A decline in superpower status will not change that. When it comes to security, Americans are likewise in an enviable position. Contrary to depictions in our politics and news media, the United States remains extraordinarily insulated from external threats, something unlikely to change with a more restrained grand strategy.110 Commentators worried about decline tend to associate it with a loss of status and some sense of failure, forfeit, and defeat. Beyond psychological loss aversion, however, it is hard to see how a reduction in America’s global military role equates to any real degradation in the wealth or security of American citizens. Over the course of the twentieth century, circumstances forced Britain to relinquish its top position in world politics and shed its global empire. This inflicted a painful sense of decline in Britain, but according to historian George L. Bernstein, “it is not clear that the loss of empire represented any decline in real power at all; the decline was primarily a perception by Britons and others who had identified Britain’s greatness with its empire.” In withdrawing, “Britain may well have lost an encumbrance rather than power.”111 Primacists assume too much American authorship of today’s peaceful and wealth-generating international order, and then warn hyperbolically of cata- strophic system collapse if the United States retrenches. In truth, today’s global stability trends and economic growth rates are more robust than that. And there is little reason to believe that staying out of the great power contest would undercut the wealth and security of U.S. citizens. Robert Jervis illustrates this point by reference to other former great powers, “Sweden is no longer a great power, but in what sense is this a failure? Swedish citizens, if not the abstraction of the Swedish state, probably are better off for this. They are rich and have been spared several wars. Similarly, postwar Japan was shorn of its empire and armed forces and is no longer a complete great power. But it is hard to say that the country and its citizens are the poorer for this loss of role and status.” He continued, “Sitting on the sidelines, although only possible under special circumstances of geography and the interests of other impor- tant states, can be a fine place to watch (and benefit) as the great power parade goes by.”113 Robert Kagan, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, warns against com- mitting “preemptive superpower suicide out of a misplaced fear of ... declining [U.S.] power.”114 The real danger is closer to the opposite. Indeed, to the extent that America’s wealth and security is at risk of degradation and decline, it is likely to be exacerbated by a stubborn insistence on maintaining a costly perma- nent global military presence, a hyper-interventionist foreign policy, and exces- sively high defense budgets.115 While America’s extraordinary wealth and resilience means it can probably sustain an expansive, status-driven, and activist foreign policy for the foreseeable future, the risks of over-extension and of succumbing to what Princeton Uni- versity’s G. John Ikenberry calls the “imperial temptation,” are very real.117 This temptation involves not only succumbing to ruinous adventures like Vietnam and Iraq, but also includes gradually sacrificing liberal democratic values at home as the security state undermines civil liberties protections, weakens consti-tutional checks on executive war powers, and incentivizes excessive government secrecy. The United States can choose to husband its still unmatched power and forswear status and prestige-driven foreign policy excesses, or it can hasten its own decline by extending its hyper-interventionist posture deep into the future. Neither path is imposed on us by circumstances; it remains a choice.