## 1

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement based on fair, safe, and educational arguments – anything else moots 7 minutes of the nc – other frameworks collapse since you must say it is true.

#### Prefer,

#### 1] Constituitivism – The topic is given to us to debate by NSD and five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true. These are the only roles we have going into the round which means the judge only has the jurisdiction to vote on arguments that prove the truth or falsity of the resolution.

#### 2] Inclusion – Any offense functions under truth testing but hyperspecific RoBs exclude all other discussion and hurt underpriveledged debaters that don’t have the resources to engage in those arguments.

## 2

#### Permissibility and presumption Negate,

#### 1] Text – Ought is defined as expressing obligation[[3]](#footnote-3) which means absent a proactive obligation you vote neg since the aff can’t prove an obligation. O/W since text is the only thing we have access to prior to the round.

#### 2] Safety – It’s ethically safer to presume the squo since we know what the squo is but we can’t know whether the aff will be good or not if ethics are incoherent.

#### 3] Real world – Policymakers don’t pass policies they aren’t sure about, they shelve them for later.

## 3

#### The standard is consistency with determinism.

#### 1] Thermodynamics – The first law of thermodynamics states energy can neither be created nor destroyed, only converted. Thus, free will, which comes from nothing, can’t translate into physical action.

#### 2] Biology – Every organism has controlled responses to stimuli because of its inherited genes and environment. That applies to humans, i.e. when we cut onions we cry.

#### 3] Physiology – You can always ask why did you take that action? Which would be infinitely regressive. Thus, the only solution is our actions are just complex sets of reflexes. That outweighs, simplest solutions are more likely to be true since theres less room for mistake.

#### 4] Causation – Every effect has a cause by definition, thus free will, which has no cause is illogical.

#### 5] Nature – the universe is infinite, that justifies determinism since any individual act is too small to alter the fate of the universe, Horne 1

Herman H. Horne, 1912, “The Arguments for Determinism”, Excerpt from Free Will and Human Responsibility: A Philosophical Argument, https://web.csulb.edu/~cwallis/100/articles/arguments\_for\_determinism.html

This argument has been somewhat anticipated in the preceding paragraph. It is but a generalization of all the four preceding arguments. A philosophy of nature is a general theory explanatory of all the occurrences of nature. Now the ideal of scientific explanation in physics, chemistry, biology, physiology, and everywhere is mechanical. Events do not happen because anybody or any will wants them to happen; they happen because they have to happen; they happen because they must. And it is the business of science to find this necessary connection between the occurrences of nature. The universe, by this hypothesis, whole and part, is governed by the action of mechanical law. The reign of law is universal. Man is a very small creature upon a small earth, which is itself a comparatively small planet in one of the smaller solar systems of an indefinitely large number of solar systems which partially fill infinite space. The universe is a physical mechanism in which law rules, and man is but a least part of this universal machine. How then can he do otherwise than he does do? A single free-will act would introduce caprice, whim, chance, into a universe whose actions are so mechanically determined that an omniscient observer of the present could predict infallibly all futurity. . . .

#### 6] Sociology – Every year, statisticians accurately predict the number of people who get married the next year. This type of data can only be explained through determinism since it shows human behavior is predetermined.

#### 7] Ethics - All frameworks with a bindingness or motivation claim necessitate determinism since that framework would say in a given situation a moral agent must/will act in a specific way. If they deny this justification, it proves their framework triggers permissibility since it’s escapable and can’t guide action.

#### 8] Arbitrariness – if determinism is false then you imply that human acts are random since they aren’t based on any previous cause. Ethics can’t be arbitrary because otherwise it wouldn’t guide action since anything is permissible.

#### 9] The best neuroscientific, psychological, and medical evidence agrees, Lavazza 16

Andrea Lavazza, Neuroethics, Centro Universitario Internazionale, Arezzo, Italy, Free Will and Neuroscience: From Explaining Freedom Away to New Ways of Operationalizing and Measuring It, 2016, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4887467/> ///recut from AHS PB

All these experiments seem to indicate that free will is an illusion. Yet, these relevant experiments can be interpreted in many ways. A possible view is that, in some way, determinism can be observed directly within ourselves. This interpretation might lead to the conclusion that free will is just an illusion. In fact, if one considers as a condition of free will the fact that it should be causa sui (i.e., it should be able to consciously start new causal chains), such a condition is incompatible with determinism as it is usually defined. For it, in fact, all events are linked by casual relations in the form of natural laws, which started long before we were born and which we cannot escape. However, determinism has generally been regarded as a metaphysical claim, not refutable by empirical findings. One could properly talk of automatism in the brain, not of determinism, based on the evidence available. (In any case, endorsing indeterminism might lead to consider our behavior as the causal product of choices that every time produce different results, as if we rolled a dice. This doesn’t seem to make us any freer than if determinism were overturned; cf. Levy, 2011). Most importantly, another feature of freedom seems to be a pure illusion, namely the role of consciousness. The experiments considered thus far heavily question the claim that consciousness actually causes voluntary behavior. Neural activation starts the decisional process culminating in the movement, while consciousness “comes after”, when “things are done”. Therefore, consciousness cannot trigger our voluntary decisions. But the role of consciousness in voluntary choices is part of the definition of free will (but the very definition of consciousness is a matter of debate, cf. Chalmers, 1996). Empirical research in psychology also shows that our mind works and makes choices without our conscious control. As proposed by psychologist Wegner (2002, 2003, 2004) and Aarts et al. (2004), we are “built” to have the impression to consciously control our actions or to have the power to freely choose, even though all that is only a cognitive illusion. Many priming experiments show that people act “mechanically” (even when their behavior might appear suited to the environment and even refined). Automatic cognitive processes, of which we aren’t always aware, originate our decisions, and they were only discovered thanks to the most advanced scientific research. Ultimately, consciousness, which should exercise control and assess the reasons for a choice, is thus allegedly causally ineffective: a mere epiphenomenon, to use the terminology of the philosophy of mind. This is what has been called Zombie Challenge, “based on an amazing wealth of findings in recent cognitive science that demonstrate the surprising ways in which our everyday behavior is controlled by automatic processes that unfold in the complete absence of consciousness” (Vierkant et al., 2013).

#### 10] Molecular Physics proves we are just constructs of molecules, Coyne 12

Jerry Coyne, [Professor in the Department of Ecology and Evolution at The [University of Chicago](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Organizations/Schools/University+of+Chicago)], “Why You Don’t Really Have Free Will,” *USAToday*, January 1st, 2012. Recut from SM

The first is simple: we are biological creatures, collections of molecules that must obey the laws of physics. All the success of science rests on the regularity of those laws, which determine the behavior of every molecule in the universe. Those molecules, of course, also make up your brain — the organ that does the "choosing." And the neurons and molecules in your brain are the product of both your genes and your environment, an environment including the other people we deal with. Memories, for example, are nothing more than structural and chemical changes in your brain cells. Everything that you think, say, or do, must come down to molecules and physics. True "free will," then, would require us to somehow step outside of our brain's structure and modify how it works. Science hasn't shown any way we can do this because "we" are simply constructs of our brain. We can't impose a nebulous "will" on the inputs to our brain that can affect its output of decisions and actions, any more than a programmed computer can somehow reach inside itself and change its program.

### Offense

#### 1] Obligatory responsibility doesn’t exist because everything is predetermined so the aff is false.

#### 2] Aff inherency proves you deviate from the squo which is an attempt to escape determinism by ignoring reality. That proves the AC is inconsistent with my FW.

## 4

### Disad

#### China views resources in space as key to foreign policy iniatives

Blair, Yali, 19, 03/2019, “The Space Security Dilemma”, Bruce G. Blair is the President of the World Security Institute. He was a project director at the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment and a senior fellow in the Foreign Policy Studies Program at the Brookings Institution from 1987-2000. Mr. Blair is the author of numerous articles and books on security issues including the Logic of Accidental Nuclear War and Global Zero Alert for Nuclear Forces. He is presently completing a new book on U.S. nuclear policy.sChen Yali is the editor-in-chief of Washington Observer. She is also a Program Manager of Chen Shi China Research Group based in Beijing. Chen worked for China Daily as a reporter and opinion writer on politics and international affairs between 1994 and 2000, URL: <https://www.globalzero.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/BB_Editors-Notes-Space-Security-Dilemma_2006.pdf>, KR

A zero-sum mindset toward space is hardening in China as a result of this apprehension, as amply illustrated in the public media. Space is eyed in China as an area of resources and possibilities to be acquired before it’s too late. ShuXing, whose book is reviewed later in this journal, likens the grabbing of satellite orbits to the “Enclosure Movement” in late 18th Century England in which the more capability one has, the more resources one can seize. Another reviewed author argued that countries scramble into space to fight for the tremendous resources found there and “once this fight for resources causes irreconcilable conflicts, it may lead to radical space confrontations.” A space war seems to many Chinese to be another form of resource war. Such urgency in seeking control over resources is not unique to space, but also applies to energy and other areas. Given China’s population and rapid economic growth, controlling resources is understandably a paramount concern. Regarding space, however, a zero-sum (‘win-lose’) attitude is narrow-minded and misguided. If feverish competition for resources in space causes Sino-American relations to deteriorate or leads to the outbreak of war between them, then both parties lose.

Maj. Gen. Chang Xianqi and Sui Junqin of the PLA Institute of Command and Technology (aka. Armament Command and Technology Academy) offer a straightforward description of the aims of China’s space activities over the next five to 20 years, and explain why perceptions or accusations of hidden military aims in China’s manned space flight program (which sent two astronauts into space in October 2005) do not withstand logical scrutiny. They characterize the country’s space mission as dedicated to advancing science and to supporting China’s economic modernization. They dismiss two key allegations concerning the manned space program that the Shenzhou spacecraft’s ability for mid-course orbital maneuvering indicates a Chinese military effort to apply the technology to Chinese strategic missiles in order to give these missiles the ability to avoid U.S. missile defenses, and that China envisions its manned spacecraft as platforms for conducting real-time reconnaissance and intelligence collection for military ends. China’s orbital maneuver technology, they note, is decades old and evolved independently of the U.S. missile defense program, while the inefficiencies of conducting surveillance from manned platforms compared to satellites are widely appreciated and have led other space-faring nations to choose satellites for this mission.

#### The plan forces China to respond since they can’t pursue resources – that form of militarization creates arms control and escalation crises

Blair, Yali, 19, 03/2019, “The Space Security Dilemma”, Bruce G. Blair is the President of the World Security Institute. He was a project director at the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment and a senior fellow in the Foreign Policy Studies Program at the Brookings Institution from 1987-2000. Mr. Blair is the author of numerous articles and books on security issues including the Logic of Accidental Nuclear War and Global Zero Alert for Nuclear Forces. He is presently completing a new book on U.S. nuclear policy.sChen Yali is the editor-in-chief of Washington Observer. She is also a Program Manager of Chen Shi China Research Group based in Beijing. Chen worked for China Daily as a reporter and opinion writer on politics and international affairs between 1994 and 2000, URL: <https://www.globalzero.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/BB_Editors-Notes-Space-Security-Dilemma_2006.pdf>, KR

While the China space threat consists of a spectrum of possibilities, the U.S. space threat to China clearly goes beyond the realm of possibilities, Zhang Hui at Harvard University contends in his article that examines threats from a Chinese perspective. Drawing on authoritative sources, he argues that the United States is unambiguously committed not only to exploiting space for military purposes, but also to controlling space by all necessary means including weapons deployed in space. The objective is not only to protect U.S. space assets, but to deny adversaries the use of space in wartime. In its most ambitious rendition, controlling space applies even to the transitory period of several minutes when an adversary’s missiles are passing through space enroute to their wartime targets on enemy soil. This prospective role for U.S. space control weapons – shooting down an adversary’s ballistic missiles – is the central concern of Zhang’s analysis, as it represents the most serious threat to China’s security. A space-based U.S. missile defense system, especially one designed to shoot down ballistic missiles during their several minutes of boosted flight after launch (boost-phase defenses), would pose the gravest potential threat by enabling the United States to neutralize China’s strategic nuclear missile deterrent.

In some respects Zhang and many U.S. analysts understate the degree of potential threat to China by stressing the huge cost of the thousands of space- based interceptors needed to maintain an around-the-clock vigil of Chinese missile launches, and by stressing the relative ease by which China’s missiles could punch holes in this defensive constellation. The understatement derives from the fact that a far less extensive galaxy of U.S. space-based interceptors would be needed if the United States could choose the moment for initiating hostilities as part of a preemptive offensive strategy. Even a constellation of dozens of interceptors could be decisive if the United States enjoyed the luxury of setting the terms of the onset of conflict and the interceptors were optimally positioned at that moment.

In Zhang’s view, China could counter by deploying anti-space weapons designed to cripple the U.S. missile defense network, but such a step could ignite an arms race in space (and, we might add, create impulses to preemptively strike in space during a crisis). Alternatively, China could ramp up its arsenal of nuclear missiles and warheads to the point at which it would overwhelm the U.S. defense capability, but the downsides are numerous. A Chinese missile build-up could trigger nuclear reactions from India. If Pakistan follows suit, an arms race in South Asia could result. It could also require China to re-start its fissile materials production facilities and thereby unravel China’s commitment to the multinational treaty calling for all countries to stop future production of such materials.

#### Turns aff war impacts and hyper-escalate their conflict scenarios since other states have incentives to match China

### FW

#### 1. Infinite chain of action. There are infinite end states to each action that I may take meaning we can never know if it is a good or bad action as per util because it could possibly result in many ways. For example, util would tell me to save 2 babies rather than one but there’s a chance that baby turns out to be Hitler in which case util would condemn my actions. This means any action is permissible because of the unpredictability of our end states.

#### 2. Util evaluates end states, not the way to achieve those ends states. But if the way we obtain an end is through an action and util ignores the action taken, it ignores the actions taken and cares only about the end states so technically any action is permissible under util because it wouldn’t condemn the action it would condemn the end that the action entails.

#### Proves util triggers permissibility –

### case

#### No uniqueness – most of Chinese militarization isn’t private

Lee-Singer, 21, “China’s Space Program Is More Military Than You Might Think”, 7/16/21, Defense One, P.W. Singer is Strategist at New America and the author of multiple books on technology and securityTaylor A. Lee is an analyst with BluePath Labs, a DC-based consulting company that focuses on research, analysis, disruptive technologies, and wargaming. URL <https://www.defenseone.com/ideas/2021/07/chinas-space-program-more-military-you-might-think/183790/>, KR

The militarized tilt of the Chinese space program complicates these plans. Space planning and directing organizations, the ground infrastructure supporting its space programs, and the taikonauts themselves are all under the purview of the People’s Liberation Army. Understanding these connections is important for any plans to cooperate with China in space, whether governmental or commercial.

On the organizational side, China’s equivalent to NASA is the civilian China National Space Administration, which has a focus on the space program’s international exchanges. It falls under the State Administration for Science, Technology and Industry for National Defense, which handles defense-related science and technology, including China’s state-owned defense conglomerates. However, unlike NASA, the CNSA doesn’t oversee China’s astronauts. The organization actually in charge of China’s manned space program is the China Manned Space Engineering Office, which is under China’s Central Military Commission Equipment Development Department.

Likewise, the infrastructure of China’s space program is also heavily militarized. The launch sites, control centers, and many of the satellites are directly run by the PLA. Taikonauts lift off from the Jiuquan Satellite Launch Center (aka Base 20 of the PLA’s Strategic Support Force, its space and cyber arm); directed by the PLASSF’s Beijing Aerospace Flight Control Center, with Telemetry, Tracking and Control support from the Xi’an Satellite Control Center (aka the PLASSF’s Base 26); and land at one of two sites in Inner Mongolia operated by the two bases.

#### No link:

#### Even if they’re right that they work on private projects to help each other – the larger iniative is space dominance which the aff doesn’t solve

#### their card literally says they’ve already militarized it so they don’t need alliances (which is what the impact ev is ABOUT, not alliances)

1AC Bowman and Thompson 3/31 [(Bradley Bowman, the senior director of the Center on Military and Political Power at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies) (Jared Thompson, a U.S. Air Force major and visiting military analyst at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies.) “Russia and China Seek to Tie America’s Hands in Space” Foreign Policy 3/31/2021. https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/03/31/russia-china-space-war-treaty-demilitarization-satellites/] BC

Consider the actions of the United States’ two great-power adversaries when it comes to anti-satellite weapons. China and Russia have sprinted to develop and deploy both ground-based and space-based weapons targeting satellites while simultaneously pushing the United States to sign a treaty banning such weapons.

To protect its vital space-based military capabilities—including communications, intelligence, and missile defense satellites—and effectively deter authoritarian aggression, Washington should avoid being drawn into suspect international treaties on space that China and Russia have no intention of honoring.

The Treaty on the Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space and of the Threat or Use of Force Against Outer Space Objects (PPWT), which Beijing and Moscow have submitted at the United Nations, is a perfect example. PPWT signatories commit “not to place any weapons in outer space.” It also says parties to the treaty may not “resort to the threat or use of force against outer space objects” or engage in activities “inconsistent” with the purpose of the treaty.

On the surface, that sounds innocuous. Who, after all, wants an arms race in space?

The reality, however, is that China and Russia are already racing to field anti-satellite weapons and have been for quite some time. “The space domain is competitive, congested, and contested,” Gen. James Dickinson, the head of U.S. Space Command, said in January. “Our competitors, most notably China and Russia, have militarized this domain.”

### AT: US Heg

#### Hegemony falling now, and trying to reverse ruins the economy but triggers counterbalancing --- multipolarity is best --- it doesn’t force US abdication but leads to a peaceful transition and world order

Preble 18 Christopher A. Preble, Christopher A. Preble is vice president for defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute and the author of “The Power Problem: How American Military Dominance Makes Us Less Safe, Less Prosperous and Less Free.” “Adapting to American Decline.” The New York Times. April 21, 2018. https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/21/opinion/sunday/adapting-to-american-decline.html

The news that Mike Pompeo, the C.I.A. director, met in secret with North Korea’s leader, Kim Jong-un, over the Easter weekend has renewed hope that one of the world’s most dangerous standoffs might be resolved without war. On Saturday, in fact, Mr. Kim announced that he would halt nuclear tests. Mr. Pompeo’s trip was surprising for many reasons: he went personally, it was kept a secret and it was revealed at a time when others were questioning his fitness to become secretary of state.

But it says something about America’s place in world affairs that at least one aspect of the trip was no surprise at all: that Americans are deeply, centrally involved in a dispute involving two sovereign countries thousands of miles away from Washington.

Of course, there’s a good historical reason. Under American tutelage, South Korea eventually evolved from a desperately poor autocracy to one of the wealthiest democracies on the planet. American taxpayers continue to spend billions of dollars a year to help maintain regional security. A similar process played out in other parts of Asia and in Europe, where the American security umbrella, including tens of thousands of military personnel, provided room for those countries’ leaders to build strong democracies and economies.

American leaders argued that such policies served the cause of global peace and security. They also reasoned that the substantial costs would be tolerable. And, so long as American productivity and workers’ wages were rising, it seemed that Uncle Sam could ensure a decent standard of living at home and security around the world.

It is becoming harder, though, for America to maintain this global posture. Eventually, it may become impossible, in part because we helped create the conditions that allowed other countries to prosper and grow. There may come a time, not too far in the future, when Americans would be surprised to hear that they are responsible for keeping peace on the Korean Peninsula.

Americans should be debating how to manage that transition in a way that avoids destabilizing the rest of the world. Unfortunately, if the current administration’s maneuvers between the two Koreas are any indication, this is the last thing on the minds of policymakers.

There is no question that America’s share of global wealth is shrinking. By some estimates, the United States accounted for roughly 50 percent of global output at the end of World War II. By 1985, its share stood at 22.5 percent. It has fallen to 15.1 percent today, and the [International Monetary Fund](http://www.imf.org/external/datamapper/PPPSH@WEO/WEOWORLD/USA) projects that it will slip to 13.7 percent by 2023.

The proliferation of various technologies — from crude explosives to advanced robotics — has made it easier for even relatively small and weak countries and nonstate actors to challenge the big and powerful United States. These days any truly determined country, even a very poor one like North Korea, can develop nuclear weapons to deter attacks.

Yet Americans may be the last people to recognize the changing shape of global power. It’s not that senior national security officials don’t understand that they have a problem. The Trump administration’s [National Defense Strategy](https://www.defense.gov/Portals/1/Documents/pubs/2018-National-Defense-Strategy-Summary.pdf), for example, speaks of “an ever more lethal and disruptive battlefield” and worrisome “trends” that “will challenge our ability to deter aggression.”

Its answer? Try harder.

The document predicts that America’s allies will lose faith and the country’s global influence will wane unless taxpayers commit to “devoting additional resources in a sustained effort to solidify our competitive advantage.”

The problem is, the United States already spends more on its military than the next seven or eight nations combined. Total annual expenditures, including for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, have averaged $561 billion since 2001. So, how much more must Americans spend to maintain a military edge sufficient to deter attacks against others?

About $196 billion more, on average, over the next five years. The Trump administration projects spending $3.78 trillion from 2019 to 2023, or $756.9 billion a year. Some doubt that even that will be enough.

Ideally, this additional spending will discourage others from challenging us. Even if it did, however, that would require Americans to accept less domestic spending, higher taxes or both in order to allow others to underspend on their militaries.

But what worked before might not work in the future. America’s insistence upon maintaining primacy at all costs may stimulate greater resistance from the likes of China and Russia. And the risk that the United States gets drawn into wars that it need not fight and cannot win will remain high, no matter how much we spend. We are faced with the prospect, then, of frequent uses of force — like the missile strike against suspected Syrian chemical weapons sites this month that even supporters admitted was unlikely, by itself, [to accomplish much](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/14/us/politics/trump-syria-policy.html).

There are, however, alternatives to simply spending more and trying harder. Of course, the easy, and unpalatable, options would hand over the reins of global leadership to China, or simply have American forces withdraw quickly and let the chips fall where they may.Instead, America should seek a new arrangement that asks the beneficiaries of today’s relatively peaceful and prosperous world order to make a meaningful contribution to maintaining it. The American security umbrella will stay aloft — and American military power will remain formidable — but others will need to do more.

Rather than treating allies like reckless teenagers who can’t be trusted without Uncle Sam’s constant supervision, or feckless weaklings that will jump at the chance to capitulate to rapacious neighbors, Washington should empower mature, like-minded states to deal with local challenges before they become regional or global crises.

Some countries, in fact, are already moving in this direction. South Korea has undertaken its own bilateral negotiations with North Korea. Unsettled by Donald Trump’s threats to renege on American security commitments, or offended by his attempt to extract tribute in exchange for American protection, these countries’ leaders are thinking seriously about different security arrangements. As Constanze Stelzenmüller explained [in a recent paper for the Brookings Institution](https://www.brookings.edu/research/normal-is-over/), Europeans, in particular, have an “existential” interest in “preserving an international order that safeguards peace and globalization.”

Of course, one purported advantage of an American-funded global security order is that it supposedly allows Washington to call the shots — and, naturally, some worry that its allies would show less deference and be less willing to comply with Washington’s dictates if they were less dependent upon American power. But that already happens: In fact, some allies have been known to act recklessly when they believe that America has their back. Look at the ruinous war that Saudi Arabia is waging in Yemen, one of the world’s poorest countries. Greater independence could induce greater caution.

And the benefits flow both ways. If Washington was slightly less confident that it could call the tune and expect others to dance, that might help America to avoid costly mistakes. Would the United States have invaded Iraq if it didn’t believe that other countries would help clean up after?

Transitioning to a world with many capable actors won’t be easy. It will require a deft hand to unwind defense arrangements, and patience as others find their way. Given their own domestic spending priorities and continued uncertainty about whether the United States will recommit to the old model, most American allies are likely to take a wait-and-see attitude. A gentle nudge might be needed to move them from comfortable adolescence to empowered adulthood.

The columnist Charles Krauthammer once cast [decline as a choice](http://www.weeklystandard.com/decline-is-a-choice/article/270813), as though, by mere force of will, the United States could remain atop the international order forever.

On the other hand, it was Mr. Krauthammer who in 1990 spoke of [America’s unipolar “moment”](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/1991-02-01/unipolar-moment) — a temporary state of affairs, occasioned by a unique set of circumstances that defined the first few years of the post-Cold War world. That world no longer exists. Wishing it back into existence won’t make it so.

The United States is the most important country in the world and will remain so for many years by virtue of its strong economy and prodigious military capabilities. But admitting that the United States is incapable of effectively adjudicating every territorial dispute or of thwarting every security threat in every part of the world is hardly tantamount to surrender. It is, rather, a wise admission of the limits of American power and an acknowledgment of the need to share the burdens, and the responsibilities, of dealing with a complex world. It is about seizing the opportunity to make changes that benefit us and others.

The alternative is a renewed commitment to discourage self-reliance among allies. That will be an undertaking far more onerous than any the United States has attempted since World War II — and one that is unlikely to work.

### General

#### Nation-centric approaches lead to a regulatory race to the bottom

Heise 18 -- Jack Heise (Judicial Law Clerk at U.S. Courts of Appeals), Space, the Final Frontier of Enterprise: Incentivizing Asteroid Mining Under a Revised International Framework, 40 Mich. J. Int'l L. 189 (2018). https://repository.law.umich.edu/mjil/vol40/iss1/5 WJ

However, a nation-centric, first possession framework has drawbacks that highlight the desirability of an international governance regime for as- teroid mining. First, the experience of colonization was one that prompted conflict between colonizers.122 The peaceful character of space is one of the great achievements of the OST, and it should not be jettisoned. Second, a regime characterized by national actors could spark a race to the bottom with respect to domestic regulation, leading to the same “flags of convenience” problem present in the maritime context as asteroid mining and spaceflight companies relocate to avoid taxes, labor and safety standards, and tort liability.123 An international framework, by contrast, could more easily prevent this problem by facilitating the creation of uniform standards for labor, safety, and liability, making relocation to under-regulated states a less attractive prospect. The drawbacks of a system governed by individual nations, in conjunction with the advantages of a global system illustrated above, point to the desirability of a revised framework governing asteroid mining that is international in character.

# Accessible formatting

## 1

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement based on fair, safe, and educational arguments – anything else moots 7 minutes of the nc – other frameworks collapse since you must say it is true.

#### Prefer,

#### 1] Constituitivism – The topic is given to us to debate by NSD and five dictionaries[[4]](#footnote-4) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[5]](#footnote-5) as to prove true. These are the only roles we have going into the round which means the judge only has the jurisdiction to vote on arguments that prove the truth or falsity of the resolution.

#### 2] Inclusion – Any offense functions under truth testing but hyperspecific RoBs exclude all other discussion and hurt underpriveledged debaters that don’t have the resources to engage in those arguments.

## 2

#### Permissibility and presumption Negate,

#### 1] Text – Ought is defined as expressing obligation[[6]](#footnote-6) which means absent a proactive obligation you vote neg since the aff can’t prove an obligation. O/W since text is the only thing we have access to prior to the round.

#### 2] Safety – It’s ethically safer to presume the squo since we know what the squo is but we can’t know whether the aff will be good or not if ethics are incoherent.

#### 3] Real world – Policymakers don’t pass policies they aren’t sure about, they shelve them for later.

## 3

#### The standard is consistency with determinism.

#### 1] Thermodynamics – The first law of thermodynamics states energy can neither be created nor destroyed, only converted. Thus, free will, which comes from nothing, can’t translate into physical action.

#### 2] Biology – Every organism has controlled responses to stimuli because of its inherited genes and environment. That applies to humans, i.e. when we cut onions we cry.

#### 3] Physiology – You can always ask why did you take that action? Which would be infinitely regressive. Thus, the only solution is our actions are just complex sets of reflexes. That outweighs, simplest solutions are more likely to be true since theres less room for mistake.

#### 4] Causation – Every effect has a cause by definition, thus free will, which has no cause is illogical.

#### 5] Nature – the universe is infinite, that justifies determinism since any individual act is too small to alter the fate of the universe, Horne 1

The universe is governed by mechanical law. earth is comparatively small planet in infinite space The universe is a physical mechanism How can A single free-will act introduce chance

#### 6] Sociology – Every year, statisticians accurately predict the number of people who get married the next year. This type of data can only be explained through determinism since it shows human behavior is predetermined.

#### 7] Ethics - All frameworks with a bindingness or motivation claim necessitate determinism since that framework would say in a given situation a moral agent must/will act in a specific way. If they deny this justification, it proves their framework triggers permissibility since it’s escapable and can’t guide action.

#### 8] Arbitrariness – if determinism is false then you imply that human acts are random since they aren’t based on any previous cause. Ethics can’t be arbitrary because otherwise it wouldn’t guide action since anything is permissible.

#### 9] The best neuroscientific, psychological, and medical evidence agrees, Lavazza 16

experiments indicate free will is an illusion Neural activation starts movement while consciousness “comes after”, things are done Empirical research in psychology shows our mind makes choices without control proposed by Wegner and Aarts we are “built” to have the impression to consciously control actions only illusion the most advanced scientific research

#### 10] Molecular Physics proves we are just constructs of molecules, Coyne 12

we are collections of molecules that obey physics science determine the behavior of every molecule in the universe molecules make up your brain And your brain the product of your genes and environment Everything that you do, must come to molecules and physics "free will would require step outside of our brain

### Offense

#### 1] Obligatory responsibility doesn’t exist because everything is predetermined so the aff is false.

#### 2] Aff inherency proves you deviate from the squo which is an attempt to escape determinism by ignoring reality. That proves the AC is inconsistent with my FW.

## 4

### Disad

#### China views resources in space as key to foreign policy iniatives

Blair, Yali, 19,

Space is eyed in China as an area of resources and possibilities to be acquired more capability one has, the more resources one can seize A space war to Chinese to be another form of resource war urgency is not unique to space controlling resources is a paramount concern the country’s space mission as to advancing science and supporting economic modernization.

#### The plan forces China to respond since they can’t pursue resources – that form of militarization creates arms control and escalation crises

Blair, Yali, 19

the U.S. space threat to China goes beyond the realm of possibilities the U S is committed to exploiting space for military purposes U.S. space control is the central concern the most serious threat to China’s security. China could counter by deploying anti-space weapons could ignite an arms race in space impulses to preemptively strike ramp up arsenal of nuclear missiles and warheads to the point at which it would overwhelm the U.S. defense capability, nuclear reactions from India. an arms race in South Asia

#### Turns aff war impacts and hyper-escalate their conflict scenarios since other states have incentives to match China

### FW

#### 1. Infinite chain of action. There are infinite end states to each action that I may take meaning we can never know if it is a good or bad action as per util because it could possibly result in many ways. For example, util would tell me to save 2 babies rather than one but there’s a chance that baby turns out to be Hitler in which case util would condemn my actions. This means any action is permissible because of the unpredictability of our end states.

#### 2. Util evaluates end states, not the way to achieve those ends states. But if the way we obtain an end is through an action and util ignores the action taken, it ignores the actions taken and cares only about the end states so technically any action is permissible under util because it wouldn’t condemn the action it would condemn the end that the action entails.

#### Proves util triggers permissibility –

### case

#### No uniqueness – most of Chinese militarization isn’t private

Lee-Singer, 21, “China’s Space Program Is More Military Than You Might Think”, 7/16/21, Defense One, P.W. Singer is Strategist at New America and the author of multiple books on technology and securityTaylor A. Lee is an analyst with BluePath Labs, a DC-based consulting company that focuses on research, analysis, disruptive technologies, and wargaming. URL <https://www.defenseone.com/ideas/2021/07/chinas-space-program-more-military-you-might-think/183790/>, KR

The militarized tilt of the Chinese space program complicates these plans. Space planning and directing organizations, the ground infrastructure supporting its space programs, and the taikonauts themselves are all under the purview of the People’s Liberation Army. Understanding these connections is important for any plans to cooperate with China in space, whether governmental or commercial.

On the organizational side, China’s equivalent to NASA is the civilian China National Space Administration, which has a focus on the space program’s international exchanges. It falls under the State Administration for Science, Technology and Industry for National Defense, which handles defense-related science and technology, including China’s state-owned defense conglomerates. However, unlike NASA, the CNSA doesn’t oversee China’s astronauts. The organization actually in charge of China’s manned space program is the China Manned Space Engineering Office, which is under China’s Central Military Commission Equipment Development Department.

Likewise, the infrastructure of China’s space program is also heavily militarized. The launch sites, control centers, and many of the satellites are directly run by the PLA. Taikonauts lift off from the Jiuquan Satellite Launch Center (aka Base 20 of the PLA’s Strategic Support Force, its space and cyber arm); directed by the PLASSF’s Beijing Aerospace Flight Control Center, with Telemetry, Tracking and Control support from the Xi’an Satellite Control Center (aka the PLASSF’s Base 26); and land at one of two sites in Inner Mongolia operated by the two bases.

#### No link:

#### Even if they’re right that they work on private projects to help each other – the larger iniative is space dominance which the aff doesn’t solve

#### their card literally says they’ve already militarized it so they don’t need alliances (which is what the impact ev is ABOUT, not alliances)

1AC Bowman and Thompson 3/31 [(Bradley Bowman, the senior director of the Center on Military and Political Power at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies) (Jared Thompson, a U.S. Air Force major and visiting military analyst at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies.) “Russia and China Seek to Tie America’s Hands in Space” Foreign Policy 3/31/2021. https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/03/31/russia-china-space-war-treaty-demilitarization-satellites/] BC

Consider the actions of the United States’ two great-power adversaries when it comes to anti-satellite weapons. China and Russia have sprinted to develop and deploy both ground-based and space-based weapons targeting satellites while simultaneously pushing the United States to sign a treaty banning such weapons.

To protect its vital space-based military capabilities—including communications, intelligence, and missile defense satellites—and effectively deter authoritarian aggression, Washington should avoid being drawn into suspect international treaties on space that China and Russia have no intention of honoring.

The Treaty on the Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space and of the Threat or Use of Force Against Outer Space Objects (PPWT), which Beijing and Moscow have submitted at the United Nations, is a perfect example. PPWT signatories commit “not to place any weapons in outer space.” It also says parties to the treaty may not “resort to the threat or use of force against outer space objects” or engage in activities “inconsistent” with the purpose of the treaty.

On the surface, that sounds innocuous. Who, after all, wants an arms race in space?

The reality, however, is that China and Russia are already racing to field anti-satellite weapons and have been for quite some time. “The space domain is competitive, congested, and contested,” Gen. James Dickinson, the head of U.S. Space Command, said in January. “Our competitors, most notably China and Russia, have militarized this domain.”

### AT: US Heg

#### Hegemony falling now, and trying to reverse ruins the economy but triggers counterbalancing --- multipolarity is best --- it doesn’t force US abdication but leads to a peaceful transition and world order

Preble 18 Christopher A. Preble, Christopher A. Preble is vice president for defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute and the author of “The Power Problem: How American Military Dominance Makes Us Less Safe, Less Prosperous and Less Free.” “Adapting to American Decline.” The New York Times. April 21, 2018. https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/21/opinion/sunday/adapting-to-american-decline.html

The news that Mike Pompeo, the C.I.A. director, met in secret with North Korea’s leader, Kim Jong-un, over the Easter weekend has renewed hope that one of the world’s most dangerous standoffs might be resolved without war. On Saturday, in fact, Mr. Kim announced that he would halt nuclear tests. Mr. Pompeo’s trip was surprising for many reasons: he went personally, it was kept a secret and it was revealed at a time when others were questioning his fitness to become secretary of state.

But it says something about America’s place in world affairs that at least one aspect of the trip was no surprise at all: that Americans are deeply, centrally involved in a dispute involving two sovereign countries thousands of miles away from Washington.

Of course, there’s a good historical reason. Under American tutelage, South Korea eventually evolved from a desperately poor autocracy to one of the wealthiest democracies on the planet. American taxpayers continue to spend billions of dollars a year to help maintain regional security. A similar process played out in other parts of Asia and in Europe, where the American security umbrella, including tens of thousands of military personnel, provided room for those countries’ leaders to build strong democracies and economies.

American leaders argued that such policies served the cause of global peace and security. They also reasoned that the substantial costs would be tolerable. And, so long as American productivity and workers’ wages were rising, it seemed that Uncle Sam could ensure a decent standard of living at home and security around the world.

It is becoming harder, though, for America to maintain this global posture. Eventually, it may become impossible, in part because we helped create the conditions that allowed other countries to prosper and grow. There may come a time, not too far in the future, when Americans would be surprised to hear that they are responsible for keeping peace on the Korean Peninsula.

Americans should be debating how to manage that transition in a way that avoids destabilizing the rest of the world. Unfortunately, if the current administration’s maneuvers between the two Koreas are any indication, this is the last thing on the minds of policymakers.

There is no question that America’s share of global wealth is shrinking. By some estimates, the United States accounted for roughly 50 percent of global output at the end of World War II. By 1985, its share stood at 22.5 percent. It has fallen to 15.1 percent today, and the [International Monetary Fund](http://www.imf.org/external/datamapper/PPPSH@WEO/WEOWORLD/USA) projects that it will slip to 13.7 percent by 2023.

The proliferation of various technologies — from crude explosives to advanced robotics — has made it easier for even relatively small and weak countries and nonstate actors to challenge the big and powerful United States. These days any truly determined country, even a very poor one like North Korea, can develop nuclear weapons to deter attacks.

Yet Americans may be the last people to recognize the changing shape of global power. It’s not that senior national security officials don’t understand that they have a problem. The Trump administration’s [National Defense Strategy](https://www.defense.gov/Portals/1/Documents/pubs/2018-National-Defense-Strategy-Summary.pdf), for example, speaks of “an ever more lethal and disruptive battlefield” and worrisome “trends” that “will challenge our ability to deter aggression.”

Its answer? Try harder.

The document predicts that America’s allies will lose faith and the country’s global influence will wane unless taxpayers commit to “devoting additional resources in a sustained effort to solidify our competitive advantage.”

The problem is, the United States already spends more on its military than the next seven or eight nations combined. Total annual expenditures, including for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, have averaged $561 billion since 2001. So, how much more must Americans spend to maintain a military edge sufficient to deter attacks against others?

About $196 billion more, on average, over the next five years. The Trump administration projects spending $3.78 trillion from 2019 to 2023, or $756.9 billion a year. Some doubt that even that will be enough.

Ideally, this additional spending will discourage others from challenging us. Even if it did, however, that would require Americans to accept less domestic spending, higher taxes or both in order to allow others to underspend on their militaries.

But what worked before might not work in the future. America’s insistence upon maintaining primacy at all costs may stimulate greater resistance from the likes of China and Russia. And the risk that the United States gets drawn into wars that it need not fight and cannot win will remain high, no matter how much we spend. We are faced with the prospect, then, of frequent uses of force — like the missile strike against suspected Syrian chemical weapons sites this month that even supporters admitted was unlikely, by itself, [to accomplish much](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/14/us/politics/trump-syria-policy.html).

There are, however, alternatives to simply spending more and trying harder. Of course, the easy, and unpalatable, options would hand over the reins of global leadership to China, or simply have American forces withdraw quickly and let the chips fall where they may.Instead, America should seek a new arrangement that asks the beneficiaries of today’s relatively peaceful and prosperous world order to make a meaningful contribution to maintaining it. The American security umbrella will stay aloft — and American military power will remain formidable — but others will need to do more.

Rather than treating allies like reckless teenagers who can’t be trusted without Uncle Sam’s constant supervision, or feckless weaklings that will jump at the chance to capitulate to rapacious neighbors, Washington should empower mature, like-minded states to deal with local challenges before they become regional or global crises.

Some countries, in fact, are already moving in this direction. South Korea has undertaken its own bilateral negotiations with North Korea. Unsettled by Donald Trump’s threats to renege on American security commitments, or offended by his attempt to extract tribute in exchange for American protection, these countries’ leaders are thinking seriously about different security arrangements. As Constanze Stelzenmüller explained [in a recent paper for the Brookings Institution](https://www.brookings.edu/research/normal-is-over/), Europeans, in particular, have an “existential” interest in “preserving an international order that safeguards peace and globalization.”

Of course, one purported advantage of an American-funded global security order is that it supposedly allows Washington to call the shots — and, naturally, some worry that its allies would show less deference and be less willing to comply with Washington’s dictates if they were less dependent upon American power. But that already happens: In fact, some allies have been known to act recklessly when they believe that America has their back. Look at the ruinous war that Saudi Arabia is waging in Yemen, one of the world’s poorest countries. Greater independence could induce greater caution.

And the benefits flow both ways. If Washington was slightly less confident that it could call the tune and expect others to dance, that might help America to avoid costly mistakes. Would the United States have invaded Iraq if it didn’t believe that other countries would help clean up after?

Transitioning to a world with many capable actors won’t be easy. It will require a deft hand to unwind defense arrangements, and patience as others find their way. Given their own domestic spending priorities and continued uncertainty about whether the United States will recommit to the old model, most American allies are likely to take a wait-and-see attitude. A gentle nudge might be needed to move them from comfortable adolescence to empowered adulthood.

The columnist Charles Krauthammer once cast [decline as a choice](http://www.weeklystandard.com/decline-is-a-choice/article/270813), as though, by mere force of will, the United States could remain atop the international order forever.

On the other hand, it was Mr. Krauthammer who in 1990 spoke of [America’s unipolar “moment”](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/1991-02-01/unipolar-moment) — a temporary state of affairs, occasioned by a unique set of circumstances that defined the first few years of the post-Cold War world. That world no longer exists. Wishing it back into existence won’t make it so.

The United States is the most important country in the world and will remain so for many years by virtue of its strong economy and prodigious military capabilities. But admitting that the United States is incapable of effectively adjudicating every territorial dispute or of thwarting every security threat in every part of the world is hardly tantamount to surrender. It is, rather, a wise admission of the limits of American power and an acknowledgment of the need to share the burdens, and the responsibilities, of dealing with a complex world. It is about seizing the opportunity to make changes that benefit us and others.

The alternative is a renewed commitment to discourage self-reliance among allies. That will be an undertaking far more onerous than any the United States has attempted since World War II — and one that is unlikely to work.

### General

#### Nation-centric approaches lead to a regulatory race to the bottom

Heise 18 -- Jack Heise (Judicial Law Clerk at U.S. Courts of Appeals), Space, the Final Frontier of Enterprise: Incentivizing Asteroid Mining Under a Revised International Framework, 40 Mich. J. Int'l L. 189 (2018). https://repository.law.umich.edu/mjil/vol40/iss1/5 WJ

However, a nation-centric, first possession framework has drawbacks that highlight the desirability of an international governance regime for as- teroid mining. First, the experience of colonization was one that prompted conflict between colonizers.122 The peaceful character of space is one of the great achievements of the OST, and it should not be jettisoned. Second, a regime characterized by national actors could spark a race to the bottom with respect to domestic regulation, leading to the same “flags of convenience” problem present in the maritime context as asteroid mining and spaceflight companies relocate to avoid taxes, labor and safety standards, and tort liability.123 An international framework, by contrast, could more easily prevent this problem by facilitating the creation of uniform standards for labor, safety, and liability, making relocation to under-regulated states a less attractive prospect. The drawbacks of a system governed by individual nations, in conjunction with the advantages of a global system illustrated above, point to the desirability of a revised framework governing asteroid mining that is international in character.
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