# 1NC

### speaks r neat

roses are red

violets are blue

if u gave me a 29.9

id be very happy

it rhymes: source, just trust me bro

### Th

#### Interpretation—the aff must disclose the affirmative speech document 30 minutes before round if asked preround.

#### Violation—they didn’t – screenshot in the doc

Graphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generated

Graphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generated

#### Vote neg for prep and clash—two internal links—

#### a) neg prep—4 minutes of prep is not enough to put together a coherent 1nc or update generics—30 minutes is necessary to learn a little about the affirmative and piece together what 1nc positions apply and cut and research their applications to the affirmative

#### b) aff quality— full aff disclosure discourages cheap shot affs. If the aff isn’t inherent or easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, it should lose—this will answer the 1ar’s claim about innovation—with 30 minutes of prep, there’s still an incentive to find a new strategic, well justified aff, but no incentive to cut a horrible, incoherent aff that the neg can’t check against the broader literature.

#### c) plantext disclosure doesn’t solve – we don’t have any context for what it means in offense of impacts meaning we still cant prep the 1nc

#### [D] Paradigm Issues

#### 1 – Drop the debater –

Deter future abuse

Promotes better disclosure norms

#### 2 - Comes before 1AR theory —

Any reason the 1nc was abusive was because of perceived aff abuse

#### 3 - Use competing interps –

Sets the best norms for debate

Reasonability is arbitrary

#### 4 - No RVIs –

Logic

Baiting

Should be able to check abuse

#### 5 – Fairness is a voter –

Constituve of debate

#### 6 – Education is a voter –

Only long term impact to debate

### NC

#### The meta-ethic is practical reason—

#### [1] Inescapability— I can question why to follow or the validity of an ethical theory, which concedes the authority of reason as if I question reason, I use reason to question. Outweighs on validity—any other truth risks falsity Reality may be fake, our experiences may be arbitrary, and experience may be descriptive not normative, but questioning the validity of reason requires reason, conceding its validity. Any other ethic begs the question of why, meaning it’s arbitrary and nonbinding

#### [2] Action theory— Only reason can explain why we take transitional action to an overall end. For example, setting the end of tea provides me a reason to unify the necessary actions to produce tea, like getting a pot, filling it with water, etc. Any other explanation fails since it can’t give meaning to why we take transitioning action – freezing action. 2 Impacts—

#### [a] That’s a side constraint on the AC—ethics is a guide to action so it must appeal to a structure of action.

#### [b] Bindingness—reason is intrinsic to actions since only it can provide value to transitioning action, which justifies universality

#### That justifies universality—

#### If we are all reasoners, we must all be able to determine if an action is good. An action that maximizes my freedom at the cost of others then would have to be recognized as good by everyone, but that leads to a contradiction where everyone takes other’s freedoms to maximize theirs, making it impossible to reach my end

#### Thus, the standard is respecting a system of inner and outer freedom

#### Offense

#### Property rights in space have to be consistent with international law – key to avoiding disputes.

Simberg ’12 [(Rand, MSE in technical management from West Coast University, recognized as an expert in space transportation by the Office of Technology Assessment) “Homesteading the Final Frontier A Practical Proposal for Securing Property Rights in Space,” Competitive Enterprise Institute, April 2012, [https://cei.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/Rand-Simberg-Homesteading-the-Final-Frontier.pdf]//](https://cei.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/Rand-Simberg-Homesteading-the-Final-Frontier.pdf%5d//) recut akhileshp

But is it true that any recognition of off-planet property claims is de facto a violation of the Outer Space Treaty? Not necessarily. For instance, one could argue that the existence of the Moon Treaty is in and of itself a refutation of the notion that the Outer Space Treaty outlaws private property in space, or else there would be no need for another treaty that essentially explicitly does so. And there is at least one potential loophole that could be exploited by appropriately worded legislation. There are two key assumptions in the legal argument used by opponents of off-planet property claims: 1) that the recognition by a government would only recognize claims by its own citizens; and 2) that it would defend them by force. That need not necessarily be so. Under the treaty, it would in fact be possible for a government, or group of governments, to recognize the property claims of anyone who met specified conditions, regardless of their citizenship or nationality. Such cooperation would obviate the need for physical force to defend claims. The argument that the treaty permits individual property rights was actually made from the very beginning. In 1969, two years after the treaty went into force, the late distinguished space-law professor, Stephen Gorove, noted that under it, “[A]n individual acting on his own behalf or on behalf of another individual or a private association or an international organization could lawfully appropriate any part of outer space, including the [M]oon and other celestial bodies.”32 This clearly provides support for the concept of individual claims off planet under Article II.

#### Deontology’s theorization of humans being valuable as ends in themselves not just means necessitates privatization because each individuals ownership over themselves is converted into ownership of objects over space

Blodger 16 [Ian Blodger The Minnesota Journal of Law, Science & Technology 2016 Reclassifying Geostationar Reclassifying Geostationary Earth Orbit as Priv th Orbit as Private Property: Why ty: Why Natural Law and Utilitarian Theories of Property Demand Privatization <https://scholarship.law.umn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1006&context=mjlst> ]//aaditg

--Works w any NC that defends natural rights

--Geo = geostationary earth orbit

Analyzing the situation first from a Lockean perspective, GEO should be open to private ownership when individuals have invested their labor in the space.93 Companies that currently have satellites in orbit have invested time and resources sufficient to attain a property right in the orbital zone.94 Looking to the theories of Lockes work, which argue that an increase in value is a necessary condition for labor, satellites in GEO clearly meet the standard.95 Since space is essentially void,96 a satellites presence will increase the value of the space by generating industry and allowing for communications and other activities, which were not possible because that space was empty to begin with.97 One argument against this theory is that the space is at its highest value as void, since the voided area itself allows for travel through that point on future space missions.98 However, this argument would overstate the need for a spacecraft to cross the very narrow belt of satellites in GEO.99 It is also possible to argue that the satellite would produce higher values elsewhere, suggesting an opportunity cost and thus a net loss compared to the current location.100 However, this argument relies on the fluctuating value of the satellite and not the value of the GEO. Since the party launching the satellite already owns it, the question of its value has no bearing on whether they have improved the GEO area for purposes of Lockes theory.101 Thus, under this interpretation of Lockes labor requirement, the space is sufficiently increased in value so that it can be considered property. The same conclusion results under different interpretations of Lockes theory of property. The more general interpretation of Lockes theory is that any time someone interacts with something with the purpose of bringing about a better result, then that interaction constitutes labor and confers a property right in the object.102 The satellites themselves currently occupy a physical location, which does not change relative to Earths position.103 This position prevents other satellites from entering a wide area around the existing satellite, and prevents other satellites from transmitting on frequencies, which are already in use.104 These qualities denote at least a transitive interaction between the person and the GEO area through the satellite, since it was the individuals purpose to place the satellite in that location. Lockes example of tilling the land suggests that transitive relationships between a person and the object of his action are sufficient to confer a property interest.105 Thus, tilling and planting do not necessarily require the actor to physically touch the soil with his body, but rather allow him to do so through the use of tools.106 In the context of a satellite as well, the person who sends the satellite into orbit has a connection with his property and that of the orbital zone.107 This makes sense on the metaphysical level. For Locke, the reason a persons labor converts common areas into private zones is because each person owns his body.108 Here, ownership over the body is converted into ownership over a satellite, and that satellite is used in an exertion of great labor to settle a voided location in space.109 Since a person owns the fruits of his labor, a satellite owner gains a property interest in the GEO occupied by his satellite.110 Therefore under this reading of Lockes theory, anyone who places a satellite in geostationary orbit should be conferred a property right in that space. The labor need not alter the orbit itself, since the orbit is simply a scientific property of a location in space allowing the satellite to remain in a fixed point relative to the earth.111 In this way, the satellite is no different from a house built on Earth since both are bound to a fixed point, and improve the area generally.112 It could be argued that the house inherently alters the ground beneath it by laying foundations and is therefore distinct from a satellite that simply occupies a position. However, pouring concrete in an Earth bound location is the same kind of action taken by placing a satellite in a location bound to Earth, just farther away. Placing a satellite in orbit is similar to transporting materials from one area and erecting them in another location which does confer a property right under Lockes theory (just as a farmer might harvest trees and transport them to his plot to build a house, so the scientist combines electronic components and shoots them off to GEO to make a functioning satellite).113 Spaces lack of matter makes little difference to the question of whether the actor invested labor in a specific location.114

#### Space Commercialization is the extension of free market – every transaction is voluntary and no coercion is involved

Sowers’19 [George Sowers, professor of practice in mechanical engineering at Colorado School of Mines. Space News. “Op-ed | Commercializing Space: Before a commercial LEO market can flourish, the ISS must be retired” March 19, 2019 <https://spacenews.com/op-ed-commercializing-space-before-a-commercial-leo-market-can-flourish-the-iss-must-be-retired/>] //aaditg

The last two decades have seen a great upswing in commercial space endeavors with hundreds of new companies formed and a few prominent billionaires entering the fray. This is all good, but it remains devilishly hard to make money in space without tapping into government space markets. Nevertheless, I’m a firm believer that the commercialization of space is absolutely essential for the growth of the space economy and achieving all of the goals we espouse for human activities in space. So, what do I mean by commercial space? This has been a great topic of debate ever since NASA initiated the commercial cargo and commercial crew programs. There are many definitions and which is appropriate depends on the context. The real distinction is between the public sector and the private sector. Any given space activity can include a mixture of both elements. The purest form of commercial activity takes place entirely within the private sector. It is performed by private-sector companies for the benefit of private-sector customers using private-sector capital. Something like Direct TV would be an example. At the other end of the spectrum is a pure public-sector activity where the activity is performed entirely by public-sector agencies using public-sector employees, entirely funded by public funds for a public purpose. An example would be SLS, but even it is not purely public as several private sector companies are employed. In between are all manner of hybrids involving a mix of investment funds, executing entities and customers. When I talk about commercializing space, I’m talking about growing the purely private sector part of the space economy while recognizing that the space economy in total intertwines public and private in many complex ways. Given that government funding of space activities will likely not grow much, any growth in the overall space economy must come from the private sector. ECON 101 Now the only economic system that can reliability deliver growth is the free market. Some people call it capitalism, but I prefer free market as being more descriptive and without the negative connotations that have arisen around the term capitalism. The free market is based on the principle of economic freedom. That is, every transaction that occurs between one or more parties is completely voluntary. No coercion of any kind is involved. For example, when you walk into a grocery store and buy a bag of apples, no one forced you to do it. It was your choice. And no one forced the store to sell apples. It was their choice. The transaction is governed by a price, the value of the exchange amenable to both the buyer and the seller. In that sense, every free market transaction is a win-win situation for both sides. Each gained something. You gained some tasty apples, and the store made a small profit. Of course, there is competition within the free market. That’s one of its strengths. But the competition is between sellers to attract the business of the buyers or consumers as they’re known. Competition among sellers results in choices for consumers, and we all like choices. The supermarket across the street may attract your business by offering more selection or better quality or lower prices or better service. It short, it must provide more value where value is defined by you, the individual consumer.

#### Private entities utilize their own property and resources to fund and conduct space exploration which means – Prohibition of it is a violation of a) Their ability to use their own property (like their rocketships or fuel) to set their ends in space and b). Their freedom to explore unknown horizons such as space.

### CP

#### CP: The appropriation of outer space is unjust except for current Starlink satellites in LEO during the Russia Ukraine War

-we defend current starlink satellites are excluded from their regulations

#### Starlink is providing the only connectivity to Ukrainians

Rachel Lerman, and Cat Zakrzewski, Elon Musk’s Starlink is keeping Ukrainians online when traditional Internet fails Washington Post March 20. 2022 12:20AM https://www.theday.com/article/20220320/NWS13/220329964

Ukraine has already received thousands of antennas from Musk’s companies and European allies, which has proved “very effective,” Fedorov said in an interview with The Washington Post Friday. “The quality of the link is excellent,” Fedorov said through a translator, using a Starlink connection from an undisclosed location. “We are using thousands, in the area of thousands, of terminals with new shipments arriving every other day.” The use of Starlink as a stopgap measure for citizens and the government to stay connected during an invasion is a major test of the relatively new technology, experts say, and could have widespread implications for the future of war. Internet has become an essential tool for communication, staying informed and even powering weapons. It’s also a test for Musk. The world’s richest man, valued at $232 billion according to the Bloomberg Billionaire‘s Index, makes a habit of turning to Twitter for brash promises and proclamations in the midst of world crises. Already this week, the Tesla CEO has challenged Putin to a fight and followed up by pledging he would use just one hand if Putin was scared. And he told Putin he could bring a bear. He has fallen short on some past pledges, including making ventilators for coronavirus patients and efforts to help rescue Thai children stuck in a cave. But this time, Fedorov and some experts say he’s come through. Tesla employees in Europe reportedly assembled systems to help power Starlink in Ukraine, and Fedorov said other European countries have sent Starlink equipment from their own supplies. Musk responded to a request for comment on his efforts with Starlink and past efforts, telling The Post to give his regards “to your puppet master Besos😘😘.” (Amazon founder Jeff Bezos owns The Post.) Musk did not respond to a follow-up request specifically on his work with Starlink in Ukraine. SpaceX declined to comment on its work in Ukraine. Internet disruptions can be caused by power outages or by fiber optic cables being cut as a result of shelling, experts said. The Starlink technology is being used by civilians in areas under attack that have lost Internet service, and by government officials. Starlink terminals have also been provided to help the country’s tech companies stay online when the war has forced them to relocate. The Times of London reports that a Ukrainian unit is using Starlink to connect its drones attacking Russian forces. Starlink has grown quickly in recent years, surpassing some satellite Internet competitors by launching more than 1,000 satellites into space. People can buy the service online for $99 a month, plus $499 for the equipment, but Starlink cautions it can take six or more months to ship in some cases. A person familiar with Starlink’s effort in Ukraine, speaking on the condition of anonymity to discuss sensitive matters, said there are more than 5,000 terminals in the country. Still, experts said that even a big Starlink network probably wouldn’t be enough power to keep an entire country online and operating at full-speed. But the terminals can serve as a reliable backup as Internet services falter. Fedorov said he and his staff are having discussions with other European leaders and companies about additional satellite and cellular technologies that could help keep Ukrainians online in the event of greater Internet outages. Internet flows deteriorated on the first day of Russia’s invasion of Ukraine on Feb. 24 and have not fully recovered, according to data-monitoring services. But since that initial dip, connectivity has remained fairly stable, with mainly temporary, isolated outages even during heavy Russian shelling. “Every day there are outages, but generally service comes back,” said Doug Madory, director of Internet analysis for Kentik, which monitors global data flows. Even before Fedorov tweeted at Musk for help, SpaceX was working on a way to get Starlink to Ukraine. President and COO Gwynne Shotwell said in a talk at California Institute of Technology this month that the company had been working for several weeks to get regulatory approval to allow the satellites to communicate in Ukraine. “But then they tweeted,” she said, according to SpaceNews. “There’s our permission.” Fedorov’s agency is working to get Starlink terminals to regions where Internet access has been cut off, he said. The systems have in some instances been used to connect people when cellular networks in the country have been overloaded. Fedorov said that he’s briefly texted with Musk and that the tech billionaire has also had a call with Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky. There are some concerns that accompany the use of the terminals. Like all satellite communications during war, Starlink signals could be used to detect the location of the antennas, experts say. While it’s unclear if Russia can use the signals to target attacks, Musk instructed caution on Twitter. “Important warning: Starlink is the only non-Russian communications system still working in some parts of Ukraine, so probability of being targeted is high,” he tweeted. He added that users should turn on the terminal only when needed and keep it far away from people. Experts have warned that the devices could give away Ukrainians’ locations to Russian attackers, but that hasn’t been an issue so far, Fedorov said. The devices have usually been used in “densely populated areas where there would be a lot of civilians anyway.” He said Russian cyberattacks have not ramped up on the systems — yet.

#### Starlink is in LEO

[Adam Mann](https://www.space.com/author/adam-mann) , [Tereza Pultarova](https://www.space.com/author/tereza-pultarova) , [Elizabeth Howell](https://www.space.com/author/elizabeth-howell) 4/14/22 Starlink: SpaceX's satellite internet project https://www.space.com/spacex-starlink-satellites.html

SpaceX's satellite internet proposal [was announced](https://www.space.com/28305-spacex-satellite-internet-seattle.html) in January 2015. Though it wasn't given a name at the time, CEO [Elon Musk](https://www.space.com/18849-elon-musk.html) said that the company had filed documents with international regulators to place about 4,000 satellites in low [Earth](https://www.space.com/54-earth-history-composition-and-atmosphere.html) orbit. We're really talking about something which is, in the long term, like rebuilding the internet in space," Musk said during a speech in Seattle when revealing the project. (Musk also owns electric car company Tesla, but Tesla does not produce satellites.) Musk's initial estimate of the number of satellites soon grew, as he hoped to capture a part of the estimated $1 trillion worldwide internet connectivity market to help achieve [his Mars colonization vision](https://www.space.com/spacex-starlink-internet-satellites-mars-colonization.html). The U.S. Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has granted SpaceX permission to fly 12,000 Starlink satellites, and the company has filed paperwork with an international regulator to loft [up to 30,000 additional spacecraft](https://www.space.com/spacex-30000-more-starlink-satellites.html). To put that into perspective, as of Jan. 5 2022, 12,480 satellites have been launched in all of history with only 4,900 still active, [according to the European Space Agency](https://www.esa.int/Safety_Security/Space_Debris/Space_debris_by_the_numbers). SpaceX launched its first two Starlink test craft, named TinTinA and TinTinB, in February 2018. The mission went smoothly. Based on initial data, the company asked regulators for its fleet to be allowed to operate at lower altitudes than originally planned, [and the FCC agreed](https://licensing.fcc.gov/cgi-bin/ws.exe/prod/ib/forms/attachment_menu.hts?id_app_num=128513&acct=599269&id_form_num=15&filing_key=-425955). The [first 60 Starlink satellites](https://www.space.com/spacex-launches-60-starlink-internet-satellites.html) launched on May 23, 2019, aboard a SpaceX [Falcon 9 rocket](https://www.space.com/18962-spacex-falcon-9.html). The satellites successfully reached their operational altitude of 340 miles (550 kilometers) — low enough to get pulled down to Earth by atmospheric drag in a few years so that they don't become space junk once they die.

#### Starlink is essential to securing Ukrainian win against Russia

#### First, connectivity is key to morale, foreign support, and Russian infighting

Aral, Sinal, David Austin Professor of Management, IT, Marketing and Data Science at MIT,Director of the MIT Initiative on the Digital Economy, Ph.D. in Information Systems from MIT) “Ukraine is winning the information war,” Washington Post, 3/1/2022 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2022/03/01/information-war-zelensky-ukraine-putin-russia/>

Today, the information war in Ukraine is more intense, more tightly contested and arguably more important than ever because motivating volunteer fighters at home and encouraging foreign support abroad are critical to success. And this time, it seems, Russia is losing. Reports abound on social media of more than 4,000 Russian casualties, images of crippled Russian helicopters and armored vehicles and cellphone videos of savage Russian missile attacks on civilian targets. This mix of official Ukrainian war statistics combined with videos (both verified and unverified), posted by Ukrainian citizens and sympathizers from the front lines, is painting a vivid picture of a homegrown resistance successfully slowing the advance of a much larger and ostensibly better organized military machine. Facebook posts showing Ukrainians kneeling in front of tanks to stop their progress and Twitter images of women and children sheltering in subways and basements set the emotional backdrop of senseless aggression against a peaceful nation. Viral videos and audio clips evoke a defiant optimism impossible to ignore: Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky appearing via his cellphone walking the streets of Kyiv, unharmed, in a “proof of life” demonstration emphasizing his willingness to stay and fight for his country, despite a U.S. offer to evacuate him, for example, or the recording of soldiers in an isolated Ukrainian outpost on Snake Island, in the Black Sea, cursing and telling off the Russian Black Sea Fleet. These stories are spreading rapidly on social media and subsequently echoing through official news channels in a media feedback loop that amplifies the information war and broadcasts it on television sets all over the world. Zelensky, in particular, is deftly outmaneuvering Putin in this information war. He rallied Ukrainian men to defend their homeland, used the encrypted messaging platform Telegram to speak directly to the Russian people to counter Putin’s narrative, urged the West to step up its assistance in defense of law, order and peace, and even pleaded with foreigners to cross the border into Ukraine to defend Western democracy. While misinformation exists on both sides, Zelensky gives the impression that he’s more committed to truth and transparency. In contrast, Russia has been secretive, obfuscating the true extent of its incursion into Ukraine, and out of touch, airing the rambling addresses of its leader. It’s as if Putin has forgotten that social media transitioned from text to real-time video around the time of the Crimean annexation. In today’s information war, Russian news claiming Zelensky had turned tail and fled was swiftly countered by a video selfie of the Ukrainian president in Kyiv, vowing to defend his homeland. The symbolic contrast between Zelensky striding through war-torn streets, confident even under fire, and Putin, seated, hunched over a large wooden desk in the safety of a secure office hundreds of miles away from the fighting, is stark. This time, Facebook, YouTube, Twitter and Google are also proactively engaged in the information war. During the Crimean annexation, they were reactive and struggled to keep up with misinformation and false abuse reports. Today, in Ukraine, they have banned Russian state-owned media from advertising on their platforms and defiantly fact-checked Putin’s propaganda despite Russia’s protests and a full ban of Twitter and a partial ban of Facebook in Russia. Facebook has spun up a special operations center, staffed with native Russian and Ukrainian speakers, to monitor misinformation posted about the war, added warning labels to war-related images that its software detects are more than a year old, and restricted access to content from the state-affiliated Russian media outlets RT and Sputnik. YouTube is restricting access to Russian state-owned media outlets for users in Ukraine, removing Russian state-owned channels from recommendations, and limiting their content’s reach across the platform. Twitter has temporarily banned all ads in Ukraine and Russia, added labels to tweets with links to Russian state-affiliated media and downranked their content in algorithmic timelines. While numerous fake videos are circulating on TikTok about Ukraine, the Chinese-owned platform has no comprehensive policy on policing information about the conflict. Despite blocking state-owned Russian media in the European Union, this information flows freely in Ukraine and Russia on the platform, now dubbed “WarTok” by some observers, in part because it is organizing such videos into a convenient discover playlist by the same name. The information war is critical to what happens next in Ukraine for several reasons. It motivates the resistance by inspiring Ukrainian citizens to take up arms in defense of their country and motivating them with social proof that they are united and not fighting alone. It encourages foreign assistance, pressuring Europe and the United States to step up their efforts to end the conflict. It fans the flames of protest in Russia, mobilizing the antiwar movement in Moscow and elsewhere in defiance of Putin’s aggression. And it may even eventually demoralize Russian troops, who must be wondering what on earth they are doing in Ukraine if the motivation for the intervention has been a lie all along. When Russia struck a Ukrainian television tower on Tuesday, it seemed to confirm Moscow’s keen awareness of the need to counter Ukraine’s information war and to highlight the importance of information in modern conflicts. Information campaigns are difficult to quantify during the fog of war. But while it is hard to pinpoint the extent to which the information war is contributing to the overwhelming international unity against Putin’s aggression, one thing is clear: Social media, mainstream media and the narrative framing of the invasion of Ukraine undoubtedly will play an important role in how this conflict ends. Now, vigilance and fortitude are not only needed on the battlefield, where lives and territory will be won and lost, but also will be essential online, where the hearts and minds of the world will be won or lost.

#### Second, Starlink is key to surveillance and attacks

Brodkin, Jon, Starlink helps Ukraine’s elite drone unit target and destroy Russian tanks Ars Technica, 3/21/2022, https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2022/03/starlink-helps-ukraines-elite-drone-unit-target-and-destroy-russian-tanks/

SpaceX's Starlink Internet is proving to be useful for Ukraine's military as it fights the Russian invasion. In an article Friday titled, "Elon Musk's Starlink helping Ukraine to win the drone war," The Telegraph described how the satellite connection helps the Ukrainian army's Aerorozvidka (Aerial Reconnaissance) unit do its work of "using surveillance and attack drones to target Russian tanks and positions." The Telegraph wrote: Amid Internet and power outages, which are expected to get worse, Ukraine is turning to the newly available Starlink system for some of its communications. Drone teams in the field, sometimes in badly connected rural areas, are able to use Starlink to connect them to targeters and intelligence on their battlefield database. They can direct the drones to drop anti-tank munitions, sometimes flying up silently to Russian forces at night as they sleep in their vehicles. The Ukrainian unit's "most sophisticated drones are connected using Starlink," The Times of London wrote. "If we use a drone with thermal vision at night, the drone must connect through Starlink to the artillery guy and create target acquisition," an Aerorozvidka officer told the paper. The Times wrote that Aerorozvidka "has been picking off tanks, command trucks, and vehicles carrying electronic equipment since the invasion began," destroying dozens of "priority targets."

#### Ukrainian victory shores up global democracy – the alternative is mass genocide – that’s a decision rule

Applebaum, Anne, Senior Fellow Johns Hopkins School Advanced International Studies Ukraine Must Win, The Atlantic, 3/22/2022, https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2022/03/how-democracy-can-win-ukraine/627125/

Russian planners expected the entire war, the conquest of Ukraine, to last no more than six weeks. More than half that time has already passed. There must be an endgame, a moment when the conflict stops. The Ukrainians, and the democratic powers that support Ukraine, must work toward a goal. That goal should not be a truce, or a muddle, or a decision to maintain some kind of Ukrainian resistance over the next decade, or a vow to “bleed Russia dry,” or anything else that will prolong the fighting and the instability. That goal should be a Ukrainian victory. Before you can achieve something, you have to imagine what it will look like. And in this war, victory can be imagined without difficulty. It means that Ukraine remains a sovereign democracy, with the right to choose its own leaders and make its own treaties. There will be no pro-Russian puppet regime in Kyiv, no need for a prolonged Ukrainian resistance, no continued fighting. The Russian army retreats back over the borders. Maybe those borders could change, or maybe Ukraine could pledge neutrality, but that is for the Ukrainians to decide and not for outsiders to dictate. Maybe international peacekeepers are needed. Whatever happens, Ukraine must have strong reasons to believe that Russian troops will not quickly return. Imagine, too, the consequences of such a victory. In Washington, most people have long believed that Ukraine is part of a regional conflict, and that Ukraine is a piece of territory that the Russians care more about than we do and always will. But this is no longer true. The Ukrainians, and especially their president, Volodymyr Zelensky, have made their cause a global one by arguing that they fight for a set of universal ideas—for democracy, yes, but also for a form of civic nationalism, based on patriotism and a respect for the rule of law; for a peaceful Europe, where disputes are resolved by institutions and not warfare; for resistance to dictatorship. Zelensky has urged Americans to remember Pearl Harbor. He appealed to the German Parliament with the phrase “Never again”—a mantra used to mean that no Hitler would be allowed to arise again—and told members that, in light of the brutal war in his country, those words are now “worthless.” He called on the European Parliament to “prove that you indeed are Europeans” and admit Ukraine to the European Union. This language is effective because it evokes the principles that bind together the majority of Europeans, Americans, and many other people around the world, reminding them of how much worse the world was in the bloodier past, and how much worse it could be in the future if those principles no longer matter. The words Zelensky uses also reverberate because they are true. A victory for Ukraine really will be a victory for all who believe in democracy and the rule of law. Citizens of existing democracies and members of the democratic opposition in Russia, Cuba, Belarus, and Hong Kong will all be emboldened. “Their struggle is ours,” a Venezuelan acquaintance told me last week. The institutions protecting the states that embody those ideas, most notably the European Union and NATO, will be strengthened too. Zelensky’s words resonated further because the Russians have also given this conflict enormous significance. The Russian foreign minister has just declared that this war will change global politics: “This is not about Ukraine at all, but the world order. The current crisis is a fateful, epoch-making moment in modern history. It reflects the battle over what the world order will look like.” Much as Stalin once declared that, when the Second World War ended, “everyone imposes his own system as far as his army can reach,” President Vladimir Putin had planned for the Russian army to impose Russia’s autocratic, kleptocratic political system on all of Ukraine. Already, the Russian occupation of some eastern-Ukrainian towns resembles the Soviet occupation of Central Europe at the end of World War II. Public officials and civic leaders—mayors and police but also members of Parliament, journalists, museum curators—have been arrested and not seen since. Civilians have been terrorized at random. In Mariupol, authorities report that citizens are being forcibly deported to Russia, just as Soviet secret police deported Balts, Poles, and others to Russia after the invasions of 1939 and 1945. In the case of a Russian victory, these tactics would be applied all over Ukraine, creating mass terror, mass violence, and instability for years to come. And, yes, if we accept that outcome, autocrats from Minsk to Caracas to Beijing will take note: Genocide is now allowed*.*

#### Democracy solves great power war.

Larry **Diamond 19**. PhD in Sociology, professor of Sociology and Political Science at Stanford University. “Ill Winds: Saving Democracy from Russian Rage, Chinese Ambition and American Complacency,” Kindle Edition

In such a near future, my fellow experts would no longer talk of “democratic erosion.” We would be spiraling downward into a time of democratic despair, recalling Daniel Patrick Moynihan’s grim observation from the 1970s that liberal democracy “is where the world was, not where it is going.” 5 The world pulled out of that downward spiral—but it took new, more purposeful American leadership. The planet was not so lucky in the 1930s, when the **global implosion of democracy** led to a **catastrophic world war**, between a rising axis of emboldened dictatorships and a shaken and economically depressed collection of selfdoubting democracies. These are the stakes. Expanding democracy—with its liberal norms and constitutional commitments—is a **crucial foundation** for **world peace and security**. Knock that away, and our most basic hopes and assumptions will be imperiled. The problem is not just that the ground is slipping. It is that we are **perched on a global precipice**. That ledge has been gradually giving way for a decade. If the **erosion** continues, we **may** well reach a **tipping point** where **democracy goes bankrupt** suddenly—plunging the world into **depths of oppression** and **aggression** that we have **not seen since** the end of **World War II**. As a political scientist, I know that our theories and tools are not nearly good enough to tell us just how close we are getting to that point—until it happens.