## three tier

#### Our interpretation is that affirmatives must enact the resolution through a three-tier process.

Reid-Brinkley 8 – PhD from UGA, professor of communications at the University of Pittsburgh (Shanara, “THE HARSH REALITIES OF “ACTING BLACK”: HOW AFRICAN-AMERICAN POLICY DEBATERS NEGOTIATE REPRESENTATION THROUGH RACIAL PERFORMANCE AND STYLE”)

The process of signifyin’ engaged in by the Louisville debaters is not simply designed to critique the use of traditional evidence. As Green argues, their goal is to “challenge the relationship between social power and knowledge.”57 In other words, those with social power within the debate community are able to produce and determine “legitimate” knowledge. These legitimating practices usually function to maintain the dominance of normative knowledge-making practices, while crowding out or directly excluding alternative knowledge-making 83 practices. The Louisville “framework looks to the people who are oppressed by current constructions of power.”58 Jones and Green offer an alternative framework for drawing claims in debate speeches, they refer to it as a three-tier process: A way in which you can validate our claims, is through the three-tier process. And we talk about personal experience, organic intellectuals, and academic intellectuals. Let me give you an analogy. If you place an elephant in the room and send in three blind folded people into the room, and each of them are touching a different part of the elephant. And they come back outside and you ask each different person they gone have a different idea about what they was talking about. But, if you let those people converse and bring those three different people together then you can achieve a greater truth.59 Jones argues that without the three tier process debate claims are based on singular perspectives that privilege those with institutional and economic power. The Louisville debaters do not reject traditional evidence per se, instead they seek to augment or supplement what counts as evidence with other forms of knowledge produced outside of academia. As Green notes in the double-octo-finals at CEDA Nationals, “Knowledge surrounds me in the streets, through my peers, through personal experiences, and everyday wars that I fight with my mind.”60 The thee-tier process: personal experience, organic intellectuals, and traditional evidence, provides a method of argumentation that taps into diverse forms of knowledge-making practices. With the Louisville method, personal experience and organic intellectuals are placed on par with traditional forms of evidence. While the Louisville debaters see the benefit of academic research, they are also critically aware of the normative practices that exclude racial and ethnic minorities from policy-oriented discussions because of their lack of training and expertise. Such exclusions prevent radical solutions to racism, classism, sexism, and homophobia from being more permanently addressed. According to Green: bell hooks talks about how when we rely solely on one perspective to make our claims, radical liberatory theory becomes rootless. That’s the reason why we use a three-tiered process. That’s why we use alternative forms of discourse such as hip hop. That’s also how we use traditional evidence and our personal narratives so you don’t get just one perspective claiming to be the right way. Because it becomes a more meaningful and educational view as far as how we achieve our education.61 The use of hip hop and personal experience function as a check against the homogenizing function of academic and expert discourse. Note the reference to bell hooks. Green argues that without alternative perspectives, “radical libratory theory becomes rootless.” The term rootless seems to refer to a lack of grounded-ness in the material circumstances that academics or experts study. In other words, academics and experts by definition represent an intellectual population with a level of objective distance from that which they study. For the Louisville debaters, this distance is problematic as it prevents the development of a social politic that is rooted in the community of those most greatly affected by the status of oppression.

#### Vote Neg:

#### 1 – Distancing DA – normative knowledge-making practices are steeped in expert vernaculars that crowd-out minority participation – exploration-sans policy analysis sans the three-tiers leads to distancing that demobilizes politics.

#### 2 – Access – not only are privileged debaters forced to acknowledge the structural advantages of their social location and encouraged to mobilize as accomplices to minority debaters, but students confront how lived experience shapes knowledge – their model instills a view from nowhere that encourages passing privilege.

#### 3 – Presumption – absent an affective connection towards space exploration, minority debaters become parasitically invested in imaginary futures which never materialize – turns case.

#### 4 – Pornotroping – the 1AC utilizes suffering as a currency to trade in exchange for ballots which commodifies experience and fosters ivory tower detachment from material suffering – turns the aff because they recreate cruel optimism.

#### 5 – TVA – Defend radical poetry as a method of entrenched, performative resistance against the logic of space exploration or introduce a petition towards the same goal.

#### Voters –

#### 1 -- Fairness – you need fairness to evaluate debate rounds unfair advantages in debate rounds make decisions illegitimate and hurt our ability to access real world skills

#### 2 – education –it’s the reason schools fund debate and the only portable skills we gain from debate are a result of education – knowing how to discuss the merits of broad policy options has more real world implications than knowing how to go for an rvi or knowing how to defend policies that are so obscure they’d never be passed.

#### Paradigm issues –

#### 1 – No RVIs

#### a] logic – you don’t get to win just for proving you’re topical

#### b] chilling effect – rvis disincentivize debaters from checking abuse

#### c] theory baiting – rvis incentivize affs to be as unnegatable as possible so they can bait t or theory and win

#### 2 – competing interpretations over reasonability

#### a] arbitrariness – reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention

#### b] brightlines mean competing interps – it becomes a debate of whose brightline is best which is the same thing as competing interps – you’re debating about whose model is best

#### 3 – drop the debater

#### a] logic – drop the argument doesn’t make sense – the shell indics their entire advocacy

#### b] severance – if they go for drop the argument it’s severance and an independent reason to negate – kicking out of the aff no-links all neg offense and forces us to restart and finish the debate in the 2nr

## queer pess k

#### Heteronormativity and the hyperfocus on the future places the figurative child and queer people in opposition and demonizes queer people

Edelman 04 (Lee Edelman, Duke University Press, 2004, Durham and London, “No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive”, December 6, 2004, 978-0-8223-8598-1, [https:/](https://bagelabyss.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/no_future__queer_theory_and_the_death_drive.pdf)[bagelabyss.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/no\_future\_\_queer\_theory\_and\_the\_death\_drive.pdf](http://bagelabyss.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/no_future__queer_theory_and_the_death_drive.pdf), pg 20-22) SJ

Thus, while lesbians and gay men by the thousands work for the right to marry, to serve in the military, to adopt and raise children of their own, the political right, refusing to acknowledge these comrades in reproductive futurism, counters their efforts by inviting us to kneel at the shrine of the sacred Child: the Child who might witness lewd or inappropriately intimate behavior; the Child who might find information about dangerous ‘‘lifestyles’’ on the Internet; the Child who might choose a pro-vocative book from the shelves of the public library; the Child, in short, who might find an enjoyment that would nullify the figural value, itself imposed by adult desire, of the Child as unmarked by the adult’s adulterating implication in desire itself; the Child, that is, made to image, for the satisfaction of adults, an Imaginary fullness that’s considered to want, and therefore to want for, nothing. As Lauren Berlant argues force-fully at the outset of The Queen of America Goes to Washington City, ‘‘a nation made for adult citizens has been replaced by one imagined for fetuses and children.’’22On every side, our enjoyment of liberty is eclipsed by the lengthening shadow of a Child whose freedom to develop undisturbed by encounters, or even by the threat of potential encounters, with an ‘‘otherness’’ of which its parents, its church, or the state do not ap-prove, uncompromised by any possible access to what is painted as alien desire, terroristically holds us all in check and determines that political discourse conform to the logic of a narrative wherein history unfolds as the future envisioned for a Child who must never grow up. Not for nothing, after all, does the historical construction of the homosexual as distinctive social type overlap with the appearance of such literary creations as Tiny Tim, David Balfour, and Peter Pan, who enact, in an imperative most evident today in the uncannily intimate connection between Harry Potter and Lord Voldemort, a Symbolic resistance to the unmarried men(Scrooge, Uncle Ebenezer, Captain Hook) who embody, as Voldemort’s name makes clear, a wish, a will, or a drive toward death that entails the destruction of the Child. That Child, immured in an innocence seen as continuously under seige, condenses a fantasy of vulnerability to the queerness of queer sexualities precisely insofar as that Child enshrines, in its form as sublimation, the very value for which queerness regularly finds itself condemned: an insistence on sameness that intends to re-store an Imaginary past. The Child, that is, marks the fetishistic fixation of heteronormativity: an erotically charged investment in the rigid same-ness of identity that is central to the compulsory narrative of reproductive futurism. And so, as the radical right maintains, the battle against queers is a life-and-death struggle for the future of a Child whose ruin is pursued by feminists, queers, and those who support the legal avail-ability of abortion. Indeed, as the Army of God made clear in the bomb-making guide it produced for the assistance of its militantly ‘‘pro-life’’ members, its purpose was wholly congruent with the logic of reproductive futurism: to ‘‘disrupt and ultimately destroy Satan’s power to kill our children, God’s children.

#### Queer violence is constantly erased. Every moment that passes more lives are being purged from our history by heterosexual rejections of the notion of queer violence.

**Stanley 11** Eric Stanley (assistant professor in the Department of Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of California, Riverside) “Near Life, Queer Death Overkill and Ontological Capture” *Duke University Press Vol 29 No 2* Summer 2011 p. 7 <https://queerhistory.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/near-life-queer-death-eric-stanley.pdf> DOA: 8.30.17 BAO

Where statistics fail, scars rise to tell other histories. From the phenomenological vault of growing up different, to the flickers of brutal details, one would not have to dig deep to uncover a corpse. Yet even with the horrific details, antiqueer violence is written as an outlaw practice, a random event, and an unexpected tragedy. Dominant culture’s necessity to disappear the enormity of antiqueer violence seems unsurprising. Yet I suggest that mainstream LGBT discourse also works in de-politicized collusion with the erasure of a structural recognition. Through this privatization the enormity of antiqueer violence is vanished. Thinking violence as individual acts versus epistemic force works to support the normative and normalizing structuring of public pain. In other words, privatizing antiqueer violence is one of the ways in which the national body and its trauma are heterosexualized, or in which the relegation of antiqueer violence, not unlike violence against women, racist violence, violence against animals (none of which are mutually exclusive), casts the national stage of violence and its ways of mourning as always human, masculinist, able-bodied, white, gender-conforming, and hetero- sexual. For national violence to have value it must be produced through the tangled exclusion of bodies whose death is valueless. To this end, as mainstream LGBT groups clambe for dominant power through attachment of a teleological narrative of progress, they too reproduce the argument that antiqueer violence is something out of the ordinary.

#### Cisheteronormativity actively constrains education and expression in debate - challenging it is key to accessing education. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best combats structures of cisheteronormativity

**Farrell and Gupta 2004** (Farrell, Kathleen, Honors B.A. in sociology from Trinity College; M.A. and Ph.D. in sociology from Syracuse University. Professor Farrell's primary research and teaching interests include gender and sexualities, with an emphasis on inequality studies. In her courses, Professor Farrell focuses on the interdisciplinary and practical implications of sociology and Nisha Gupta, Assistant Proffessor of Psychology at University of West Georgia, "Interrupting heteronormativity: Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender pedagogy and responsible teaching at Syracuse University." (2004)) SJ

Should discussions of sexuality be included in the classroom?1 The easy answer might be no: it is not ‘relevant’ to the subject matter of most courses except perhaps to those that explicitly engage with human sexuality, such as Child and Family Studies, Sociology, or Women’s Studies. Moreover, this reasoning might go, given estimates that within the general population less than ten percent identify as non-heterosexual, there’s a good chance that in a class of sixty students everyone is straight. It is this kind of perspective, however, that not only contributes to the invisibility of LGBT students, but it also constructs and reinforces heteronormativity in our classrooms and across campus.2 LGBT students (and teachers) ARE present in our classrooms—whether we choose to see them or not—and it is their very invisible presence that demonstrates the power of heteronormativity to mask that which does not conform, and to naturalize that which does. This is a problem for both LGBT and heterosexual students and teachers alike. Heteronormative assumptions and practices regulate the beliefs, behaviors, and desires of ALL of us, restricting the range of possibilities of identification and expression for ALL of us, to such an extent that even momentary and joyful expressions (e.g. the heterosexual man singing “I feel like a woman” in the Chevy commercial discussed by Susan Adams) become sources of discomfort and fear. Practices of regulation and restriction are integral to creating and maintaining hierarchies of power, which in turn limit the kinds of learning and teaching that can happen in our classrooms. As responsible teachers, we know that our pedagogical theories and practices need to expand the kinds of learning opportunities we provide students, not restrict them. In fact, the administration of this university recognizes the importance of this by emphasizing the link between a rich intellectual climate and a diversity of perspectives and people: “[. . .] diversity in our student body, faculty, and staff has far-ranging and significant educational benefits for all nonminorities and minorities alike” (Syracuse University Academic Plan, 2001). Particular strategies to create more inclusive curricula have been developed and implemented in programs and departments university-wide because “[s]tudents in diverse learning environments learn more, and have higher levels of satisfaction and greater degrees of civic engagements. They are better able to appreciate the ideas of others and they are better prepared to enter the world they will lead” (SU Academic Plan, 2001). This diversity of students, faculty, and ideas includes: “race, ethnicity, gender, age, religious beliefs, sexual orientation, and physical and mental ability” (Syracuse University Human Resources, emphasis added). In principle, then, SU values diversity. Taking a closer look at what diversity means and how it is “practiced,” however, exposes some gaps between these principles and actual, everyday classroom procedures, particularly when that “diversity” topic is sexual orientation. It’s important to note that sexual orientation is a term that does not reference a particular set of people; it’s not only about LGBT people, but also non-LGBT, or heterosexual, people. Why is this broader definition of sexual orientation important? Because the sexual orientation of heterosexuality is simultaneously institutionalized and naturalized to the extent that it becomes the invisible norm against which all other sexual orientations, identifications, or expressions are named “abnormal.” The issue of “invisibility,” then, isn’t just about LGBT students and teachers; it’s about the ways in which our assumptions about (hetero)sexuality are invisible to us. And we carry these assumptions into our classrooms. As a result, heteronormativity is reproduced, most often unconsciously, through our own everyday classroom practices. Rather than expanding the kinds of learning opportunities we create space for, we inadvertently reinforce a regulated and restrictive framework for understanding the complexity of human sexuality.

#### The alt is embracing queer negativity as a method of resistance against cisheteronormativity and a coping mechanism for queer people

Edelman 04 (Lee Edelman, Duke University Press, 2004, Durham and London, “No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive”, December 6, 2004, 978-0-8223-8598-1, [https:/](https://bagelabyss.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/no_future__queer_theory_and_the_death_drive.pdf)[bagelabyss.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/no\_future\_\_queer\_theory\_and\_the\_death\_drive.pdf](http://bagelabyss.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/no_future__queer_theory_and_the_death_drive.pdf), pg 6-7 ) SJ

Truth, like queerness, irreducibly linked to the ‘‘aberrant or atypical,’’ to what chafes against ‘‘normalization,’’ finds its value not in a good susceptible to generalization, but only in the stubborn particularity that voids every notion of a general good. The embrace of queer negativity, then, can have no justification if justification requires it to reinforce some positive social value; its value, instead, resides in its challenge to value as defined by the social, and thus in its radical challenge to the very value of the social itself.8 For by figuring a refusal of the coercive belief in the paramount value of futurity, while refusing as well any backdoor hope for dialectical access to meaning, the queer dispossesses the social order of the ground on which it rests: a faith in the consistent reality of the social—and by extension, of the social subject; a faith that politics, whether of the left or of the right, implicitly affirms. Divesting such politics of its thematic trappings, bracketing the particularity of its various proposals for social organization, the queer insists that politics is always a politics of the signifier, or even of what Lacan will often refer to as ‘‘the letter.’’ It serves to shore up a reality always unmoored by signification and lacking any guarantee. To say as much is not, of course, to deny the experiential violence that frequently troubles social reality or the apparent consistency with which it bears—and thereby bears down on—us all. It is, rather, to suggest that queerness exposes the obliquity of our relation to what we experience in and as social reality, alerting us to the fantasies structurally necessary in order to sustain it and engaging those fantasies through the figural logics, the linguistic structures, that shape them. If it aims effectively to intervene in the reproduction of such a reality—an intervention that may well take the form of figuring that reality’s abortion— then queer theory must always insist on its connection to the vicissitudes of the sign, to the tension between the signifier’s collapse into the letter’s cadaverous materiality and its participation in a system of reference wherein it generates meaning itself. As a particular story, in other words, of why storytelling fails, one that takes both the value and the burden of that failure upon itself, queer theory, as I construe it, marks the ‘‘other’’ side of politics: the ‘‘side’’ where narrative realization and derealization overlap, where the energies of vitalization ceaselessly turn against themselves; the ‘‘side’’ outside all political sides, committed as they are, on every side, to futurism’s unquestioned good. The rest of this book attempts to explain the implications of this assertion, but first, let me sketch some connections between politics and the politics of the sign by establishing the psychoanalytic context within which my argument takes shape.

**uv**

**Fiat is utopian – when the debate round is over, their aff won’t be passed in the real world – but how frame their impact spills over and affects their view of the world, which means their exaggerated impacts they obscure the systemic inequalities present in the status quo**

## Case

### Framing

**Util ov general—**

**1] util justify reallocation of resources away from queer bodies because they aren’t useful to reproductive futurity**

**2] value to life comes first it doesn’t matter if people die if their life isn’t worth living in the first place empirics prove transgender and other queer folk have some of the highest suicide rates because queer violence destroys value to life means we are a pre-req to their FW**

#### On Pleasure and Pain

#### 1] everyone has different conceptions of pain and pleasure and

#### 2] They don’t actually guide action, if this was true then the US would have helped third world countries, or you would have donated a majority of your money to others.

#### On Actor spec

#### 1—is ought fallacy—just because states use util doesn’t mean we ought to

**2] Empirically denied Govs can still act w/o a utilitarian calculus, legalized all gender marriage despite gender minorities is not the majority.**

**On extinction first– this is a independent link it literally is the definition of reproductive futurism because they say their FW comes first because of the death of future generations of the child the entire K is a reason this logic is bad**

#### The drive to prevent extinction is a form of heteronormative survivalism where gendered bodies become the unwilling tools to sustain humanity.

**Mitchell 15** (Audra Mitchell, Audra Mitchell is a settler scholar who lives and works on the Ancestral and treaty lands of the Neutral (Attawandaron), Haudenosaunee and Mississaugas of the New Credit (please see Honouring the Land). She currently holds the the Canada Research Chair in Global Political Ecology at Wilfrid Laurier University. From 2015-18 she held the CIGI Chair in Global Governance and Ethics at the Balsillie School of International Affairs   Audra is an Associate Professor at Wilfrid Laurier University, Canada, 8-3-2015, "Gendering extinction," Worldly, <https://worldlyir.wordpress.com/2015/08/03/gendering-extinction/>, JKS)

**The reproduction of survival/ the survival of reproduction**

Extinction is almost always understood against the horizon of survival and the imperative to sustain it – at least for life forms deemed to be of value to humans. In many cases, this imperative takes the form of deliberate strategies for enforcing existence. Donna Haraway’s influential book When Species Meet devotes considerable attention to the logics, practices and politics of Species Survival Plans. These plans monitor and enforce reproduction amongst ‘endangered’ species, not least by collecting data on populations, genetic profiles and genetic materials to enable selective breeding. This strategy assumes that all organisms can, should, and can be made to exercise their reproductive capacities in order to resist extinction, and it actively mobilizes members of ‘endangered species’ into this project. In so doing, it helps to entrench norms regarding gender, sexuality and reproductive labour that are deeply entrenched in modern, Western human cultures. Attention to these programmes highlights an important way in which extinction is gendered in dominant scientific and policy frameworks. Specifically, strategic breeding programmes share in the belief that reproduction is an imperative for those capable of reproducing if ‘the species’ is at risk’. This belief is directly related to Western norms of the reproductive imperative for women. Indeed, Haraway points out that it is precisely “‘woman’s’ putative self-defining responsibility to ‘the species’ as this singular and typological female is reduced to her reproductive function”. In a similar sense, within SSPs and other strategies of enforced survival, entire life forms are reduced to their reproductive capacities. Moreover, programmes of enforced survival can, in the context of sexual reproduction, disproportionately burden female organisms with the task of avoiding extinction. This logic is particularly fraught in discussions of the possibility of human extinction, in which female fertility (captured in the standard policy language of ‘births per woman’) is framed simultaneously as a threat to survival, and the only hope for escaping extinction (see, for instance, Alan Weisman’s comments on this). In these ways, the securitization of survival entrenches the intersectional categories of gender, species and race discussed above. Dominant discourses of extinction and conservation also entrench and privilege sexual reproduction, in ways that entrench heteronormative assumptions and norms. This is reflected in the way that the subjects of extinction and conservation are framed. The standard object of conservation is the biological ‘species’, a term which is defined by the ability of organisms to reproduce sexually. As Myra Hird has pointed out, this conception of ‘species’ makes it appear as if sexual reproduction is the ‘best’ means of sustaining the existence of a life form. However, Hird’s work demonstrates that Earthly life forms actually engage in myriad forms of reproduction, from the free exchange of DNA between bacteria to the hermaphroditic practices of some fish. The upshot of these arguments is that Earthly life is sustained through a huge variety of reproductive activities that do not conform to biological understandings of life processes or species. Crucially, Hird argues that there is no necessary hierarchy between forms of reproduction. In Darwinian terms, all species that manage to survive are equally successful. However, by conflating survival with sexual reproduction, existing discourses of extinction embed hetero-normative frameworks that devalue other forms of reproduction. They also reduce reproduction to the imperative to survive, ignoring the myriad cultural, political, aesthetic, sensual and other dimensions of reproduction.

### Adv 1

#### Sino-India tensions unlikely to cause war—four warrants

**Singh 20** (Ameya Singh, June 1st, 2020, Why Another Sino-Indian War Is Unlikely, The Diplomat, Doctoral student at the University of Oxford; MPhil, University of Cambridge; MSc. London School of Economics and Political Science., <https://thediplomat.com/2020/06/why-another-sino-indian-war-is-unlikely/>) SJ

However, contrary to widespread [fears](https://www.indiatoday.in/india/story/india-china-border-standoff-may-escalate-into-an-armed-conflict-top-strategic-expert-ashley-tellis-1683028-2020-05-28), another Sino-Indian war is unlikely to be in the offing. In the shadow of nuclear weapons, a limited conventional war on the Sino-Indian border — somewhat akin to the month-long clash in 1962 – can be avoided for several reasons. First, this is because of the nature of the dispute and the lack of ideological fundamentalism and issue indivisibility. Unlike the United States, which has increasingly begun to view the geopolitical competition with China as a battle for values such as freedom of navigation or democracy or the preservation of the liberal international order, India and China do not see each other through such an ideological lens. The authoritarian regime of the Chinese Community Party is not perceived to be antithetical to India’s democratic character, and vice versa. India’s long-term strategy, as former Foreign Secretary Vijay Gokhale puts it, is to retain its strategic autonomy, and pursue alignments based “on issues, not [ideology](https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/china-border-tensions-unlikely-to-lead-to-conflict-say-former-officials/article31705025.ece?homepage=true).” Hence, while both parties have been cautious of each other’s maneuvers on the border, they have refrained from linking these to existential attributes of national identity, which are notorious for inflating the significance of disputed territories — for example in the case of Kashmir, Tibet, or Taiwan. In fact, Beijing has long held that the border dispute is a remnant of British colonialism and its reckless cartographic practices, rather than being driven by India’s territorial expansionism. On the Indian side, Army Chief General Manoj Mukund Naravane, in a break from traditional bouts of recrimination between adversaries, accepted that due to differing notions of the LAC, “[both sides](https://twitter.com/dperi84/status/1260861994866896896)” were guilty of aggressive behavior in Eastern Ladakh and North Sikkim. This choice of words effectively yielded the use of any victimhood narratives that could be mobilized to create moral justification for retaliatory action. Second, the risks of inadvertent pre-emption are also not nearly as high as they were in 1962, when Nehru’s ill-fated “[forward policy](https://theprint.in/opinion/how-india-asked-for-trouble-in-1962/136481/)” was met by overwhelming Chinese military force. This is because of a series of [five agreements](https://www.republicworld.com/world-news/rest-of-the-world-news/on-lac-standoff-india-following-protocol-sources.html) signed between India and China to address disputes arising over the LAC: 1) the [1993 Agreement](https://peacemaker.un.org/chinaindia-borderagreement93) on the Maintenance of Peace and Tranquility along the LAC; 2) the [1996 Agreement](https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/CN%20IN_961129_Agreement%20between%20China%20and%20India.pdf) on Confidence-Building Measures in the Military Field Along the LAC, 3) the [2005 Protocol](https://peacemaker.un.org/chinaindiaconfidenceagreement2005) on Modalities for the Implementation of Confidence-Building Measures in the Military Field Along the LAC; 4) the [2012 Agreement](https://peacemaker.un.org/chinaindia-coordinationmechanism2012) on the Establishment of a Working Mechanism for Consultation and Coordination on India-China Border Affairs; and 5) the [2013 Border Defense Cooperation Agreement](https://peacemaker.un.org/china-india-border-cooperation2013). These agreements provide a modus operandi for diplomatic engagement at the military and political levels, as well as a set of “status quo” commitments both sides can return to in case of escalation. They proved [effective](https://theprint.in/defence/how-india-and-china-resolved-three-major-stand-offs-in-the-modi-era/430594/) during the 16-day stand-off between Indian and Chinese forces in eastern Ladakh near the village of Chumar, the military confrontation at Burtse in the Depsang plains in northern Ladakh in 2015, and the Doklam crisis in 2017. Indian Ministry of External Affairs spokesperson Anurag Srivastava has also affirmed New Delhi’s intention to de-escalate the current stand-off based on these [agreements](https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/defence/india-china-activates-5-pacts-to-defuse-lac-tensions/articleshow/76083868.cms). He [stated](https://mea.gov.in/media-briefings.htm?dtl/32699/Transcript_of_Media_Briefing_by_Official_Spokesperson_May_21_2020) that “the two sides [already] have established mechanisms to resolve such situations peacefully through dialogue.” Similarly, the Chinese official statement also reiterated Beijing’s commitment “to uphold peace and [tranquility](https://indianexpress.com/article/world/sino-india-border-clashes-china-says-its-troops-committed-to-uphold-peace-6405130/) in border areas.” Summit diplomacy is likely to return if the crisis escalates further. Third is the element of ambiguity and the “fog” surrounding the details of the military stand-off. Typically, analysts have viewed “nationalist strongmen” as promoters of aggressive state [behavior](https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/28/why-india-china-sparring-border-clashes-conflict/). But, in this case, the ability of both governments to control national media, and the inscrutability of the facts related to the dispute, aided efforts to manage domestic audience costs. For instance, media reports of 15-20 personnel of the Indo-Tibetan Border Police force being detained by the Chinese were categorically refuted by the Indian [side](https://www.ndtv.com/india-news/indian-jawans-detained-by-chinese-in-ladakh-last-week-freed-later-army-denies-2234310). This meant that no domestic pressure for retaliation arose and no great reputational damage was suffered. In the aftermath of the Doklam crisis, similar ambiguity allowed both sides to claim tactical victories for [themselves](https://www.ndtv.com/india-news/india-china-both-claim-victory-in-end-of-border-standoff-foreign-media-1742942) and diffuse the situation successfully. In India, criticism has been incrementally rising with respect to the Modi government’s lack of [transparency](https://www.thehindu.com/opinion/editorial/the-hindu-editorial-on-the-governments-awful-silence-in-india-china-border-standoff/article31705339.ece) on the matter, but it is unlikely to reach electorally harmful proportions. Lastly, the material costs of limited war for both parties far outweigh potential gains. For China, conflict on the border with India would diminish its ability to meet key security challenges in the South China Sea, thus making it vulnerable to the United States, which Beijing considers its primary security competitor. It seems unlikely that Beijing would want to risk a two-front war. Additionally, reputational [damages](https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/china/covid-19-global-backlash-builds-against-china-over-coronavirus/articleshow/75531645.cms) suffered due to COVID-19, pre-existing [fears](https://business.time.com/2011/06/07/why-do-we-fear-a-rising-china/) surrounding China’s rise, and India’s conventional and nuclear deterrence [capabilities](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/05679329708449447?journalCode=tadl19) will all temper Beijing’s pre-emptive use of military force. Similarly, for India, the primary security challenge remains Pakistan-based terrorist infiltration on the Kashmir border. More importantly, beyond the protection of vital strategic points on either side that allow military forces to effectively defend and patrol their territories in challenging high-altitude mountainous regions, the vast tracts of disputed land along the LAC do not hold any important material resources such as oil, precious mineral reserves, or ethnic-kin populations. The benefits of territorial aggrandizement are therefore, limited to deterrence value and the natural terrain offers few advantages to offensive forces.

#### No one would be confident enough to launch a space war – especially China

Bloomfield 13 [Lincoln Palmer Bloomfield Jr. is a United States Defense Department and State Department official. Bloomfield was educated at Harvard University, graduating cum laude with an A.B. in 1974. He later attended The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, receiving an M.A. in Law and Diplomacy in 1980. Bloomfield is also a member of the Board of Directors of the Henry L. Stimson Center. Anti-satellite Weapons, Deterrence and Sino-American Space Relations. September 2013. www.nuclearfiles.org/menu/key-issues/space-weapons/issues/Anti-Satellite%20Weapons,%20Deterrence%20and%20Sino-American%20Space%20Relations.pdf]

In the first-ever severe crisis between major powers in space, both contestants will possess the capacity to deny each others pursuit of space dominance. In this way, the nature of the space domain, where offense easily trumps defense, is like the nuclear domain. Consequently, the contestants will be unable confidently to ensure decisive victory by means of surprise attack. Just as protection from fallout in nuclear exchanges cannot be secured, so, too, will the first use of kinetic-energy ASATs be self-denying: mutating debris fields will make large swaths of space inoperable to one’s own satellites, either quickly or over time. The use of non-kinetic-energy ASATs on a modest scale invites retaliation in kind or retaliation across domains. The use of non-kinetic-energy ASATs on a massive scale invites massive retaliation, if not in kind, then across domains. In the event of a severe crisis between Washington and Beijing, would a Chinese leader risk everything with this cosmic throw of the dice?

#### No risk of space war – its unintended consequences deters aggressors

Handberg 18 - chair of the Political Science Department at University of Central Florida – specializes in space policy, defense policy, the U.S. Supreme Court and judicial politics (Roger Handberg; “Defense & Security Analysis”; “War and rumours of war, do improvements in space technologies bring space conflict closer?”; Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group; pg. 4; Accessed 7/3/18)

The reasons why the space sanctuary approach survived intellectual and political attack is the reality that the result would be a graveyard in terms of sustaining any viable operational presence in low Earth orbit and likely out to the orbital arc. Attacking satellites initially involved nuclear warheads, which could be as devastating to the attacker as to the target. EMP effects from nuclear blasts, even if mitigated for national security space assets, meant that civilian electronic systems in the affected areas are likely to be junk. That effectively defeats the justification for the defensive use of ASAT weapons. The idea being that you defeat the enemy and take possession of the resulting open area, either in space, or on the ground. Alternatively, you reject the use of nuclear weapons because of the after-effects of EMP and radiation depending on the circumstances. Instead, you employ kinetic hit-to-kill (HTK) weapons. The debris fields produced can be extraordinarily large and persistent. The Chinese 2007 ASAT test destroying their aging weather satellite produced one of the largest debris fields ever observed.11 This problem draws much attention, but few remedies exist except establishing international standards calling for de-orbiting satellites if possible, or at the geosynchronous orbit (35,790 km), lifting up out of the orbit into a higher storage orbit. Attacks on orbiting satellites produces much space debris, which only slowly re-enters the atmosphere to burn up on re-entry. For example, Vanguard 1 launched in March 1958 remains in space until the twenty-second century.12 Even more detrimental to any idea of space conflict with its debris issues was the question that became a bigger problem going forward. Whenever a satellite prematurely went out of service, for whatever reason, satellite replacement took time, sometimes multiple years. Replacement was not a particular problem initially when space applications were in their infancy. Terrestrial systems still existed, but as space applications are more integrated into routine military operations; especially when deployed globally, earlier systems either disappear, or are downgraded in importance.

#### Nuke war won’t cause extinction, but it’ll spur political will for meaningful disarmament.

Deudney 18 [Associate Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University. 03/15/2018. “The Great Debate.” The Oxford Handbook of International Security. www.oxfordhandbooks.com, doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198777854.013.22] // Re-Cut Justin

Although nuclear war is the oldest of these technogenic threats to civilization and human survival, and although important steps to restraint, particularly at the end of the Cold War, have been achieved, the nuclear world is increasingly changing in major ways, and in almost entirely dangerous directions. The third “bombs away” phase of the great debate on the nuclear-political question is more consequentially divided than in the first two phases. Even more ominously, most of the momentum lies with the forces that are pulling states toward nuclear-use, and with the radical actors bent on inflicting catastrophic damage on the leading states in the international system, particularly the United States. In contrast, the arms control project, although intellectually vibrant, is largely in retreat on the world political stage. The arms control settlement of the Cold War is unraveling, and the world public is more divided and distracted than ever. With the recent election of President Donald Trump, the United States, which has played such a dominant role in nuclear politics since its scientists invented these fiendish engines, now has an impulsive and uninformed leader, boding ill for nuclear restraint and effective crisis management. Given current trends, it is prudent to assume that sooner or later, and probably sooner, nuclear weapons will again be the used in war. But this bad news may contain a “silver lining” of good news. Unlike a general nuclear war that might have occurred during the Cold War, such a nuclear event now would probably not mark the end of civilization (or of humanity), due to the great reductions in nuclear forces achieved at the end of the Cold War. Furthermore, politics on “the day after” could have immense potential for positive change. The survivors would not be likely to envy the dead, but would surely have a greatly renewed resolution for “never again.” Such an event, completely unpredictable in its particulars, would unambiguously put the nuclear-political question back at the top of the world political agenda. It would unmistakeably remind leading states of their vulnerability It might also trigger more robust efforts to achieve the global regulation of nuclear capability. Like the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki that did so much to catalyze the elevated concern for nuclear security in the early Cold War, and like the experience “at the brink” in the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962, the now bubbling nuclear caldron holds the possibility of inaugurating a major period of institutional innovation and adjustment toward a fully “bombs away” future.

#### There’s no nuclear winter. Prefer our study – it has 9 PhD’s with experts in every relevant scientific field.

**Reisner et al 2018[** [Jon Reisner](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/action/doSearch?ContribAuthorStored=Reisner%2C+Jon) - Climate and Atmospheric Sciences PhD at Los Alamos National Laboratory; [Gennaro D'Angelo](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/action/doSearch?ContribAuthorStored=D%27Angelo%2C+Gennaro) – PhD [Los Alamos National Laboratory](https://www.researchgate.net/institution/Los_Alamos_National_Laboratory), [Theoretical Division](https://www.researchgate.net/institution/Los_Alamos_National_Laboratory/department/Theoretical_Division2) [Eunmo Koo](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/action/doSearch?ContribAuthorStored=Koo%2C+Eunmo) - Ph.D., Mechanical Engineering, University of California at Berkeley, Expertise: Atmospheric fluid dynamics, Modeling fluid-solid interactions, Fire spread in urban and wildland environment, Wind energy harvest, High-performance computing simulations; [Wesley Even](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/action/doSearch?ContribAuthorStored=Even%2C+Wesley) - Ph.D. Physics - Louisiana State University, Expertise: Computational Physics, Astrophysics [Matthew Hecht](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/action/doSearch?ContribAuthorStored=Hecht%2C+Matthew) – Expert in Climate and Ocean Modeling [Elizabeth Hunke](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/action/doSearch?ContribAuthorStored=Hunke%2C+Elizabeth) - Ph.D., Program in Applied Mathematics, University of Arizona, Expertise: Sea Ice Models; [Darin Comeau](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/action/doSearch?ContribAuthorStored=Comeau%2C+Darin) – PhD, Applied Mathematics, University of Arizona , Expert in High dimensional data analysis, statistical and predictive modeling, and uncertainty quantification, with particular applications to climate science, as well as process-based modeling of the cryosphere; [Randall Bos](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/action/doSearch?ContribAuthorStored=Bos%2C+Randall) – PhD, Expert in Nuclear Weapon Effects Modeling and Simulation [James Cooley](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/action/doSearch?ContribAuthorStored=Cooley%2C+James) - Ph.D. -- Physics, University of Maryland, Expert in Weapon Physics, Emergency Response, Computational Physics, Verification, and Validation (2018). Climate impact of a regional nuclear weapons exchange: An improved assessment based on detailed source calculations. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres , 123 , 2752 – 2772. https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JD027331 Received 20 JUN 2017 Accepted 1 FEB 2018 Accepted article online 13 FEB 2018 Published online 14 MAR 2018 ©2018. The Authors. This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use and distri- bution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modi fi cations or adaptations are made.] LHSBC

Abstract We present a multiscale study examining the impact of a regional exchange of nuclear weapons on global climate. Our models investigate **multiple phases of the effects of nuclear weapons** usage, including growth and rise of the nuclear fireball, ignition and spread of the induced fi restorm, and **comprehensive Earth system modeling** of the oceans, land, ice, and atmosphere. This study follows from the scenario originally envisioned by Robock, Oman, Stenchikov, et al. (2007, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-7-2003-2007), based on the analysis of Toon et al. (2007, https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-7-1973-2007), which assumes a regional exchange between India and Pakistan of fi fty 15 kt weapons detonated by each side. We expand this scenario by modeling the processes that lead to production of black carbon, in order to re fi ne the black carbon forcing estimates of these previous studies. When the Earth system model is initiated with 5 × 10 9 kg of black carbon in the upper troposphere (approximately from 9 to 13 km), the impact on climate variables such as global temperature and precipitation in our simulations is similar to that predicted by previously published work. However, while our thorough simulations of the fi restorm produce about 3.7 × 10 9 kg of black carbon, we fi nd that the vast majority of the black carbon **never reaches an altitude above weather systems** (approximately 12 km). Therefore, our Earth system model simulations conducted with model-informed atmospheric distributions of black carbon produce signi fi cantly lower global climatic impacts than assessed in prior studies, as the carbon at lower altitudes is more **quickly removed from the atmosphere**. In addition, our model ensembles indicate that statistically signi fi cant effects on global surface temperatures are limited to the fi rst 5 years and are much smaller in magnitude than those shown in earlier works. None of the simulations produced a nuclear winter effect. We fi nd that the effects on global surface temperatures are not uniform and are concentrated primarily around the highest arctic latitudes, dramatically **reducing the global impact on human health and agriculture** compared with that reported by earlier studies. Our analysis demonstrates that the probability of significant global cooling from a limited exchange scenario as envisioned in previous studies is **highly unlikely**, a **conclusion supported by examination of natural analogs,** such as large forest fires and volcanic eruptions.

#### Mutual dependence on space infrastructure prevents war

Triezenberg 17 [Bonnie Triezenberg is a senior engineer at RAND. Previously, she was the senior technical fellow at the Boeing Company, specializing in agile systems and software development. She received a B.S. in aerospace engineering from the University of Michigan, an M.S. in systems science from the University of California-Los Angeles, and a Ph.D. in policy analysis from the Pardee RAND Graduate School. Deterring Space War. 2017. https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/rgs\_dissertations/RGSD400/RGSD400/RAND\_RGSD400.pdf]

The above discussion suggests that a likely means to achieve deterrence of acts of war in outer space is to increase civilian dependence on space to support day-to-day life—if everyone on earth is equally dependent on space, no one has an incentive to destroy space. Largely by accident, this dependence appears to have, in fact, occurred. The space age was born in an age of affluence and rapid economic expansion; space quickly became a domain of international commerce as well as a domain of national military use. Space assets and the systems they enable have transformed social, infrastructure and information uses perhaps more visibly than they have transformed military uses. In fact, in the current satellite database published by the Union of Concerned Scientists, of the 1461 satellites in orbit 40% support purely commercial ventures, while only 16% have a strictly military use.46 The first commercial broadcast by a satellite in geo-synchronous orbit was of international news between Europe and the United States.47 The first telephony uniting the far flung islands of Indonesia was enabled by satellite48. Those of us who are old enough remember the 1960s “magic” of intercontinental phone calls and international “breaking news” delivered by satellite. Today, most social and infrastructure uses of space are taken for granted - even in remote locales of Africa, people expect to be able to monitor the weather, communicate seamlessly with colleagues and to find their way to new and unfamiliar locations using the GPS in their phones. All of us use space every day.49 These unrestricted economic and social uses of space may be the best deterrent, making everyone on all sides of combat equally dependent on space and heightening the taboo against weaponizing space or threatening space assets with weapons.