### 1NC – DA

#### Deal now – US and French coordination and they prevent Russian interference.

RFE 3-8 RadioFreeEurope/RadioLiberty. RFE/RL journalists report the news in 27 languages in 23 countries where a free press is banned by the government or not fully established. They provide what many people cannot get locally: uncensored news, responsible discussion, and open debate. March 8, 2022. “U.S., France Agree To Continue 'Close Coordination' On Reviving Iran Nuclear Deal” [https://www.rferl.org/a/iran-satellite-launch-military-nuclear-deal/31742560.html Accessed 3-9 //](https://www.rferl.org/a/iran-satellite-launch-military-nuclear-deal/31742560.html%20Accessed%203-9%20//) gord0

The United States and France have agreed to continue their close coordination as talks on reviving a 2015 nuclear deal between Tehran and major powers reached a critical point.

The U.S. State Department issued the statement after Secretary of State Antony Blinken met with French President Emmanuel Macron in Paris on March 8 to discuss the Iran nuclear deal.

Earlier, the European parties negotiating to revive the deal warned Russia not to add conditions that would complicate reaching an accord, they said in a joint statement to the UN nuclear watchdog's 35-country board of governors.

"The window of opportunity is closing. We call on all sides to make the decisions necessary to close this deal now, and on Russia not to add extraneous conditions to its conclusion," Britain, France and Germany said after Russia announced extra demands that stalled negotiations.

The diplomatic activity comes after Iran announced earlier it had successfully launched its second military satellite.  
  
"Iran's second military satellite -- named Noor-2 -- has been launched into space by the Qassed rocket of the aerospace wing of the Revolutionary Guards and successfully placed in orbit 500 kilometers above the Earth," the official IRNA news agency [reported](https://www.irna.ir/news/84675620/%D9%85%D8%A7%D9%87%D9%88%D8%A7%D8%B1%D9%87-%D9%86%D9%88%D8%B1-%DB%B2-%D8%B3%D9%BE%D8%A7%D9%87-%D8%A8%D9%87-%D9%81%D8%B6%D8%A7-%D9%BE%D8%B1%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%A8-%D8%B4%D8%AF) on March 8.  
  
Iran's military has struggled to get effective military reconnaissance craft into orbit, though it took a major step toward strengthening its capabilities when it successfully put a Noor-1 satellite into orbit in 2020.

The United States has alleged Iran’s satellite launches defy a UN Security Council resolution and has called on Tehran to abstain from activity related to ballistic missiles capable of delivering nuclear weapons.  
  
Some Middle Eastern and Western officials have expressed concern that Tehran could share imagery from the satellites with pro-Iran militia groups around the region.  
  
Talks to restore the 2015 deal that the United States withdrew from in 2018 have been ongoing in Vienna since April, mediated by France, Germany, the United Kingdom, Russia, and China.  
  
Negotiators on all sides have signaled that a potential deal is close as the head of the UN nuclear watchdog agreed to a timetable for Iran to answer the watchdog's long-standing questions about Tehran's program.

#### Space diplomacy trades off – finite manpower, money, and political will.

Johnson-Freeze 16 [(Joan, Professor and former Chair of National Security Affairs at the US Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island) “Space Warfare in the 21st Century: Arming the Heavens,” Cass Military Studies, 11/8/2016] JL

 \*The plan is legislated in the AVC (same bureau of the State Department that’s concerned with the JCPOA)

Proactive policymaking takes commitment, manpower, and money. A quick look at the money and manpower devoted to diplomacy in the US State and Defense departments compared to the resources available for the hardwareproducing military–industrial complex efforts described in Chapter 5 is enlightening. The Assistant Secretary of State for Arms Control, Verification, and Compliance (AVC) leads space-related diplomacy in the State Department. The AVC Bureau is responsible for “all matters related to the implementation of certain international arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements and commitments; this includes staffing and managing treaty implementation commissions.”34 The AVC arms control portfolio includes nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons and all related issues. The AVC section charged with space issues is the Office of Emerging Security Challenges; this office also handles missile defense issues and the promotion of transparency, cooperation, and building confidence regarding cybersecurity. As of financial year 2013, AVC had a budget of $31.2 million and 141 employees35 to be active participants and leaders in all of these issues.

By way of comparison, the Space Security and Defense Program, a joint program of the DoD and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) was programmed for a similar budget amount in financial year 2015: $32.3 million. That program is described as a “center of excellence for options and strategies (materiel, non-materiel, cross-Title, cross-domain) leading to a more resilient and enduring National Security Space (NSS) Enterprise.”36 A majority of SSDP funding is allocated to the development of offensive space control strategies. So basically, the same budget is allocated for all US global space diplomacy efforts as for an in-house Pentagon think tank to devise counterspace strategies.

Within the Pentagon, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Space Policy is charged with all issues related to space policy, including diplomacy. The responsibilities of the Space Policy office are to:

• Develop policy and strategy for a domain that is increasingly congested, competitive, and contested

• Implement across DoD — plans, programs, doctrine, operations — and with the IC and other agencies

• Engage with allies and other space-faring countries in establishing norms and augmenting our capabilities.37

The breadth of those responsibilities, which includes reviewing space acquisitions, means that there may be only a handful of individuals actually engaged in multilateral diplomatic efforts, acting, for example, as advisors to diplomatic discussions such as those through the United Nations. Additionally, the expanse of the Pentagon results in a chain of command that makes organizational competition for attention to subject matter challenging at best. The Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Space Policy reports to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense, who then reports to the Principle Deputy Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Global Security, who then reports to the Under Secretary of Defense for Defense Policy. There are also a multitude of space players in other governmental organizations to coordinate and contend with, particularly within the Air Force and intelligence communities. Personnel are spread thin.

US government-wide space diplomacy needs a mandate, manpower, and a supporting budget. Diplomacy, especially multilateral diplomacy, can be timeconsuming, manpower-intensive, and frustrating; and patience is not a strong American virtue. The recent experience in the UN LTS Working Group is emblematic of everything that causes the United States to shun multilateralism. Under the auspices of this group, countries had worked in good faith over the past five years to develop technical guidelines as reciprocal constraints, as insisted upon by the developing countries when they rejected the ICOC. Yet group success appeared thwarted at the February 2016 meeting of the LTS Working Group by one country, Russia.

#### Nuclear deal solves Iran proliferation

Kemp 19 Scott, Department of Nuclear Science and Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA. February 11, 2019. “The Iran nuclear deal as a case study in limiting the proliferation potential of nuclear power" [The Iran nuclear deal as a case study in limiting the proliferation potential of nuclear power | Nature Energy](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41560-019-0325-2) Accessed 3-8 // gord0

Historically, the potential to exploit nuclear power technology to make weapons has increased international interest in nuclear power and limited the willingness of supplier nations to provide it. Recently, concern about non-peaceful intent drove a decades-long standoff between the Islamic Republic of Iran and a six-state collective known as the E3+3 (also P5+1) consisting of China, France, Germany, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States. That standoff was eventually resolved through the negotiation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), a novel non-treaty agreement concluded in 2015 that limits Iran’s use of civil-nuclear technology. The agreement is unprecedented in that it is the first time a small group of states have reached an agreement for governing how a particular state may use its own technology to mitigate proliferation concerns held by external states. Although the United States under President Trump has withdrawn from the agreement, all other parties have remained committed to upholding its terms and there remains every indication that the agreement is functioning as intended.

Representatives from the United States, United Kingdom, Iran, European Union, Germany, France and China attend an Iran nuclear talk meeting in Vienna, Austria on 14 July 2015.

Despite its early successes, the JCPOA was only intended to be a temporary measure. Key provisions expire in 2025, ten years after implementation, and parties to the agreement made it clear that they do not wish its terms to become a de facto norm[3](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41560-019-0325-2#ref-CR3). This is driven by both sides: some view the terms as unfairly restrictive while others view them as too permissive. Nevertheless, the fact that the agreement brought years of escalation to a temporary resolution suggests that the approach might serve as a model for mitigating nuclear weapon concerns associated with the future use of nuclear power in other nuclear-newcomer states. This article reviews the technical nature of the problem the agreement attempts to tackle, and the technical solutions the agreement used to reduce proliferation concern in Iran. Although the politics of any future proliferation case will be sui generis, the underlying technical problem has a good probability of being similar to that of the Iran case, and may, therefore, be soluble through similar means.

#### Iranian proliferation goes nuclear – causes regional war and spurs proliferation cascades across the Middle East

Chilton and Hoshovsky 20 – [(Kevin, led U.S. Strategic Command and has participated in the Jewish Institute for National Security of America’s Generals and Admirals Program; Harry, policy analyst at JINSA’s Gemunder Center for Defense and Strategy) "Avoiding a nuclear arms race in the Middle East," Defense News, 2-13-2020, https://www.defensenews.com/opinion/commentary/2020/02/13/avoiding-a-nuclear-arms-race-in-the-middle-east/] TDI

This raises two immediate concerns. First, **should Iran race for the bomb, it is** almost inevitable that the United States and/or Israel will take preventative military action **to stop it from crossing that fateful threshold**. This could easily spiral into a regional war as Iran activates its various proxy forces against the United States and its allies.

Second, **an Iranian nuclear breakout attempt could** spur a proliferation cascade throughout the Middle East, **beginning with Saudi Arabia.**

Mohammed bin Salman, **the Saudi crown prince, openly stated in 2018 that if Iran developed nuclear weapons**, Riyadh would quickly “follow suit.” **One suggested approach would see Saudi Arabia purchase a nuclear power reactor from a major supplier like South Korea and then build a reprocessing plant that would yield enough weapons-grade plutonium in five years**.

A half-decade delay isn’t optimal, however, when the goal is achieving nuclear deterrence quickly. Thus, there is the so-called Islamabad option.

This refers to Riyadh’s role in financing Pakistan’s nuclear weapons program and an alleged commitment from Islamabad that it would repay the favor. While Pakistani and Saudi officials have denied any such understanding, **there is the possibility that the two could work out an arrangement where Islamabad could deploy some of its nuclear arsenal on Saudi soil following a successful Iranian breakout.**

Although this maneuver would draw sharp, international criticism, in theory, it would allow Riyadh to remain in good standing vis-a-vis the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. Nevertheless, Pakistan might not be willing to play spoiler against a nuclearized Iran. If it is, Middle Eastern geopolitics would become extremely unstable.

**If Saudi Arabia acquires nuclear weapons**, many believe Turkey would follow suit. Last September, Turkish President Recep Tayyip **Erdogan declared that he “cannot accept” the argument from Western nations that Turkey should not be allowed to attain nuclear weapons.** In 1958, Charles de Gaulle proclaimed that a nation without nuclear weapons “does not command its own destiny”; two years later, France tested its first bomb. Erdogan’s comments echo those earlier remarks and raise the possibility that Ankara could become the second NATO member to leave the alliance’s nuclear umbrella in favor of its own independent arsenal.

## Case

### 1NC – AT: Tech Innovation

#### Emerging tech regulation fails and AFF can’t solve.

Greg E. Marchant 20, Regents Professor and Lincoln Professor of Emerging Technologies, Law & Ethics, and Faculty Director, Center for Law, Science & Innovation, Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law, Arizona State University, “Governing Emerging Technologies,” Vanderbilt Law Review, Vol. 73(6), 2020, p. 1863-1865

I. THE WICKED PROBLEM OF EMERGING TECHNOLOGY GOVERNANCE

Emerging technologies—such as synthetic biology, gene editing, nanotechnology, artificial intelligence, internet of things, 3D printing, drones, applied neurotechnologies, and blockchain and cryptocurrencies—present a common set of governance challenges.5 Perhaps most significant is the “pacing problem,” where the pace of technology development far outstrips the capability of regulatory systems to keep up.6 Powered by growing market demand and intense business competition, new technologies are being developed, deployed, and commercialized faster than ever before.7 At the same time, traditional governmental processes of legislation, regulation, and judicial review have been slowed by increasing bureaucratic requirements and the increasing politicization of technological disputes.8 The result of accelerating technology and decelerating regulatory oversight is a growing governance gap. Any new statutes or regulations affecting these new technologies are likely to be outdated before the ink dries. As technology governance expert David Rajeski has noted, “[i]f you think that any existing regulatory framework can keep pace with this rate of change, think again.”9 Facing such a bleak prospect, regulators often sensibly defer regulation, waiting for a more stable technology plateau that may or may not ever come.

A second regulatory challenge of many emerging technologies is that they present risks and concerns outside the scope of existing regulatory agency jurisdictions.10 Regulatory agencies, such as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, are restricted to regulating the safety and efficacy of products. But many applications of emerging technologies raise broader ethical and social concerns relating to human enhancement, “playing God,” autonomy, dignity, fairness, equitable access, privacy, and longer-term impacts on society.11 These issues are largely outside the safety and efficacy scope of current agency jurisdictions and thus often escape any regulatory oversight.

Yet another challenge to the regulation of emerging technologies is their breadth of application. Technologies such as artificial intelligence, nanotechnology, and blockchain span the entire industry spectrum, as well as many nonindustrial activities and sectors. They are sometimes referred to as “enabling” or “platform” technologies that, like computers or the internet, have the potential to affect virtually every industry sector.12 There are thousands, if not tens or hundreds of thousands, of ways these core technologies are used, each with their own context of risks and benefits. These broad applications not only involve many different types of industries and businesses, but also affect many other types of stakeholders and nongovernmental organizations with particular interests in specific applications. The broad applications of these technologies also span many different regulatory agencies, each with their own organic statutes with different requirements, criteria, and goals. The end result of this multitude of applications, regulated parties, stakeholders, and regulators is tremendous regulatory diversity and complexity. Further complicating the regulatory challenge, emerging technologies are inherently international in application, creating the need for some type of international coordination.13

Finally, the unprecedented uncertainty about emerging technologies also impedes effective regulation.14 Because the technologies are so new and moving forward so quickly, there is enormous uncertainty about the trajectories, benefits, and risks of these technologies.15 Given these uncertainties, it is possible to paint unrealistically optimistic or pessimistic visions of the technology at issue, thus fostering public controversy, conflict, and unease.16

In summary, the governance of emerging technologies is characterized by complexity, diversity, and uncertainty. These same characteristics—complexity, diversity, and uncertainty—are the defining characteristics of a wicked problem.17 As a wicked problem, the governance of emerging technologies is unlikely to be solved by a single or simple solution. Traditional government regulation will not be sufficient, or many times even appropriate, for emerging technologies.18 Rather than traditional regulation—consisting of enforceable rules unilaterally imposed by a regulatory agency—emerging technologies will require a “governance” approach that expands the categories of responsible parties beyond government to include the private sector, nongovernmental organizations, and think tanks and also expands the relevant oversight mechanism beyond enforceable government regulations.19 Four alternative governance approaches for emerging technologies are discussed and evaluated in the next Part.

### 1NC – AT: Food Wars

#### No food wars – no causal evidence, only maybe true for the poorest countries, and government responses solve the impact

Rosengrant 13 [Mark W. Rosegrant, Director of the Environment and Production Technology Division at the International Food Policy Research Institute, et al., 2013, “The Future of the Global Food Economy: Scenarios for Supply, Demand, and Prices,” in Food Security and Sociopolitical Stability, p. 39-40]

The food price spikes in the late 2000s caught the world’s attention, particularly when sharp increases in food and fuel prices in 2008 coincided with street demonstrations and riots in many countries. For 2008 and the two preceding years, researchers identified a significant number of countries (totaling 54) with protests during what was called the global food crisis (Benson et al. 2008). Violent protests occurred in 21 countries, and nonviolent protests occurred in 44 countries. Both types of protest took place in 11 countries. In a separate analysis, developing countries with low government effectiveness experienced more food price protests between 2007 and 2008 than countries with high government effectiveness (World Bank 201la). Although the incidence of violent protests was much higher in countries with less capable governance, many factors could be causing or contributing to these protests, such as government response tactics, rather than the initial food price spike. Data on food riots and food prices have tracked together in recent years. Agricultural commodity prices started strengthening in international markets in 2006. In the latter half of 2007, as prices continued to rise, two or fewer food price riots per month were recorded (based on World Food Programme data, as reported in Brinkman and Hendrix 2011). As prices peaked and remained high during mid-2008, the number of riots increased dramatically, with a cumulative total of 84 by August 2008. Subsequently, both prices and the monthly number of protests declined. Several researchers have studied the connection between food price shocks and conflict, finding at least some relationship between food prices and conflict. According to Dell et al. (2008), higher food prices lead to income declines and an increase in political instability, but only for poor countries. Researchers also found a positive and significant relationship between weather shocks (affecting food availability, prices, and real income) and the probability of suffering government repression or a civil war (Besley and Persson 2009). Arezki and Bruckner (2011) evaluated a constructed food price index and political variables, including data on riots and anti-government demonstrations and measures of civil unrest. Using data from 61 countries over the period 1970 to 2007, they found a direct connection between food price shocks and an increased likelihood of civil conflict, including riots and demonstrations. Other researchers have broadened the analysis by considering government responses or underlying policies that affect local prices, and consequently influence outcomes and the linkage between food price shocks and conflict. Carter and Bates (2012) evaluated data from 30 developing countries for the time period 1961 to 2001, concluding that when governments mitigate the impact of food price shocks on urban consumers, the apparent relationship between food price shocks and civil war disappears. Moreover, when the urban consumers can expect a favorable response, the protests only serve as a motivation for a policy response rather than as a prelude to something more serious, such as violent demonstrations or even civil war. Many in the international development community see war and conflict as a development issue, with a war or conflict severely damaging the local economy, which in turn leads to forced migration and dislocation, and ultimately acute food insecurity. Brinkman and Hendrix (2011) ask if it could be the other way around, with food insecurity causing conflict. Their answer, based on a review of the literature, is "a highly qualified yes," especially for intrastate conflict. The primary reason is that insecurity itself heightens the risk of democratic breakdown and civil conflict. The linkage connecting food insecurity to conflict is contingent on levels of economic development (a stronger linkage for poorer countries), existing political institutions, and other factors. The researchers say establishing causation directly is elusive, considering a lack of evidence for explaining individual behavior. The debate over cause and effect is ongoing. Policies can nevertheless be implemented to reduce price variability. Less costly forms of stabilization, at least in terms of government outlays, include reducing import tariffs (and quotas) to lower prices and restricting exports to increase food availability. However, these types of policy responses, while perhaps helping an individual country's consumers in the short run, can lead to increased international price volatility, with potential for disproportionate adverse impacts on other countries that also may be experiencing food insecurity.

### 1NC – Inevitable

#### Warming inevitable - humans have already done too much damage

**Plumer and Fountain ‘21**(Brad Plumer, climate reporter specializing in policy and technology efforts to cut carbon dioxide emissions. At The Times, he has also covered international climate talks and the changing energy landscape in the United States., Henry Fountain, specializes in the science of climate change and its impacts. He has been writing about science for The Times for more than 20 years and has traveled to the Arctic and Antarctica, 8-9-21, accessed on: 9-1-21, NYT, “A Major New Report Finds Some of the Devastating Impacts of Global Warming are Now Unavoidable”, [https://www.nytimes.com/2021/08/09/climate/a-major-new-report-finds-some-of-the-devastating-impacts-of-global-warming-are-now-unavoidable.html)//JMS](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/08/09/climate/a-major-new-report-finds-some-of-the-devastating-impacts-of-global-warming-are-now-unavoidable.html)/JMS)

Humans have already heated the planet by roughly 1.1 degrees Celsius, or 2 degrees Fahrenheit, since the 19th century, largely by burning coal, oil and gas for energy. And the consequences can be felt across the globe: This summer alone, blistering heat waves have killed hundreds of people in the United States and Canada, floods have devastated Germany and China, and wildfires have raged out of control in Siberia, Turkey and Greece.

But that’s only the beginning, according to the report, issued on Monday by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, a body of scientists convened by the United Nations. Even if nations started sharply cutting emissions today, total global warming is likely to rise around 1.5 degrees Celsius within the next two decades, a hotter future that is now essentially locked in.

At 1.5 degrees of warming, scientists have found, the dangers grow considerably. Nearly 1 billion people worldwide could swelter in more frequent life-threatening heat waves. Hundreds of millions more would struggle for water because of severe droughts. Some animal and plant species alive today will be gone. Coral reefs, which sustain fisheries for large swaths of the globe, will suffer more frequent mass die-offs.

“We can expect a significant jump in extreme weather over the next 20 or 30 years,” said Piers Forster, a climate scientist at the University of Leeds and one of hundreds of international experts who helped write the report. “Things are unfortunately likely to get worse than they are today.”

#### Warming is irreversible – even if humans stop emissions.

Mark Kaufman 21, Mark is a science reporter at Mashable, “What Earth was like last time CO2 levels were this high,” Mashable, 4-20-2021, https://mashable.com/article/carbon-dioxide-earth-co2/ //EM

It’s a time called the Pliocene or mid-Pliocene, some 3 million years ago, when sea levels were around 30 feet higher (but possibly much more) and giant camels dwelled in a forested high Arctic. The Pliocene was a significantly warmer world, likely at some 5 degrees Fahrenheit (around 3 degrees Celsius) warmer than pre-Industrial temperatures of the late 1800s. Much of the Arctic, which today is largely clad in ice, had melted. Heat-trapping carbon dioxide levels, a major temperature lever, hovered around 400 parts per million, or ppm. Today, these levels are similar but relentlessly rising, at some 418 ppm.

Humanity is currently on track to warm Earth to Pliocene-like temperatures by century’s end – unless nations ambitiously slash carbon emissions in the coming decades. Sea levels, of course, won’t instantly rise by tens of feet: Miles-thick ice sheets take many centuries to thousands of years to melt. But, critically, humanity is already setting the stage for a relatively quick return to Pliocene climes, or climes at least significantly warmer than now. It’s happening fast. When CO2 naturally increases in the atmosphere, pockets of ancient air preserved in ice show this CO2 rise happens gradually, over thousands of years. But today, carbon dioxide levels are skyrocketing as humans burn long-buried fossil fuels.

"CO2 in the atmosphere has gone up 100 ppm in my lifetime," said Kathleen Benison, a geologist at West Virginia University who researches past climates. “That’s incredibly fast geologically."

"You don’t have to be a scientist to realize something totally weird is going on, and that weird thing is humans," noted Dan Lunt, a climate scientist at the University of Bristol who has researched the Pliocene.

A NASA graphic, from 2013, showing Earth's atmospheric CO2 levels had already reached levels similar to the Pliocene.

The problematic Pliocene

Sure, it takes a long time for sea levels to catch up with Earth’s warming. But in a plethora of other ways, the planet is already reacting to about 2 F (1.1 C) of warming since the late 1800s: Wildfires are surging in the U.S., major Antarctic ice sheets have destabilized, heat waves are smashing records, storms are intensifying, and beyond.

More warming will further exacerbate these consequences of increased heat. It will get worse. But will it get Pliocene bad? That’s up to the most fickle, unpredictable factor of the climate equation: humans.

"CO2 levels are going to increase," said Lunt. "We could hit the Pliocene in terms of temperature. But it depends on how rapidly we emit [greenhouse gases]."

Some of the human-driven changes happening on Earth today won’t be reversed for centuries or thousands of years. In large part, that’s because civilization continues to deposit prodigious loads of carbon into the atmosphere each year, and all these heat-trapping gases won’t magically vanish from the air, even if we instantly stop adding carbon to the atmosphere. Rather, they’ll have impacts upon the planet – like gradually rising seas and acidifying oceans – for at least centuries. Already, sea levels have risen by some eight to nine inches since the late 1800s, and a conservative estimate, from the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, is sea levels will rise by another one to two feet by the century's end. But, this could very well be more like two or three feet, or even more depending on what Antarctica’s colossal, melting Thwaites Glacier (it’s the size of Britain) purges into the sea this century.

"Sea level rise and ocean acidification are permanent on a human time scale," said Julie Brigham-Grette, a geologist at the University of Massachusetts Amherst who researches how the Arctic has changed since the Pliocene.

### China War

#### No China war – fears are overblown

* Diplomacy, institutional ties, and economic flows have expanded
* Tensions and criticism occur against a cooperative backdrop
* Far lower military spending than cold war
* Nukes kept at low alert
* Water barriers limit escalation and build in negotiation time because of low force numbers and unclear barriers – can’t conquer anything
* Other countries act as buffers
* Ideologically against conflict

Shifrinson 2/8/19 [Joshua Shifrinson is an assistant professor of international relations at Boston University. The ‘new Cold War’ with China is way overblown. Here’s why. February 8, 2019. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2019/02/08/there-isnt-a-new-cold-war-with-china-for-these-4-reasons/?noredirect=on&utm\_term=.f8ca8195c4e4]

Is a new Cold War looming — or already present — between the United States and China? Many analysts argue that a combination of geopolitics, ideology and competing visions of “global order” are driving the two countries toward emulating the Soviet-U.S. rivalry that dominated world politics from 1947 through 1990.

But such concerns are overblown. Here are four big reasons why.

1. The historical backdrops of the two relationships are very different

When the Cold War began, the U.S.-Soviet relationship was fragile and tenuous. Bilateral diplomatic relations were barely a decade old, U.S. intervention in the Russian Revolution was a recent memory, and the Soviet Union had called for the overthrow of capitalist governments into the 1940s. Despite their Grand Alliance against Nazi Germany, the two countries shared few meaningful diplomatic, economic or institutional links.

In 2019, the situation between the United States and China is very different. Since the 1970s, diplomatic interactions, institutional ties and economic flows have all exploded. Although each side has criticized the other for domestic interference (such as U.S. demands for journalist access to Tibet and China’s espionage against U.S. corporations), these issues did not prevent cooperation on a host of other issues. Yes, there were tensions over the past decade, but these occurred against a generally cooperative backdrop.

2. Geography and powers’ nuclear postures suggest East Asia is more stable than Cold War-era Europe

The Cold War was shaped by an intense arms race, nuclear posturing and crises, especially in continental Europe. Given Europe’s political geography, the United States feared a “bolt from the blue” attack would allow the Soviet Union to conquer the continent. Accordingly, the United States prepared to defend Europe with conventional forces, and to deter Soviet aggrandizement using nuclear weapons.

Unsurprisingly, the Soviet Union also feared that the United States might attack and wanted to deter U.S. adventurism. Concerns that the other superpower might use force and that crises could quickly escalate colored Cold War politics.

Today, the United States and China spend proportionally far less on their militaries than the United States and the Soviet Union did. Though an arms race may be emerging, U.S. and Chinese nuclear postures are not nearly as large or threatening: Arsenals remain far below the size and scope witnessed in the Cold War, and are kept at a lower state of alert.

As for geography, East Asia is not primed for tensions akin to those in Cold War Europe. China can threaten to coerce its neighbors, but the water barriers separating China from most of Asia’s strategically important states make outright conquest significantly harder. Of course, as scholars such as Caitlin Talmadge and Avery Goldstein note, crises may still erupt, and each side may face pressures to escalate. Unlike the Cold War, however, U.S.-Chinese confrontations occur at sea with relatively limited forces and without clear territorial boundaries. This suggests there are countervailing factors that may give the two sides room to negotiate — and limit the speed with which a crisis unfolds.

3. The Cold War had just two major powers

The Cold War took place in a bipolar system, with the United States and Soviet Union uniquely powerful, compared with other nations. This dynamic often pushed the United States and the U.S.S.R. toward confrontation and contributed to more or less fixed alliances; moreover, it encouraged efforts to suppress prospective great powers, such as Germany.

In 2019, it’s not at all clear we are back to bipolarity. Analysts remain divided over whether the U.S. unipolar era is waning (or is already over) — and, if so, whether we are heading for a new period of bipolarity, modern-day multipolarity or something else. Regardless, most analysts accept that other countries will play a central role in East Asian security affairs.

Russia, for example, still benefits from legacy military investments, India is developing economically and militarily, and Japan is beginning to build highly capable military forces to complement its still-significant economic might. Even if these nations aren’t as powerful as the United States or China, their presence makes for more fluid diplomatic arrangements and more diffuse security concerns than during the U.S.-Soviet competition. The resulting security dynamics are therefore likely to look very different.

4. Ideology plays less of a role in U.S.-Chinese relations

Many people see the Cold War as an ideological contest between U.S.-backed liberalism and Soviet-backed communism. But that’s not the whole story.

The early 20th century saw liberalism, communism and fascism vie for ideological preeminence. With fascism defeated alongside Nazi Germany, the postwar stage was set for a struggle between communism and liberalism to reinforce the U.S.-Soviet contest. That each ideology claimed universal scope ensured that the ideologies served as rallying cries for Third World conflicts, which were subsequently associated with the U.S.-Soviet struggle.

The respective “ideologies” of the United States and China do not favor this type of contest today. Indeed, analysts calling for a hard-line stance against China have faced difficulties even identifying a coherent Chinese ideological alternative. And while some researchers claim that a nascent ideological contest pitting an “autocratic” China against the “liberal” United States is emerging, this narrative ignores the political contests that shape Chinese politics (and have parallels in U.S. politics). Autocracies and democracies often cooperate. And on one important ideological issue — how they organize their economic lives — China and the United States have both embraced economic growth via trade, the private sector and semi-free markets.

### 1NC – AT: Disease

#### Disease doesn’t cause extinction

Adalja 16 [Amesh Adalja is an infectious-disease physician at the University of Pittsburgh. Why Hasn't Disease Wiped out the Human Race? June 17, 2016. https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2016/06/infectious-diseases-extinction/487514/]

But when people ask me if I’m worried about infectious diseases, they’re often not asking about the threat to human lives; they’re asking about the threat to human life. With each outbreak of a headline-grabbing emerging infectious disease comes a fear of extinction itself. The fear envisions a large proportion of humans succumbing to infection, leaving no survivors or so few that the species can’t be sustained.

I’m not afraid of this apocalyptic scenario, but I do understand the impulse. Worry about the end is a quintessentially human trait. Thankfully, so is our resilience.

For most of mankind’s history, infectious diseases were the existential threat to humanity—and for good reason. They were quite successful at killing people: The 6th century’s Plague of Justinian knocked out an estimated 17 percent of the world’s population; the 14th century Black Death decimated a third of Europe; the 1918 influenza pandemic killed 5 percent of the world; malaria is estimated to have killed half of all humans who have ever lived.

Any yet, of course, humanity continued to flourish. Our species’ recent explosion in lifespan is almost exclusively the result of the control of infectious diseases through sanitation, vaccination, and antimicrobial therapies. Only in the modern era, in which many infectious diseases have been tamed in the industrial world, do people have the luxury of death from cancer, heart disease, or stroke in the 8th decade of life. Childhoods are free from watching siblings and friends die from outbreaks of typhoid, scarlet fever, smallpox, measles, and the like.

So what would it take for a disease to wipe out humanity now?

In Michael Crichton’s The Andromeda Strain, the canonical book in the disease-outbreak genre, an alien microbe threatens the human race with extinction, and humanity’s best minds are marshaled to combat the enemy organism. Fortunately, outside of fiction, there’s no reason to expect alien pathogens to wage war on the human race any time soon, and my analysis suggests that any real-life domestic microbe reaching an extinction level of threat probably is just as unlikely.

Any apocalyptic pathogen would need to possess a very special combination of two attributes. First, it would have to be so unfamiliar that no existing therapy or vaccine could be applied to it. Second, it would need to have a high and surreptitious transmissibility before symptoms occur. The first is essential because any microbe from a known class of pathogens would, by definition, have family members that could serve as models for containment and countermeasures. The second would allow the hypothetical disease to spread without being detected by even the most astute clinicians.

The three infectious diseases most likely to be considered extinction-level threats in the world today—influenza, HIV, and Ebola—don’t meet these two requirements. Influenza, for instance, despite its well-established ability to kill on a large scale, its contagiousness, and its unrivaled ability to shift and drift away from our vaccines, is still what I would call a “known unknown.” While there are many mysteries about how new flu strains emerge, from at least the time of Hippocrates, humans have been attuned to its risk. And in the modern era, a full-fledged industry of influenza preparedness exists, with effective vaccine strategies and antiviral therapies.

HIV, which has killed 39 million people over several decades, is similarly limited due to several factors. Most importantly, HIV’s dependency on blood and body fluid for transmission (similar to Ebola) requires intimate human-to-human contact, which limits contagion. Highly potent antiviral therapy allows most people to live normally with the disease, and a substantial group of the population has genetic mutations that render them impervious to infection in the first place. Lastly, simple prevention strategies such as needle exchange for injection drug users and barrier contraceptives—when available—can curtail transmission risk.

Ebola, for many of the same reasons as HIV as well as several others, also falls short of the mark. This is especially due to the fact that it spreads almost exclusively through people with easily recognizable symptoms, plus the taming of its once unfathomable 90 percent mortality rate by simple supportive care.

Beyond those three, every other known disease falls short of what seems required to wipe out humans—which is, of course, why we’re still here. And it’s not that diseases are ineffective. On the contrary, diseases’ failure to knock us out is a testament to just how resilient humans are. Part of our evolutionary heritage is our immune system, one of the most complex on the planet, even without the benefit of vaccines or the helping hand of antimicrobial drugs. This system, when viewed at a species level, can adapt to almost any enemy imaginable. Coupled to genetic variations amongst humans—which open up the possibility for a range of advantages, from imperviousness to infection to a tendency for mild symptoms—this adaptability ensures that almost any infectious disease onslaught will leave a large proportion of the population alive to rebuild, in contrast to the fictional Hollywood versions.

## Space

**Probability – 0.1% chance of a collision.**

**Salter 16** [(Alexander William, Economics Professor at Texas Tech) “SPACE DEBRIS: A LAW AND ECONOMICS ANALYSIS OF THE ORBITAL COMMONS” 19 STAN. TECH. L. REV. 221 \*numbers replaced with English words] TDI

The probability of a collision is currently low. Bradley and Wein estimate that the maximum probability in LEO of a collision over the lifetime of a spacecraft remains below one in one thousand, conditional on continued compliance with NASA’s deorbiting guidelines.3 However, the possibility of a future “snowballing” effect, whereby debris collides with other objects, further congesting orbit space, remains a significant concern.4 Levin and Carroll estimate the average immediate destruction of wealth created by a collision to be approximately $30 million, with an additional $200 million in damages to all currently existing space assets from the debris created by the initial collision.5 The expected value of destroyed wealth because of collisions, currently small because of the low probability of a collision, can quickly become significant if future collisions result in runaway debris growth.

#### Alliances check miscalc – too costly

MacDonald 13 [(Bruce, teaches at the United States Institute of Peace on strategic posture and space/cyber security issues, leads a study on China and Crisis Stability in Space, and is adjunct professor at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies) “Deterrence and Crisis Stability in Space and Cyberspace,” in Anti-satellite Weapons, Deterrence and Sino-American Space Relations, September 2013, <https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a587431.pdf>] TDI

The US alliance structure can promote deterrence and crisis stability in space, as with nuclear deterrence. China has no such alliance system. If China were to engage in large-scale offensive counter-space operations, it would face not only the United States, but also NATO, Japan, South Korea and other highly aggrieved parties. Given Beijing’s major export dependence on these markets, and its dependence upon them for key raw material and high technology imports, China would be as devastated economically if it initiated strategic attacks in space. In contrast to America’s nuclear umbrella and extended deterrence, US allies make a tangible and concrete contribution to extended space deterrence through their multilateral participation in and dependence upon space assets. Attacks on these space assets would directly damage allied interests as well as those of the United States, further strengthening deterrent effects.

**No ‘space war’ – Insurmountable barriers and everyone has an interest in keeping space peaceful**

**Dobos 19** [(Bohumil Doboš, scholar at the Institute of Political Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic, and a coordinator of the Geopolitical Studies Research Centre) “Geopolitics of the Outer Space, Chapter 3: Outer Space as a Military-Diplomatic Field,” Pgs. 48-49] TDI

Despite the theorized potential for the achievement of the terrestrial dominance throughout the utilization of the ultimate high ground and the ease of destruction of space-based assets by the potential space weaponry, the utilization of space weapons is with current technology and no effective means to protect them far from fulfilling this potential (Steinberg 2012, p. 255). In current global international political and technological setting, the utility of space weapons is very limited, even if we accept that the ultimate high ground presents the potential to get a decisive tangible military advantage (which is unclear). This stands among the reasons for the lack of their utilization so far. Last but not the least, it must be pointed out that the states also develop passive defense systems designed to protect the satellites on orbit or critical capabilities they provide. These further decrease the utility of space weapons. These systems include larger maneuvering capacities, launching of decoys, preparation of spare satellites that are ready for launch in case of ASAT attack on its twin on orbit, or attempts to decrease the visibility of satellites using paint or materials less visible from radars (Moltz 2014, p. 31). Finally, we must look at the main obstacles of connection of the outer space and warfare. The first set of barriers is comprised of physical obstructions. As has been presented in the previous chapter, the outer space is very challenging domain to operate in. Environmental factors still present the largest threat to any space military capabilities if compared to any man-made threats (Rendleman 2013, p. 79). A following issue that hinders military operations in the outer space is the predictability of orbital movement. If the reconnaissance satellite's orbit is known, the terrestrial actor might attempt to hide some critical capabilities-an option that is countered by new surveillance techniques (spectrometers, etc.) (Norris 2010, p. 196)-but the hide-and-seek game is on. This same principle is, however, in place for any other space asset-any nation with basic tracking capabilities may quickly detect whether the military asset or weapon is located above its territory or on the other side of the planet and thus mitigate the possible strategic impact of space weapons not aiming at mass destruction. Another possibility is to attempt to destroy the weapon in orbit. Given the level of development for the ASAT technology, it seems that they will prevail over any possible weapon system for the time to come. Next issue, directly connected to the first one, is the utilization of weak physical protection of space objects that need to be as light as possible to reach the orbit and to be able to withstand harsh conditions of the domain. This means that their protection against ASAT weapons is very limited, and, whereas some avoidance techniques are being discussed, they are of limited use in case of ASAT attack. We can thus add to the issue of predictability also the issue of easy destructibility of space weapons and other military hardware (Dolman 2005, p. 40; Anantatmula 2013, p. 137; Steinberg 2012, p. 255). Even if the high ground was effectively achieved and other nations could not attack the space assets directly, there is still a need for communication with those assets from Earth. There are also ground facilities that support and control such weapons located on the surface. Electromagnetic communication with satellites might be jammed or hacked and the ground facilities infiltrated or destroyed thus rendering the possible space weapons useless (Klein 2006, p. 105; Rendleman 2013, p. 81). This issue might be overcome by the establishment of a base controlling these assets outside the Earth-on Moon or lunar orbit, at lunar L-points, etc.-but this perspective remains, for now, unrealistic. Furthermore, no contemporary actor will risk full space weaponization in the face of possible competition and the possibility of rendering the outer space useless. No actor is dominant enough to prevent others to challenge any possible attempts to dominate the domain by military means. To quote 2016 Stratfor analysis, "(a) war in space would be devastating to all, and preventing it, rather than finding ways to fight it, will likely remain the goal" (Larnrani 20 16). This stands true unless some space actor finds a utility in disrupting the arena for others.