## NC

#### Permissibility negates:

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

#### 2) Logic-

#### a) Propositions require positive justification before being accepted, otherwise one would be forced to accept the validity of logically contradictory propositions regarding subjects one knows nothing about, i.e if one knew nothing about P one would have to presume that both the “P” and “~P” are true.

#### b) The role of the aff is to provide a proactive moral obligation to do the aff and with permissibility we have no moral obligations

#### 3) Permissibility negates under TT OR Comparative Worlds-

#### a) Under TT the role of the ballot is to prove or disprove the aff and permissibility means that the aff’s moral obligation can’t be true

#### b) Under Comparative Worlds the role of the ballot is to decide whether we have a moral obligation to get to the world of the aff but we can’t obligate actors to get to the world of the aff

#### Don’t buy any affirming is harder arguments-

#### a) they’re all arbitrary and uncontextualized to the round

#### b) the permissibility debate is about morality, not theory- fairness or education aren’t arguments against our moral position

#### Determinism is true:

#### 1) Cognition – the best neuroscientific, psychological, and medical evidence show free will doesn’t exist. Lavazza 16

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

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

#### 2) Molecular Physics – our existence can be modeled by the molecules which comprise our bodies, which are all regulated by the laws of physics. Coyne 12

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

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

#### Determinism negates:

#### a) Determinism means that all actions are predetermined, which means that prescribing an action is incoherent because we are not in control to implement the aff- this negates independently of the permissibility debate

#### b) Free will is necessary to impose moral obligations upon actors and Determinism denies the existence of free will. This means that moral obligations are incoherent and triggers a state of permissibility

Coates 19 [D. Justin Coates (2019) Hard incompatibilism and the participant attitude, Canadian Journal of Philosophy, 49:2, 208-229, DOI: 10.1080/00455091.2018.1516057] ZS

Suppose I promise you that I’ll help you move but I then fail to deliver. Now suppose that you discover that I made that promise only under extreme duress. Plausibly, you would conclude that my utterance ‘I promise that . . .’ was infelicitous in some crucial way and that therefore, it wasn’t binding. That is, if I promised only as a result of extreme duress, then I couldn’t come to be obligated to keep that promise even though I (apparently) performed a speech act that, in other conditions, would be sufficient to create an obligation. Similarly, if you find out that I’ve been coerced to make the promise, or if I only made the promise because I was forced to take a drug that made me especially susceptible to agree to whatever others asked of me, or . . . you’d probably conclude that I was not morally obligated to keep the promise. So too, if I was a young child, who was only at the very earliest stages of understanding the social and normative significance of ‘I promise.’ In all these cases, I think there’s a simple and unified explanation for why the outward utterance, ‘I promise to help you move’ fails to actually obligate: none of the agents’ promises were made of their own free will. Unlike categorical moral obligations, which (putatively) bind us simply because we are moral agents, promissory obligations are voluntarily undertaken. This means that the promisor’s will has to be implicated in her promise in the right way. And when the promisor is under extreme duress, or coerced, or . . ., then her will is not free, and she does not come to be obligated to follow through on the promise that she apparently makes. But notice: the hard incompatibilist tells us that, although normal adult humans are not identical to those under duress, subject to coercion, or . . ., their actions are similarly unfree. After all, on hard incompatibilism, we are no more the source of our actions than any of the characters assembled above. If hard incompatibilism is true, it seems true of no one that they have made a promise ‘of their own free will.’ However, this is just to insist that no one has ever genuinely been subject to a promissory obligation. Hard incompatibilism is apparently at odds with the very idea of promissory obligation.

#### AND theory interps about acceptable NCs or fw offense must be in the 1AC. Net benefit is strat skew- they can go for bidirectional interps which screws the neg every time since they always have an interp to read against our position

## Case- util fw

#### Util fails-

#### On extinction outweighs

#### 1) Circular and impact justified- the only reason why we care about extinction because we have already presumed that it matters

#### 2) It’s debatable what happens after we die, so it’s still likely to some extent that there is an afterlife after we die, so death being the infinite evil doesn’t make sense

#### 3) Extinction based scenarios lead to action paralysis- if extinction is the worst outcome, then we can’t weigh between two extinction scenarios

#### 4) Statistically very probable that we will have another extinction event at some point because the earth is volatile, which means that extinction is inevitable and no reason to base all of our actions off of preventing it

#### On the three other cards- they’re just circular and presume that things like consequences matter to begin with. If I prove that util fails, these arguments get completely taken out

#### Any reason why their fw fails is a permissibility trigger because it means that the aff can’t dictate moral obligations. We have additional permissibility triggers-

#### A) Butterfly effect- any consequence will have infinitely repeating effects that cause impacts we won’t be able to predict, and any birghtline as to where we draw the line is arbitrary and self-serving

#### B) Aggregation fails- quantifying pleasure and pain is impossible, you can’t compare a migraine and 5 headaches

#### C) We can’t do utilitarian calculus with infinities- that’s just basic algebra- and

#### Infinite Worlds means infinite pleasure – all actions are permissible

Bostrom 08 Bostrom, Nick [Professor at University of Oxford, director of Oxford’s Future of Humanity Institute, PhD from London School of Economics]. The Infinitarian Challenge to Aggregative Ethics. 2008. <http://www.nickbostrom.com/ethics/infinite.pdf>)

“Recent cosmological evidence suggests that the world is probably infinite. Moreover, if the totality of physical existence is indeed infinite, in the kind of way that modern cosmology suggests it is, then it contains an infinite number of galaxies, stars, and planets. If there are an infinite number of planets then there is, with probability one, an infinite number of people. Infinitely many of these people are happy, infinitely many are unhappy. Likewise for other local properties that are plausible candidates for having value, pertaining to person-states, lives, or entire societies, ecosystems, or civilizations—there are infinitely many democratic states, and infinitely many that are ruled by despots, etc. It therefore appears likely that the actual world is canonically infinite. We do not know for sure that we live in a canonically infinite world. Contemporary cosmology is in considerable flux, so its conclusions should be regarded as tentative. But it is definitely not reasonable, in light of the evidence we currently possess, to assume that we do not live in a canonically infinite world. And that is sufficient for the predicament to arise. Any ethical theory that fails to cope with this likely empirical contingency must be rejected. We should not accept an ethical theory which, conditional on our current best scientific guesses about the size and nature of the cosmos, [Consequentialism] implies that it is ethically indifferent whether we cause or prevent another holocaust. Infinitarian paralysis threatens a wide range of popular ethical theories. Consider, to begin with, hedonistic utilitarianism [fails because], which in its classical formulation states that you ought to do that which maximizes the total amount of pleasure and minimizes the total amount of pain in the world. [i]f pleasure and pain are already infinite, then all possible actions you could take would be morally on a par according to this criterion, for none of them would make any difference to the total amount of pleasure or pain.

## BBB DA

#### Build Back Better is likely to happen, but we need political strength to convince Manchin

Becker 1/12 [(Amanda Becker, 1-12-2022) "Build Back Better isn’t dead, but talks have moved behind the scenes," 19th, <https://19thnews.org/2022/01/build-back-better-talks-behind-scenes>] ZS

When the U.S. Senate returned to Washington last week after its winter recess, Democrat Joe Manchin of West Virginia poured cold water on the prospects for the Build Back Better plan, a sweeping $1.75 trillion Democratic economic proposal with numerous measures designed to support working women. “There is no negotiation going on at this time,” Manchin told reporters January 4. The Senate has turned its attention to voting rights in the near term. But White House spokesperson Jen Psaki told reporters this week that Build Back Better “conversations are continuing behind the scenes at a staff level” — an assertion that is backed up by a dozen interviews. The 19th conducted with congressional staffers, advocacy groups and other stakeholders. Both Manchin and his staff are participating in those conversations, they said. Manchin’s statements on Build Back Better are closely followed as he, along with Sen. Kyrsten Sinema of Arizona, are both moderate Democrats who have objected to various components of the plan approved by the House in November. To get it over the finish line, Senate Democrats are aiming to use a process known as reconciliation, a once-a-year maneuver that requires a simple majority in the evenly divided, 100-seat Senate instead of the usual 60-vote filibuster threshold. To pass, it will need support from both Manchin and Sinema. The starting point for the next round of negotiations is a package focused on previously proposed climate provisions, subsidized child care that caps contributions for most families at 7 percent of their income, and universal pre-K — all things for which Manchin has expressed some level of support, according to those familiar with the status of negotiations. It looks similar to a proposal Manchin pitched to the White House in December before he told Fox News that he had “tried everything humanly possible” to support the Build Back Better plan Democrats were negotiating but could not. The child care and pre-K components would be funded for a longer period of time than in the White House’s proposal — a decade, instead of six years — likely necessitating the removal of other components, such as paid leave or an extended, expanded child tax credit to remain under the agreed-upon $1.75 trillion price tag. Manchin previously expressed reservations that both paid leave and the child tax credit could be abused, and the latter is a main reason why Senate negotiations fell apart in December, those familiar with the process said. Still being negotiated are health care components that could, among other things, extend expanded subsidies for purchasing Affordable Care Act plans that were in the coronavirus relief package signed into law last year. The fates of funding for home-based care for the elderly and people with disabilities and investments in higher education are less clear. “I can confidently say that Build Back Better is not dead. We know folks in the White House and on the Hill are continuing to work together to move this forward, as are groups on the outside that have been consistently fighting,” Danielle Melfi, the executive director of Building Back Together, an outside group formed to support President Joe Biden’s domestic agenda. “Conversations are ongoing to get this across the finish line,” Melfi added, though she did not weigh in on Manchin’s role specifically. Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer plans to hold a vote by next week on changing filibuster rules to carve out election bills. Multiple Democratic senators have expressed opposition to the change, so that effort is likely to fail. The ideal deadline to pass election-related legislation would likely be by March 1, when Texas holds the first primary of the 2022 midterm elections cycle. Build Back Better negotiators told The 19th that they anticipated public focus to return to the economic proposal in March and April. “We can walk and chew gum at the same time,” Psaki told reporters last week, “And I can assure you that we are in touch with a range of senators and their staffs and committee staff about Build Back Better, even as we’re working with Leader Schumer about getting voting rights done.” Democrats say they have not given up on extending the expanded child tax credit that expired at the end of 2021 — Psaki reiterated that Biden sees it as a “key priority” that could cut childhood poverty by as much as 40 percent annually. Privately, key Democrats acknowledge that they may need to pursue another extension as part of a future COVID-19 relief bill or as a stand-alone piece of legislation if they cannot get Manchin on board. A Manchin spokesperson told The 19th that he “has clearly articulated his policy concerns with Build Back Better, which are rooted in rising inflation, the ongoing pandemic and the geopolitical uncertainty around the world” and that he “continues to look for ways to improve the lives of every American.”

#### The plan is a political firestorm---regulating private space is unpopular---lawmakers want to encourage private space industries to encourage innovation and avoid government liability.

Loren Grush 15, science reporter for The Verge, the technology and culture brand from Vox Media, where she specializes in news about Space and Space law, 2015, “Private space companies avoid FAA oversight again, with Congress' blessing,” https://www.theverge.com/2015/11/16/9744298/private-space-government-regulation-spacex-asteroid-mining

The Senate passed the bill [H.R. 2262](https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/2262), also known as the US Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act, last week, and both the House and the Senate have expressed support for it. House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy has [scheduled the bill for final approval this afternoon](http://www.majorityleader.gov/floor/#daily). After it passes, it goes to the president for his official signature. PRIVATE SPACE TRAVEL IS STILL CONSIDERED YOUNG Many prominent commercial space companies — including SpaceX, Blue Origin, and Virgin Galactic — [have applauded H.R. 2262](https://science.house.gov/sites/republicans.science.house.gov/files/documents/FINAL%20WTS_SPACE%20Act%20of%202015.pdf). The legislation means that private space travel is still considered young, and lawmakers have given the industry more time to experiment and gather data."It allows the industry to grow, to test, and to develop without this overshadow of the regulatory hammer coming down on them," Eric Stallmer, president of the Commercial Spaceflight Federation, a non-profit aimed at promoting commercial spaceflight development, told *The Verge*. It also means that people participating in private spaceflight do so at their own risks, and there are no government regulations in place specifically to keep them safe. Space travel isn’t that safe, of course; nearly 1 in 10 rockets fail, though most vehicles that go into space these days don’t have crew members on board. The FAA is concerned about the spacecraft that will carry people, though, which is why the agency doesn’t seem supportive of the learning period extension. In February of 2014, George Nield, head of the FAA Office of Commercial Space Transportation, [testified before the House Subcommittee on Space](http://docs.house.gov/meetings/SY/SY16/20140204/101703/HHRG-113-SY16-Wstate-NieldG-20140204.pdf) that he thinks it's time for the period to expire. Nield said he understands that many in the industry fear overregulation by the FAA, but that his office is more concerned with ensuring crew safety than issuing "burdensome" standards. "We want to enable safe and successful commercial operations," he testified. REGULATORY LEARNING PERIOD The advent of private spaceflight began in the 1960s, but the industry has only started growing rapidly this decade. To address this expansion, Congress passed the Commercial Space Launch Amendments Act in 2004. It granted the private sector a "learning period" free of regulation. The learning period was set to expire in December 2012 but was granted two short extensions. H.R. 2262 will extend the period for a further eight years, through September 30th, 2023. THE FAA STILL HAS SOME AUTHORITY TO REGULATE THE COMMERCIAL SECTOR During the learning period, the FAA still has some authority to regulate the commercial sector. The agency is responsible for issuing licenses for rocket launches and for vehicles re-entering Earth's atmosphere. The agency’s main concern is to ensure that launch vehicles aren’t immediate threats to the uninvolved public and property. Under this legislation, the FAA is restricted from issuing licenses specifically pertaining to the safety of a spacecraft's crew or passengers. Right now, people who participate in commercial spaceflight do so through "informed consent" — meaning they know that they're partaking in an endeavor that could [easily kill them](http://www.popsci.com/article/technology/virgin-galactic-crash-may-lead-new-regulations-private-spaceflight). Before these participants can fly, they must sign a document that says spaceflight is inherently dangerous and they understand the risks associated with it. The end of the learning period would allow the FAA to issue standards related to crew safety — but it also means the agency could issue standards for anything else in relation to commercial spaceflight. For example, the agency could dictate specifically how engines or vehicles should be designed and built, similar to how the FAA oversees the commercial aviation industry. *NTSB investigators stand next to the crash site of SpaceShipTwo. (NTSB)* The FAA hasn't expressed interest in doing this, but Nield noted in his 2014 testimony that the agency wants to regulate spaceflight activities that take place in orbit; for instance, the FAA wants to issue standards for collision avoidance. The agency also hinted it might try to regulate commercial crew safety following last year's Virgin Galactic crash, in which a pilot was killed during a test flight of the company's SpaceShipTwo vehicle. The initial regulatory learning period allowed the FAA to issue regulations in direct response to a serious commercial space travel accident, and the SpaceShipTwo crash was the first commercial flight to result in a fatality. [The FAA told *Bloomberg*](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2014-11-07/should-space-travel-be-like-climbing-everest-or-airlines-) that the agency may want additional regulations following an accident investigation, without saying what those might entail. H.R. 2262 still maintains the FAA's ability to issue regulations in the event of a fatal accident, however those regulations must specifically address the accident itself and wouldn't apply to the entire industry. Stallmer, of the Commercial Spaceflight Federation, argued that there will be a time when more regulations are needed — after this learning period is over, without saying when that would be. He hopes that any new standards will stem from extensive dialogue between the government and commercial sectors, as companies continue to learn more about the business of rocket science. "And as the industry grows, we’ll have the knowledge we need so we can eventually have efficient and common sense regulations," said Stallmer. SPACE STATION AND ASTEROID MINING *The International Space Station (NASA)* H.R. 2262 also issues a number of other key provisions, [which can be found here](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-114hr2262eas/pdf/BILLS-114hr2262eas.pdf). For one, the bill officially extends operations of the International Space Station through 2024. President Obama had already approved this ISS extension, but Congress must sign off on it in order for it to be final. "A new president could come and say, 'To hell with this space station,'" said Stallmer. "This puts into law that the space station will continue to be a national laboratory." And then there’s the asteroid mining. Under one provision of H.R. 2262 called the Space Resource Exploration and Utilization Act of 2015, commercial companies get the rights to any resources that they collect from celestial bodies. The provision is important for companies like the asteroid mining company Planetary Resources, which recently partnered with Virgin Galactic. "Now, if you go out somewhere in space and you pick [something] up, it’s yours," said Chris Lewicki, the president and chief engineer of Planetary Resources. "IF YOU GO OUT SOMEWHERE IN SPACE AND YOU PICK [SOMETHING] UP, IT’S YOURS." The bill mostly refines what was originally laid out in the Outer Space Treaty, a document signed by 104 companies in 1967 that eventually became the basis for international space law. The treaty forbids anyone from claiming asteroids or planets as new government territories, but it does grant non-government entities the rights "explore and use" outer space. That means companies can go collect any space materials they can find and bring back home with them. Now, H.R. 2262 guarantees that they will own those materials.

#### Even if pressure fails---regaining US leadership vindicates the democratic model.

Jonathan **Freedland 21**, Guardian columnist, “The battle to get here was ugly, but the impact of Joe Biden’s climate plan will be huge,” Guardian, 10-29-2021, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2021/oct/29/joe-biden-climate-plan-emissions-cop26>

This matters not only because the US is, after China, the world’s biggest emitter of CO2, but because of the leadership role the US needs to play. It’s hard for Biden to bang the table and demand greater, speedier action from the likes of China and India when the US itself is still hesitating, even during this all too rare interlude – likely to end at next year’s midterms – when Biden’s party controls the White House and both houses of Congress. Authoritarian states fond of arguing that democracy is unfit for purpose in the 21st century will be cheered. Those young voters who rallied to Biden for the sake of the climate will wonder if it was worth it. And yet, there is another way to look at all this. It begins with a recognition that the alternative to Manchin as the senator from West Virginia is not some impeccable liberal: if he or someone very much like him wasn’t there, the seat would be filled by a Republican and there would be no Biden plan, big or small. (The same is not true of Sinema: Arizona, which voted for Biden in 2020, would not punish her for behaving like a Democrat.) Not that this package is so small. If it passes, it will represent the biggest US spend to tackle global heating in history. During the negotiations that led to this admittedly provisional agreement, Biden gave way on that string of popular, necessary domestic pledges, including free community college and expanded healthcare provision – but he held firm on the climate. It now stands as the largest single component of the entire bill, and that represents a huge victory by the environmental movement. It has persuaded one of the two main US parties to recognise that the climate is the dominant issue of the age. Besides, $555bn is not to be sneezed at. I spoke on Thursday with Ben Rhodes, former adviser to Barack Obama. In 2009, Obama set aside a mere $90bn for climate-related action. But even that sum worked wonders. Despite Trump’s “ranting and raving”, and despite his withdrawal from the Paris accords, Rhodes notes that the US actually met its Paris targets in the Trump period. That’s because Obama’s move had signalled where the economy was going, setting in train a shift that Trump could not reverse: “Companies were adjusting, the markets were adjusting, money was moving.” Now, a decade later, “people are not building new coal plants in the United States; they’re building windfarms and solar panels.” Biden is sending a much bigger signal now. Combined with various executive actions he can take as president – moves he can make without the blessing of the senate or Manchin or anyone else – the legislation should help US greenhouse emissions fall to half their 2005 levels by 2030. That can serve as a useful corrective to the view that the US, and democracy itself, has become dysfunctional and ineffective in the face of an existential threat. Yes, a dictatorship such as China can move more quickly: there is no senator from West Shanxi for Xi Jinping to worry about. But it is Europe and, if Biden’s deal holds, the US that is setting the pace. That, Rhodes adds, is partly down to the pressure to act on the climate that comes with an open civil society and a free press.

#### Shoring up the democratic model cascades and prevents a global erosion to authoritarianism that causes nuclear war- turns their heg scenario

Dr. Larry **Diamond 19**, Professor of Political Science and Sociology at Stanford University, Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution, Senior Fellow at the Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies, PhD in Sociology from Stanford University, Ill Winds: Saving Democracy from Russian Rage, Chinese Ambition, and American Complacency, p. 199-202

The most obvious response to the ill winds blowing from the world’s autocracies is to help the winds of freedom blowing in the other direction. The democracies of the West cannot save themselves if they do not stand with democrats around the world. This is truer now than ever, for several reasons. We live in a globalized world, one in which models, trends, and ideas cascade across borders. Any wind of change may gather quickly and blow with gale force. People everywhere form ideas about how to govern—or simply about which forms of government and sources of power may be irresistible—based on what they see happening elsewhere. We are now immersed in a fierce global contest of ideas, information, and norms. In the digital age, that contest is moving at lightning speed, shaping how people think about their political systems and the way the world runs. As doubts about and threats to democracy are mounting in the West, this is not a contest that the democracies can afford to lose. Globalization, with its flows of trade and information, raises the stakes for us in another way. Authoritarian and badly governed regimes increasingly pose a direct threat to popular sovereignty and the rule of law in our own democracies. Covert flows of money and influence are subverting and corrupting our democratic processes and institutions. They will not stop just because Americans and others pretend that we have no stake in the future of freedom in the world. If we want to defend the core principles of self-government, transparency, and accountability in our own democracies, we have no choice but to promote them globally. It is not enough to say that dictatorship is bad and that democracy, however flawed, is still better. Popular enthusiasm for a lesser evil cannot be sustained indefinitely. People need the inspiration of a positive vision. Democracy must demonstrate that it is a just and fair political system that advances humane values and the common good. To make our republics more perfect, established democracies must not only adopt reforms to more fully include and empower their own citizens. They must also support people, groups, and institutions struggling to achieve democratic values elsewhere. The best way to counter Russian rage and Chinese ambition is to show that Moscow and Beijing are on the wrong side of history; that people everywhere yearn to be free; and that they can make freedom work to achieve a more just, sustainable, and prosperous society. In our networked age, both idealism and the harder imperatives of global power and security argue for more democracy, not less. For one thing, if we do not worry about the quality of governance in lower-income countries, we will face more and more troubled and failing states. Famine and genocide are the curse of authoritarian states, not democratic ones. Outright state collapse is the ultimate, bitter fruit of tyranny. When countries like Syria, Libya, and Afghanistan descend into civil war; when poor states in Africa cannot generate jobs and improve their citizens’ lives due to rule by corrupt and callous strongmen; when Central American societies are held hostage by brutal gangs and kleptocratic rulers, people flee—and wash up on the shores of the democracies. Europe and the United States cannot withstand the rising pressures of immigration unless they work to support better, more stable and accountable government in troubled countries. The world has simply grown too small, too flat, and too fast to wall off rotten states and pretend they are on some other planet. Hard security interests are at stake. As even the Trump administration’s 2017 National Security Strategy makes clear, the main threats to U.S. national security all stem from authoritarianism, whether in the form of tyrannies from Russia and China to Iran and North Korea or in the guise of antidemocratic terrorist movements such as ISIS.1 By supporting the development of democracy around the world, we can deny these authoritarian adversaries the geopolitical running room they seek. Just as Russia, China, and Iran are trying to undermine democracies to bend other countries to their will, so too can we contain these autocrats’ ambitions by helping other countries build effective, resilient democracies that can withstand the dictators’ malevolence. Of course, democratically elected governments with open societies will not support the American line on every issue. But no free society wants to mortgage its future to another country. The American national interest would best be secured by a pluralistic world of free countries—one in which autocrats can no longer use corruption and coercion to gobble up resources, alliances, and territory. If you look back over our history to see who has posed a threat to the United States and our allies, it has always been authoritarian regimes and empires. As political scientists have long noted, no two democracies have ever gone to war with each other—ever. It is not the democracies of the world that are supporting international terrorism, proliferating weapons of mass destruction, or threatening the territory of their neighbors. For all these reasons, we need a new global campaign for freedom. Everything I am proposing in this book plays a role in that campaign, but in this chapter, I am concerned more narrowly with the ways that we can directly advance democracy, human rights, and the rule of law in the twenty-first-century world. As with any policy area, many of the challenges can be somewhat technical, requiring smart design and the careful management of programs and institutions. Those operational debates I leave for another venue. Here, I make a more basic case for four imperatives. First, we must support the democrats of the world—the people and organizations struggling to create and improve free and accountable government. Second, we must support struggling and developing democracies, helping them to grow their economies and strengthen their institutions. Third, we must pressure authoritarian regimes to stop abusing the rights and stealing the resources of their citizens, including by imposing sanctions on dictators to make them think hard about their choices and separate them from both their supporters and the people at large. Finally, we need to reboot our public diplomacy—our global networks of information and ideas—for today’s fast-paced age of information and disinformation. For the sake of both our interests and our values, we need a foreign policy that puts a high priority on democracy, human rights, and the rule of law.