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#### Xi is tightening control over the PLA but completing goals are critical.

Krishnan 21 – Ananth, 11/18/21, [‘Xi tightened control over the PLA’, TheHindu, <https://www.thehindu.com/news/international/xi-tightened-control-over-the-pla/article37549460.ece>] Justin

The new resolution on history passed last week by China’s ruling Communist Party has said that President Xi Jinping had tightened control over the military to address the party’s “obviously lacking” leadership of the armed forces under his predecessors.

The full text of the resolution, released on Tuesday evening, listed some of the actions taken by the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) under Mr. Xi, who is also the chairman of the Central Military Commission. These included what the document described as “major operations related to border defence”.

No specifics

It did not specify what those major operations were. China has unresolved land borders with India and Bhutan. In April 2020, the PLA mobilised two divisions and carried out multiple transgressions across the Line of Actual Control (LAC) in Eastern Ladakh, sparking the worst crisis along the border in many years. Talks to resolve the tensions are still on-going.

“The armed forces have remained committed to carrying out military struggles in a flexible manner to counter military provocations by external forces, and they have created a strong deterrent against separatist activities seeking ‘Taiwan independence,’” the resolution said.

“They have conducted major operations related to border defence, protecting China’s maritime rights, countering terrorism and maintaining stability, disaster rescue and relief, fighting COVID-19, peacekeeping and escort services, humanitarian assistance, and international military cooperation.”

Last week’s resolution on history was only third such document putting forth the official view on party history, following resolutions passed by Mao Zedong in 1945 and Deng Xiaoping in 1981.

The new resolution dealt more with the future than the past. It essentially reaffirmed the official view on history, saying that the “basic points and conclusions” of past resolutions “remain valid to this day.”

It repeated the conclusion reached in 1981 on Mao’s errors noting that “mistakes were made” and that “Mao Zedong’s theoretical and practical errors concerning class struggle in a socialist society became increasingly serious” leading to the disasters of the Cultural Revolution.

Criticism of predecessors

Much of the new resolution focuses on emphasising Mr. Xi’s leadership and calling for the party to support his “core” status. It only briefly mentioned Mr. Xi’s predecessors Jiang Zemin and Hu Jintao, and implicitly critcised some aspects of their leadership including on military matters.

“For a period of time, the party’s leadership over the military was obviously lacking,” it noted. “If this problem had not been completely solved, it would not only have diminished the military’s combat capacity, but also undermined the key political principle that the party commands the gun.”

The document said Mr. Xi’s leadership had tightened supervision on the military including boosting “troop training and battle preparedness”, and it repeated China’s stated goals of completing the modernisation of its armed forces by 2035 and building a “world class” military by 2050, which observers see as meaning on par with the U.S.

‘Working vigorously’

“To build strong people’s armed forces, it is of paramount importance to uphold the fundamental principle and system of absolute party leadership over the military, to ensure that supreme leadership and command authority rest with the party Central Committee and the Central Military Commission (CMC), and to fully enforce the system of the CMC chairman assuming overall responsibility,” the resolution said, adding that “setting their sights on this problem, the Central Committee and the CMC have worked vigorously to govern the military with strict discipline in every respect.”

#### The commercial space sector is one of the PLAs central goals – the plan is a 180.

Bartholomew & Cleveland 19 – Carolyn and Robin, 4/25/19, Chairmen and Vice Chairmen. Section is written from Michael A. McDevitt, US Congressperson, [“HEARING ON CHINA IN SPACE: A STRATEGIC COMPETITION?,” <https://www.uscc.gov/sites/default/files/transcripts/April%2025%2C%202019%20Hearing%20Transcript%20%282%29.pdf>] Justin

As the Chairman said, China is determined to become a leading space power, which requires continuing to boost its innovation capabilities, both in its civilian and military sectors. The People’s Liberation Army is closely involved in most if not every aspect of China’s space program, from helping formulate and execute national space goals to overseeing China’s human spaceflight program. Coverage of China’s space program must treat seriously the implications of the reality that in many cases the boundaries between the military and civil silos of China’s program are thin, if they exist at all.

Our second panel today will address the application of what China calls its “military-civil fusion” strategy to its space sector. Military-civil fusion, a strategic concept designed to harness civilian sector innovation to power China’s military and technological modernization with the goal of leapfrogging the United States and becoming a technological powerhouse. Space has been designated as an especially important sector for military-civil fusion, and the impacts of this campaign on China’s burgeoning commercial space sector—itself a recipient of generous government support and protection—will be crucial as Chinese companies increasingly seek to compete in the international marketplace. Military-civil fusion is especially worthy of attention due to its continued reliance on technology transfer, by hook or by crook, to fuel China’s industrial and military growth.

Our third and final panel today will examine China’s military space and counterspace activities. Since its direct-ascent kinetic antisatellite test in 2007, which was responsible for a large amount of all space debris currently in Earth’s orbit, China has continued to invest in a variety of offensive antisatellite capabilities. Indeed, China’s counterspace arsenal contains many options: earlier this month, Acting Secretary of Defense Patrick Shanahan said China “has exercised and continues to develop” jamming capabilities; is deploying directed-energy counterspace weapons; has deployed an operational ground-based antisatellite missile system; and is prepared to use cyberattacks against U.S. space systems.

#### That triggers backlash – they don’t support restrictions on the space sector and will do everything to convince leaders not to do the plan.

Cheng 14 [Dean Cheng, Senior Research Fellow in the Asia Studies Center at the Heritage Foundation, Former Senior Analyst at the China Studies Division of the Center for Naval Analyses, Former Senior Analyst with Science Applications International Corporation, “Prospects for U.S.-China Space Cooperation”, Testimony before the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, United States Senate, 4/9/2014, https://www.heritage.org/testimony/prospects-us-china-space-cooperation]

At the same time, space is now a sector that enjoys significant political support within the Chinese political system. Based on their writings, the PLA is clearly intent upon developing the ability to establish “space dominance,” in order to fight and win “local wars under informationized conditions.”[8] The two SOEs are seen as key parts of the larger military-industrial complex, providing the opportunities to expose a large workforce to such areas as systems engineering and systems integration. It is no accident that China’s commercial airliner development effort tapped the top leadership of China’s aerospace corporations for managerial and design talent.[9] From a bureaucratic perspective, this is a powerful lobby, intent on preserving its interests. China’s space efforts should therefore be seen as political, as much as military or economic, statements, directed at both domestic and foreign audiences. Insofar as the PRC has scored major achievements in space, these reflect positively on both China’s growing power and respect (internationally) and the CCP’s legitimacy (internally). Efforts at inducing Chinese cooperation in space, then, are likely to be viewed in terms of whether they promote one or both objectives. As China has progressed to the point of being the world’s second-largest economy (in gross domestic product terms), it becomes less clear as to why China would necessarily want to cooperate with other countries on anything other than its own terms. Prospects for Cooperation Within this context, then, the prospects for meaningful cooperation with the PRC in the area of space would seem to be extremely limited. China’s past experience of major high-technology cooperative ventures (Sino–Soviet cooperation in the 1950s, U.S.–China cooperation in the 1980s until Tiananmen, and Sino–European space cooperation on the Galileo satellite program) is an unhappy one, at best. The failure of the joint Russian–Chinese Phobos–Grunt mission is likely seen in Beijing as further evidence that a “go-it-alone” approach is preferable. Nor is it clear that, bureaucratically, there is significant interest from key players such as the PLA or the military industrial complex in expanding cooperation.[10] Moreover, as long as China’s economy continues to expand, and the top political leadership values space efforts, there is little prospect of a reduction in space expenditures—making international cooperation far less urgent for the PRC than most other spacefaring states. [FOOTNOTE] [10]It is worth noting here that the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs is not a part of the CCP Politburo, a key power center in China. Thus, the voice of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is muted, at best, in any internal debate on policy. [END FOOTNOTE] If there is likely to be limited enthusiasm for cooperation in Chinese circles, there should also be skepticism in American ones. China’s space program is arguably one of the most opaque in the world. Even such basic data as China’s annual space expenditures is lacking—with little prospect of Beijing being forthcoming. As important, China’s decision-making processes are little understood, especially in the context of space. Seven years after the Chinese anti-satellite (ASAT) test, exactly which organizations were party to that decision, and why it was undertaken, remains unclear. Consequently, any effort at cooperation would raise questions about the identity of the partners and ultimate beneficiaries—with a real likelihood that the PLA would be one of them.

#### An unhinged PLA triggers Himalayan war – goes global

Chellaney 17 [Dr. Brahma Chellaney, Professor of Strategic Studies at the Center for Policy Research and Fellow at the Robert Bosch Academy, PhD in International Studies from Jawaharlal Nehru University, “Why the Chinese Military’s Rising Clout Troubles Xi Jinping”, The National, 9/9/2017, https://www.thenational.ae/opinion/why-the-chinese-military-s-rising-clout-troubles-xi-jinping-1.626815?videoId=5754807360001]

China’s president Xi Jinping has stepped up his domestic political moves in the run-up to the critical 19th national congress of the Chinese Communist Party next month, but he is still struggling to keep the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) in line. China’s political system makes it hard to get a clear picture, yet Mr Xi’s actions underscore the troublesome civil-military relations in the country. Take the recent standoff with India that raised the spectre of a Himalayan war, with China threatening reprisals if New Delhi did not unconditionally withdraw its forces from a small Bhutanese plateau, which Beijing claims is Chinese territory. After 10 weeks, the face-off on the Doklam Plateau ended with both sides pulling back troops and equipment from the site on the same day, signalling that Beijing, not New Delhi, had blinked. The mutual-withdrawal deal was struck just after Mr Xi replaced the chief of the PLA’s joint staff department. This key position, equivalent to the chairman of the US joint chiefs of staff, was created only last year as part of Mr Xi’s military reforms to turn the PLA into a force “able to fight and win wars”. The Doklam pullback suggests that the removed chief, Gen Fang Fenghui, who has since been detained for alleged corruption, was an obstacle to clinching a deal with India. To be sure, this was not the first time that the PLA’s belligerent actions in the Himalayas imposed diplomatic costs on China. A classic case happened when Mr Xi reached India on a state visit in September 2014. He arrived on Indian prime minister Narendra Modi’s birthday with a strange gift for his host, a predawn Chinese military encroachment deep into India’s northern region of Ladakh. The encroachment, the worst in many years in terms of the number of intruding troops, overshadowed Mr Xi’s visit. It appeared bizarre that the military of an important power would seek to mar the visit of its own head of state to a key neighbouring country. Yet Chinese premier Li Keqiang’s earlier visit to New Delhi in 2013 was similarly preceded by a PLA incursion into another part of Ladakh that lasted three weeks. Such provocations might suggest that they are intentional, with the Chinese government in the know, thus reflecting a preference for blending soft and hard tactics. But it is also possible that these actions underscore the continuing “disconnect between the military and the civilian leadership” in China that then US defence secretary Robert Gates warned about in 2011. During his 2014 India trip, Mr Xi appeared embarrassed by the accompanying PLA encroachment and assured Mr Modi that he would sort it out upon his return. Soon after he returned, the Chinese defence ministry quoted Mr Xi as telling a closed-door meeting with PLA commanders that “all PLA forces should follow the president’s instructions” and that the military must display “absolute loyalty and firm faith in the party”. Recently Xi conveyed that same message yet again when he addressed a parade marking the 90th anniversary of the PLA’s creation on August 1, 1927. Donning military fatigues, Mr Xi exhorted members of his 2.3-million-strong armed forces to “unswervingly follow the absolute leadership of the party.” Had civilian control of the PLA been working well, would Mr Xi repeatedly be demanding “absolute loyalty” from the military or asking it to “follow his instructions”? China does not have a national army; rather the party has an army. So the PLA has traditionally sworn fealty to the party, not the nation. Under Mr Xi’s two immediate predecessors, Hu Jintao and Jiang Zemin, the PLA gradually became stronger at the expense of the party. The military’s rising clout has troubled Mr Xi because it hampers his larger ambition. As part of his effort to reassert party control over the military, Mr Xi has used his anti-corruption campaign to ensnare a number of top PLA officers. He has also cut the size of the ground force and established a new command-and-control structure. But just as a dog’s tail cannot be straightened, asserting full civil control over a politically ascendant PLA is proving unachievable. After all, the party depends on the PLA to ensure domestic order and sustain its own political monopoly. The regime’s legitimacy increasingly relies on an appeal to nationalism. But the PLA, with its soaring budgets and expanding role to safeguard China’s overseas interests, sees itself as the ultimate arbiter of nationalism. To make matters worse, Mr Xi has made many enemies at home in his effort to concentrate power in himself, including through corruption purges. It is not known whether the PLA’s upper echelon respects him to the extent to be fully guided by his instructions. In the past decade, the PLA’s increasing clout has led China to stake out a more muscular role. This includes resurrecting territorial and maritime disputes, asserting new sovereignty claims, and using construction activity to change the status quo. China’s cut-throat internal politics and troubled civil-military relations clearly have a bearing on its external policy. The risks of China’s rise as a praetorian state are real and carry major implications for international security.

#### Extinction.

Caldicott 17 – Helen, 2017, Founder of Physicians for Social Responsibility [“The new nuclear danger: George W. Bush's military-industrial complex,” The New Press]//Elmer

The use of Pakistani nuclear weapons could trigger a chain reac­tion. **Nuclear-armed India, an ancient enemy, could respond** in kind. China, India's hated foe, could react if India used her nuclear weapons, triggering a nuclear [war] ~~holocaust~~ on the subcontinent. If any of either **Russia** or **America**'s 2,250 strategic weapons on hair-trigger alert were launched either **accidentally** or **purposefully** in response, **nuclear winter** would ensue, meaning the **end of most life on earth**.

## 2

Permissibility and presumption negate – a] Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. This means you negate if there is no offense because the resolution is probably false b] real world policies require proactive justification to be passed – outweighs since that determines portable impacts

#### Ethics must begin a priori and the meta-ethic is bindingness.

#### [1] Uncertainty – our experiences are inaccessible to others which allows people to say they don’t experience the same, however a priori principles are universally applied to all agents.

#### [2] Bindingness – I can keep asking “why should I follow this” which results in skep since obligations are predicated on ignorantly accepting rules. Only reason solves since asking “why reason?” requires reason which is self-justified.

#### That means we must universally will maxims— any non-universalizable norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative.

#### Prefer –

#### [1] All other frameworks collapse—non-Kantian theories source obligations in extrinsically good objects, but that presupposes the goodness of the rational will.

#### [2] Theory – Frameworks are topicality interps of the word ought so they should be theoretically justified. Prefer on resource disparities—a focus on evidence and statistics privileges debaters with the most preround prep which excludes lone-wolfs who lack huge evidence files. A debate under my framework can easily be won without any prep since huge evidence files aren’t required.

#### Negate:

#### [1] A model of freedom mandates a market-oriented approach to space—that negates

Broker 20 [(Tyler, work has been published in the Gonzaga Law Review, the Albany Law Review and the University of Memphis Law Review.) “Space Law Can Only Be Libertarian Minded,” Above the Law, 1-14-20, <https://abovethelaw.com/2020/01/space-law-can-only-be-libertarian-minded/>] TDI

The impact on human daily life from a transition to the virtually unlimited resource reality of space cannot be overstated. However, when it comes to the law, a minimalist, dare I say libertarian, approach appears as the only applicable system. In the words of NASA, “2020 promises to be a big year for space exploration.” Yet, as Rand Simberg points out in Reason magazine, it is actually private American investment that is currently moving space exploration to “a pace unseen since the 1960s.” According to Simberg, due to this increase in private investment “We are now on the verge of getting affordable private access to orbit for large masses of payload and people.” The impact of that type of affordable travel into space might sound sensational to some, but in reality the benefits that space can offer are far greater than any benefit currently attributed to any major policy proposal being discussed at the national level. The sheer amount of resources available within our current reach/capabilities simply speaks for itself. However, although those new realities will, as Simberg says, “bring to the fore a lot of ideological issues that up to now were just theoretical,” I believe it will also eliminate many economic and legal distinctions we currently utilize today. For example, the sheer number of resources we can already obtain in space means that in the rapidly near future, the distinction between a nonpublic good or a public good will be rendered meaningless. In other words, because the resources available within our solar system exist in such quantities, all goods will become nonrivalrous in their consumption and nonexcludable in their distribution. This would mean government engagement in the public provision of a nonpublic good, even at the trivial level, or what Kevin Williamson defines as socialism, is rendered meaningless or impossible. In fact, in space, I fail to see how any government could even try to legally compel collectivism in the way Simberg fears. Similar to many economic distinctions, however, it appears that many laws, both the good and the bad, will also be rendered meaningless as soon as we begin to utilize the resources within our solar system. For example, if every human being is given access to the resources that allows them to replicate anything anyone else has, or replace anything “taken” from them instantly, what would be the point of theft laws? If you had virtually infinite space in which you can build what we would now call luxurious livable quarters, all without exploiting human labor or fragile Earth ecosystems when you do it, what sense would most property, employment, or commercial law make? Again, this is not a pipe dream, no matter how much our population grows for the next several millennia, the amount of resources within our solar system can sustain such an existence for every human being. Rather than panicking about the future, we should try embracing it, or at least meaningfully preparing for it. Currently, the Outer Space Treaty, or as some call it “the Magna Carta of Space,” is silent on the issue of whether private individuals or corporate entities can own territory in space. Regardless of whether governments allow it, however, private citizens are currently obtaining the ability to travel there, and if human history is any indicator, private homesteading will follow, flag or no flag. We Americans know this is how a Wild West starts, where most regulation becomes the impractical pipe dream. But again, this would be a Wild West where the exploitation of human labor and fragile Earth ecosystem makes no economic sense, where every single human can be granted access to resources that even the wealthiest among us now would envy, and where innovation and imagination become the only things we would recognize as currency. Only a libertarian-type system, that guarantees basic individual rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness could be valued and therefore human fidelity to a set of laws made possible, in such an existence.

## 3

The United States federal government should:

* negotiate a new multiple-link hotline system that communicates through text and receive-only modes linking the United States National Security Council directly to the Security Council of Russia and the People’s Liberation Army

#### Redefine “aircraft” to include aerospace vehicles in the ICAO annexes.

#### Space hotlines solves miscalc

Erwin 21 [Sandra Erwin, 11-3-2021, "One way to help prevent wars in space? Military hotlines with Russia and China," SpaceNews, https://spacenews.com/one-way-to-help-prevent-wars-in-space-military-hotlines-with-russia-and-china/] Jet

WASHINGTON — Hotlines between heads of states have long been established to reduce the risk that an accident or miscalculation might trigger a nuclear war. During recent U.S. military operations in the airspace above Syria, a hotline was set up with Russia to ensure safety of flight. With space now considered a domain of war, hotlines between U.S. and foreign rivals might be worth contemplating, said Lt. Gen. B. Chance Saltzman, U.S. Space Force deputy chief of space operations for operations, cyber and nuclear. Before joining the Space Force, Saltzman led air campaigns at U.S. Air Forces Central Command in the Middle East. “We had a hotline to the Russians because we were very concerned that a miscommunication with aircraft flying in close proximity in Syria would lead to a problem,” he said Nov. 3 during a conference call with U.S. and European reporters. “I don’t see any reason why a similar approach couldn’t work for the space domain,” Saltzman said. Saltzman is in Europe this week visiting allies. He said many of the conversations were about the “strategic competition” that is unfolding in the space domain between the U.S., China and Russia and the “lessons learned from history about miscommunication,” he said. During the air campaign over Syria, “the hotline that we used was to make as many of our operations as transparent as possible and attempt to avoid those miscommunications.” The risk of a mischaracterizing what any country is doing in space is even greater than in the air because objects in orbit are “hard to see,” he said. A civilian satellite conducting surveillance, for example, could be mistaken for a hostile counterspace weapon. “In space we literally can’t use our visual reference points. We have to rely on radar. We have to rely on telescopes, and that creates a level of uncertainty.” If there was a hotline, “at least we would have a discussion before we draw the wrong conclusions. And we currently don’t have that capability. But I think the idea merits a full scale discussion.” Saltzman on Nov. 3 gave a keynote speech at the Global Milsatcom 2021 conference in London. He said one of the themes was the desire for greater cooperation on space security. “Establishing responsible norms and behaviors is really a global concern. No one nation can establish those independently, and there’s so much shared capacity that we could leverage.”

#### The CP puts aerospace regulations on par with earthly aircrafts – solves.

**Dempsey and Miniero 10** [Paul Stephen Dempsey, Michael Mineiro, in [Space Safety Regulations and Standards](https://www.sciencedirect.com/book/9781856177528/space-safety-regulations-and-standards), 2010. . “Air Commerce”. ScienceDirect. https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/engineering/air-commerce.]

Perhaps the simplest, and most sensible initial effort would be for ICAO to amend its Annexes to redefine aircraft to include aerospace vehicles, so that when they fly in air space used by civil aircraft, the rules of safety and navigation would be identical.155 This would solve several, but not all, of the legal and safety issues discussed in this essay. ICAO could regulate aerospace vehicles by amending the definition of an “aircraft” to include aerospace vehicles. It created the definition of aircraft, and amended it to clarify that air cushion vehicles were not within the Chicago Convention; ICAO could amend its Annexes again to clarify that sub-orbital vehicles fall within the definition of "aircraft." Annex 7 already includes gliders, balloons, helicopters, ornithopters, rotorcraft, and gyroplanes within the definition of “aircraft.”156 Balloons have no wings. If a balloon can legally be deemed to be an “aircraft”, then an suborbital aerospace vehicle can be deemed to be an “aircraft” as well, even if it is in the shape of a rocket. One potential model definition for the term “aircraft” was that promulgated by the US Congress in the Air Commerce Act of 1926: "any contrivance now known or hereafter invented, used or designed for navigation or flight in the air."157 The Canadian Parliament has defined an aircraft as "any machine capable of deriving support in the atmosphere from reactions of the air, and includes a rocket."158 Another source recommends that suborbital vehicles be included in the Air Law regime, and orbital vehicles be placed within the Space Law regime.159 ICAO could amend particular annexes to define the rules of safety and navigation for "aircraft" so redefined.160

#### No circumvention and it creates follow-on that solves

Paulina E.Sikorska1, December 2015, "The need for legal regulation of global emissions from the aviation industry in the context of emerging aerospace vehicles," No Publication, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S235166741500013X#s0010

If, therefore, the creation of any international binding laws seems nearly impossible, soft laws could be considered as options. Paradoxically, the lack of sanctions for breaching soft laws increases their effectiveness because it increases the likelihood of them being accepted in the first place. States have proved over the last 50 years that they have had little interest in environmental matters that were lingering at the bottom of the hierarchy of important issues and always fell behind international politics and economy, but soft law is not as "harmful" because of its apparent lack of sanctions. Once a soft law is created, the informal pressure of public opinion emerges to help enforce it. All corporations that operate in the aerospace sector – from established companies such as Boeing and Airbus to newer ones such as Virgin Galactic and Blue Origin – can prove that they care about the environment and, as a result, create self-imposed limitations. This positive public opinion could increase the companies’ profits, thus placing profit maximisation on the same side as the good of the environment. Only in the future, when emissions reach a critical point and may be unpleasant to humans, will both the ICAO and state governments meet to create an international framework regulating emissions from the aerospace industry. The next issue is whether to harmonise or unify emissions from the aviation industry. It appears that harmonisation cannot be achieved at an international level because, up to this point, only one relevant soft law document has been created by the ICAO. The harmonisation of emissions standards in the aerospace sector also cannot be achieved because there is no international law regulating emissions. Unification in the form of one binding document is not possible because of the politicisation and economisation of law, and soft-law instruments are unlikely to succeed in the process of unification because of their non-binding nature. Soft law will never be a replacement for binding law – it is simply a bridge to restore international cooperation and draw the attention of the international community to the seriousness of the problem of greenhouse gases and black carbon emissions, initiating some action to help alleviate problems while a longer-term solution is sought.

## 4

#### Business confidence high now

**PTI 4-22**, 4-22-2022, "Business confidence surges in Q4 of FY22; sunny days ahead: NCAER," https://www.cnbctv18.com/economy/business-confidence-improved-in-q4-of-fy22-sunny-days-ahead-ncaer-survey-13244242.htm/Karan

Business confidence improved in the January-March period of this year and will remain buoyant in the coming months, a survey by economic think-tank NCAER said on April 22. The Business Confidence Index (BCI) increased for the third consecutive quarter by 14.9 percent on a quarter-on-quarter basis from 124.4 points in the October-December period of 2021-22 to 142.9 points in the fourth quarter. The BCI also improved by 67.6 percent in the fourth quarter of 2021-22, compared to the corresponding period of 2020-21, said the National Council of Applied Economic Research (NCAER). The upward movement was driven by an improvement in sentiment on all four components of the BCI. They were as follows:  Overall economic conditions will improve in the next six months.  Financial position of firms will improve in the next six months.  Present investment climate is positive as compared with six months ago.  Present capacity utilisation is close to or above the optimal level. NCAER carried out the 120th round of its Business Expectations Survey (BES) in March 2022, covering 500 firms in four regions across the country. The survey was supported by the National Stock Exchange of India Limited (NSE). NCAER has been carrying out the BES on a quarterly basis since 1992. "The latest round of the BES indicates that not only have firms overcome the pandemic-related slowdown but there is also an improvement in sentiments from the sluggishness observed before the pandemic," said Poonam Gupta, Director General, NCAER. The BCI has achieved the highest level since the figure of 148.5 recorded in the third quarter of 2014-15, the think-tank said. Except the consumer durables sector, which registered a rise of less than 1 percent in sentiment, all other sectors showed an improvement in the fourth quarter of 2021-22 on a sequential basis. NCAER further said business sentiment for the next six months will be relatively more buoyant with regard to domestic parameters like production, domestic sales and ex-factory prices than external parameters like exports and imports of raw materials. More than 70 percent of the firms reported an increase in the cost of raw materials and electricity over the last three months, whereas 72 percent of the firms said the cost of raw materials would rise over the next six months, it added. Hiring sentiment over the last three months was relatively stagnant in last quarter of 2021-22, compared to the preceding three months, but is expected to be resilient over the next six months, it said. The Political Confidence Index (PCI) increased by 39.2 percent from 107.8 points in third quarter of 202122 to 150.1 points.

#### Changing the legal standards of antitrust spills over to crush otherwise surging corporate growth.

Thierer ’21 [Adam; February 25; Senior Research Fellow with the Mercatus Center at George Mason University; The Hill, “Open-ended antitrust is an innovation killer,” <https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/540391-open-ended-antitrust-is-an-innovation-killer>]

Unfortunately, the calls for more bureaucracy and regulation emanating from all corners of the political world could have an unintended consequence: discouraging the sort of vibrant innovation and consumer choice that made America’s tech companies household names across the globe. Sen. [Amy Klobuchar](https://thehill.com/people/amy-klobuchar) (D-Minn.) is leading one charge. Klobuchar, who chairs the Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights, [recently introduced](https://www.klobuchar.senate.gov/public/_cache/files/e/1/e171ac94-edaf-42bc-95ba-85c985a89200/375AF2AEA4F2AF97FB96DBC6A2A839F9.sil21191.pdf) the “Competition and Antitrust Law Enforcement Reform Act.” This sweeping measure seeks to expand the powers and budgets of antitrust regulators at the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice. It also includes new filing requirements and potentially hefty civil fines. The most important feature is the proposed change to the legal standard by which regulators approve business deals. It would allow the government to stop any deal that creates an “appreciable risk of materially lessening competition,” and it also defines exclusionary behavior as, “conduct that materially disadvantages one or more actual or potential competitors.” These may sound like simple, semantic tweaks, but – much like some of the other policy ideas currently circulating – they would upend decades of settled law and create a sea change in U.S. antitrust enforcement. This change could undermine business dynamism, innovation and investment in ways that inhibit the global competitiveness of U.S. businesses. Critics of merger and acquisition (M&A) activity by large tech firms include not only Sen. Klobuchar but also Republicans such as Sen. [Josh Hawley](https://thehill.com/people/joshua-josh-hawley) (R-Mo.). Hawley recent [offered an amendment](https://www.axios.com/josh-hawley-big-tech-merger-ban-1467081d-216c-45a2-9d09-9416dfbde330.html) to a budget bill that would preemptively prohibit mergers and acquisitions by dominant online firms. Klobuchar and Hawley believe that M&A skews the market in favor of today’s largest firms, entrenching their market power and discouraging innovation. History teaches a different lesson. Consider DirecTV and Skype, both once considered innovative market leaders in their respective fields of satellite TV and internet telephony. Both firms stumbled, however, and they might not even be with us today without creative business deals. DirecTV has been partially or fully controlled by Hughes Electronics, News Corp., Liberty Media and now AT&T. Skype has swapped hands multiple times, moving from eBay, to a private investment firm and now to Microsoft. These were complex deals, and some didn’t work, leading to divestitures. But each was a learning experience that illustrated how dynamic media and technology markets can be with firms constantly searching for value-added arrangements that serve their customers and shareholders. If we make this type of activity presumptively illegal, we’re imagining that government bureaucrats are better suited to make these calls than businesspeople and the consumers who choose whether or not to buy the product. Worse yet, legal tests like those Klobuchar proposes – “conduct that materially disadvantages potential competitors” – are remarkably open-ended and could be easily abused. The system will be gamed by opponents of deals for business reasons. They will claim that their own failure to attract investors or customers must all be the fault of more creative rivals. That’s a recipe for cronyism and economic stagnation. Those who worry about today’s largest tech giants becoming supposedly unassailable monopolies should consider how similar fears were expressed not so long ago about other tech titans, many of which we laugh about today. Just 14 years ago, headlines [proclaimed](https://www.technewsworld.com/story/55185.html) that “MySpace Is a Natural Monopoly,” and [asked](https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2007/feb/08/business.comment), “Will MySpace Ever Lose Its Monopoly?” We all know how that “monopoly” ceased to exist. At the same time, pundits [insisted](https://www.marketwatch.com/story/apple-should-pull-the-plug-on-the-iphone) “Apple should pull the plug on the iPhone,” since “there is no likelihood that Apple can be successful in a business this competitive.” The smartphone market of that era was viewed as completely under the control of BlackBerry, Palm, Motorola and Nokia. A few years prior to that, critics lambasted the merger of AOL and TimeWarner as a new [corporate “Big Brother”](http://www.ojr.org/ojr/workplace/1017966109.php?__cf_chl_jschl_tk__=67a5f6a101935b8e3586ca48216d31ba6d4e03de-1612467283-0-AXvbGCtUx-p_N4T-8_2m8OHezQUhQ9kelg9-pVuD6IzKvFfXrllJujU9ERvjqjyIsAeCovUw9bfZqq75_NYasBM87SnQT_027hDJOhjXeowzK1QQH_7vcmr1tS4XgCGC_NNx6UGbAvVgcJNFhSkqkVKKeRJ-BjdDA7Vus-gwmr7wQXcS7KKfTtHyqxdRfureL9alpZHU2IJcbbdYaZpTjTrfcJHCKa8pIZcdiScjaRJmON9X1Ip20Vuv7tyDHbZSvcrn88WrY_9N_qBpKvZhQ4PAe90w5Fx5iHjjNIzoNMKSpToTFGLbPdqawgge9PVubSQbkS7xXDXxCBMA2Sh-Y_U) that would decimate digital diversity and online competition. Today, we know these tales of the apocalypse ended up instead becoming case studies in the continuing power of “creative destruction.” New innovations and players emerged from many unexpected quarters, decimating whatever dreams of continued domination the old giants once had. Today’s biggest players face similar pressures, and it’s better to let rivalry and innovation emerge organically, not through the wrecking ball of heavy-handed antitrust regulation.

#### It cascades across unrelated sectors AND the threat alone chills expenditures.

Crews ’19 [Clyde and Ryan; April 16; Vice President for Policy and Senior Fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute; Senior Fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, M.A. in Economics from George Mason University; CEI, “The Case against Antitrust Law,” <https://cei.org/studies/the-case-against-antitrust-law/>]

Uncertainty. Antitrust regulation creates an enormous amount of economic uncertainty. Nobody knows how it will be used at a given time. If antitrust statutes are interpreted literally, potentially any firm, no matter how small, can be charged with an antitrust violation—or for dominating its relevant market, however defined. If a business sells goods at a lower price than its competitors, it can be charged with predatory pricing. If it sells goods at the same price as its competitors, it can be charged with collusion. And if it sells goods at a higher price than its competitors, it can be charged with abusing market power. A century of case law has evolved some guidelines, but judicial precedents can be overturned any time a new case is brought. There are few bright-line legislative or judicial standards for antitrust enforcement. It is mostly guided by a mix of inconsistently enforced judicial precedents, regulators’ personal discretion, and political factors unrelated to market competition. Even the mere threat of antitrust enforcement can have a preemptive chilling effect on innovation, business strategies, and potential efficiency-enhancing arrangements. Rent-seeking. Neo-Brandeisians rightly want to reduce rent-seeking, but they routinely propose policies that will backfire because of a common misunderstanding of how governments work in practice. Government employees do not operate with only the public interest in mind. They are human beings, with the same incentives and flaws as other human beings. They want to increase their budgets and power and enjoy the publicity that accompanies big cases. It also makes regulators especially vulnerable to what is known as a Baptist-and-boot-legger dynamic. In Clemson University economist Bruce Yandle’s classic example, a moralizing Baptist and a profit-seeking bootlegger will both favor a law requiring liquor stores to close on Sundays, though for different reasons. A true-believing “Baptist” in Congress or at the Justice Department or the FTC would be inclined to listen seriously to the entreaties of corporate “bootleggers” who can come up with virtuous-sounding reasons for why regulators should give their businesses special favorable treatment.36 Oracle, one of Microsoft’s rivals, ran its own independent Microsoft investigation during that company’s antitrust case, for what it alleged were Baptist-style reasons. “All we did is try to take information that was hidden and bring it to light,” said Oracle CEO Larry Ellison. “I don’t think that was arrogance. I think it was a public service.”37 Former Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-UT), who counted Oracle among his constituents, was one of the loudest anti-Microsoft voices in Congress. Around that time, he also received $17,500 donations from executives at Netscape, AOL, and Sun Microsystems. Perhaps heeding Hatch’s admonition that, “If you want to get involved in business, you should get involved in politics,” Microsoft expanded its presence in Washington from a small outpost at a Bethesda, Maryland, sales office to a large downtown Washington office with a full-time staff plus multiple outside lobbyists.38 Microsoft quickly went from a virtual non-entity in Washington to the 10th-largest corporate soft money campaign donor by the 1997-1998 election cycle. Sen. Hatch’s campaign was among the beneficiaries.39 The lines between Baptist and boot- legger can be blurry, and some actors play both parts. But such ethical dynamics are an integral part of antitrust regulation in practice. Government usually stifles competition. If antitrust regulation is to be retained, it should not be a first-resort policy. If a company has an overwhelming competitive advantage, it is important to first ask what is causing it. If the advantage is due to superior performance, then consumers are not being harmed. In most cases, dominance does not last long, as evidenced by how quickly any list of America’s largest companies changes from year to year. If a company does remain dominant for a long period of time, one of two possibilities must be true. The first option is that it continues to be consumers’ preferred option. The second is that it is engaging in rent-seeking behavior. In the first case, there is no need for an antitrust intervention. In the second case, the solution is not antitrust regulation, but to take away the government’s power to tilt the scales in rent-seekers’ favor. Think long term. Robert Bork, though famous for his antitrust skepticism, still favors some antitrust regulation. He merely favors a more restrained usage than the Brandeis school. As he writes in The Antitrust Paradox, “Antitrust is valuable because in some cases it can achieve results more rapidly than can market forces. We need not suffer losses while waiting for the market to erode cartels and monopolistic mergers.”40 Bork’s statement is problematic for several reasons. How do regulators and judges know which cases are causing consumer harm and which are not? How do they decide which cases to pursue? Cases also often take years to resolve. Assuming regulators identify a valid case, how would they, and the judges who hear the case, know if market activity could address the problem by the time the case is decided? Do the benefits of regulatory action exceed the court and enforcement costs? Are the affected companies in a position to capture the regulators? More to the point, does the short-term benefit come at a greater long-term cost? An enforcement action now could have a deterrent effect on future mergers, contracts, and innovations, including in unrelated industries. The consumer harm from these could well exceed the short-term benefits of a short-term improvement on market outcomes—assuming that regulators are consistently capable of such a feat.

#### Extinction.

Skaperdas ’20 [Stergios; June 16; Professor of Economics at the University of California Irvine, former Director of the Center for Global Peace and Conflict Studies; Peace Economics, Peace Science and Public Policy, “The Decline of US Power and the Future of Conflict Management after Covid,” vol. 26]

Whether the pandemic ends soon or is longer-lasting, the global economy and global geopolitics are very likely to have a different shape than they had before its onset. The high likelihood of a world depression and the differential responses across countries – especially those of China and the US – is changing the existing distribution of power across the world. After going over recent trends in the US’s superpower status, I will discuss the pandemic’s implications for the rise of China as a challenger to the US’s position and a consequent urgent importance for improving global conflict management. Urgency is justified because international institutions have atrophied over the past few decades whereas the possibilities for conflict are expanding. During the late 90’s when many thought that the end of US dominance was ending, Wohlforth (1999) argued well that unipolarity – with the US as the sole superpower – was likely to last for decades. More recently, Brooks and Wohlforth (2016) noted that “[T]he United States currently has defense pacts with sixty eight countries – a security network that spans five continents, contains a quarter of the Earth’s population, and accounts for nearly three-quarters of global economic output.” Bleckley (2018) even asserts that unipolarity will last for the rest of this century. I don’t confront the debate on “unipolarity” here. However, with the rapid economic growth of China and the emergence of Russia as a military and diplomatic competitor to the US in Eurasia, the US’s dominance in Eurasia cannot be taken for granted. If anything, as I will argue, the trends over the past two decades have been more negative for the US than is commonly recognized. With Eurasia having nearly 70 percent of the world’s population and about the same in total GDP (at PPP, IMF 2020), it will be no longer possible for a non-Eurasian power to dominate the world’s economics and geopolitics by itself. 1 Trends before the Pandemic I will discuss recent trends relating China to the US in terms of three dimensions that are often used to assess great power status: the economy, military capabilities, and technology. 1.1 Economy China has been quickly catching up with the US in its economy. In fact, by the beginning of 2020, China’s GDP at PPP was 37 percent higher than that of the US (IMF 2020). While GDP at nominal exchange rates might be better in projecting economic power, GDP at PPP is better in gauging the actual productive capacity of an economy. The trend, however, that has been in favor of the US lately, has been the enhanced status of the US dollar as a reserve currency, paradoxically since 2008. The currency swaps between the Fed and other Central Banks – to help primarily the banks of US allied countries – appears to have been the major factor in this trend (Tooze 2018). This financial power has been increasingly used in sanctions against adversaries but even Allies. 1.2 Military China has been rapidly modernizing and expanding its conventional forces but is very far away from becoming a peer to the US militarily. The US has maintained its extraordinary predominance to move military resources by sea, land, and air throughout the world. However, the actual ability for the US to force its will on others has been shown to be limited recently. It can barely hold onto its troops in Afghanistan and Iraq and has had limited influence in Syria and in Libya. The fact that, after the assassination of Iranian General Suleimani, Iran was allowed to hit the US Al-Asad military base in Iraq (with apparently pretty accurate missiles) without any reaction shows the limits of US power projection. I suspect this is the first time that the US had one of its bases hit by another sovereign state without retaliating against them. While Iraq could be occupied, Iran is unlikely to be so – it is three times as big and populous as Iraq and its invasion would involve many additional complications. Moreover, US aircraft carriers and bases are vulnerable to increasingly accurate missiles not just from Russia and China but from Iran as well. Hypersonic missiles are even deadlier, with Russia and China being reportedly ahead of the US in their development. With such vulnerabilities the US’s ability to project military power in Eurasia becomes much more limited. It would be no exaggeration to say that it is “game over” for the US’s projecting military power in Eurasia without the expectation of a challenge. Finally, the relatively small wars that US have already entered have been extremely costly. The cost of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars to US alone was estimated 10 years ago by Stiglitz and Bilmes (2012) to be between $4-6 trillion, a quarter to 40% of US GDP at the time. 1.3 Technology While the US was far ahead of China in technology and basic research barely a few years ago, China has been rapidly catching up. For example, one respectable index of current high-quality research is the Nature Index (natureindex.com) which includes articles only in the top natural science journals. In 2012 China’s scientific productivity was at 24% of the US but by 2019 it was 67% of the US’s level. This is likely a much better level than the Soviet Union ever achieved relative to the US. In technological disciplines such as computer science and AI China is likely in even better place. Furthermore, China has been demonstrating the ability to rapidly learn how to adapt foreign technologies and implement them in production at large scale. Highspeed rail, for instance, expanded from nothing to a 30,000 km network within a decade, while pushing the technology to new limits. The US by contrast seems to have largely divested itself of the necessity of maintaining primacy in engineering and manufacturing. The US’s emphasis on expensive high-tech weaponry is largely driven by military-industrial complex rent-seeking and is, at best, a gamble that would have highly uncertain returns in a hypothetical conventional battlefield. Overall, China, while still markedly militarily inferior, has become at least an equal to the US economically and has been catching up rapidly in technology, while Russia has been counter-balancing the US militarily and diplomatically in Eurasia. 2 Effects of the Pandemic The pandemic has brought about Depression levels of unemployment in the US in record time and almost all countries are facing severe contraction.1 Employment is unlikely to reach its pre-pandemic level for a long time and, because this is happening simultaneously around the world, there is no single large country or region that could help lift the rest of the world with its demand. However, in relative terms China and East Asia have been less affected thus far and will continue to do so as long as they maintain a better health policy response to the pandemic.2 China will likely have to restructure its economy to be less dependent on existing supply chains, rapidly expand the Belt-and-Road initiative, and expand its social welfare so as to rely more on internal demand for continued growth. Nevertheless, although all predictions now can be expected to have high variance, China is likely to come out in the end economically better off relative to the US. Other widely discussed probable effects include the strengthening of the nation-state and a retreat of globalization in production, trade, and capital movements. We can envision scenarios from a mild retreat of globalization with shorter supply chains to a full blown new Cold War with two or more separate economic blocks. Regardless of what the medium and long run will look like, the pandemic appears to have accelerated pre-existing trends of US declining power to the extent that we cannot say that there is one superpower dictating the international politics and economics of Eurasia. China and, secondarily, Russia will have much to say about how the global political economy evolves. Under such conditions opportunities for conflict increase and institutions of conflict management become ever more important. 3 The Alarming Future of Conflict Management US policy until recently was as if the liberal trade hypothesis were true and there was no chance of an adversarial relation with China in the future. That is consistent with a neoclassical economic perspective according to which more trade is always better. However, trade policy cannot be separated from security considerations when there is the possibility of insecurity (Garfinkel et al. 2015; Skaperdas and Syropoulos 2001). Now US policy seems to have been reversed with China being treated, not as trade partner, but effectively as an enemy. In such a case international institutions of conflict management would be important for reducing the chance of conflict, reducing the costs of arming, and allowing for smoother trade relations; most of all, for minimizing the chance of nuclear war. Those institutions, however, have gradually atrophied or have been intentionally boycotted during the time of US dominance. Over the past two decades, for example, and contrary to previous practices the US entered a number of wars without UN Security Council resolutions (including those that it could have obtained agreement such as the Afghanistan war). The recent withdrawal from the WHO, and the series of withdrawals from arms-control agreements (ABM, INF, Open Skies, and perhaps START) are other examples of the weakening of international institutions. Perhaps this is to be expected of a world hegemon, but the unilateralism appears to have increased while US power has been decreasing and the need for future restraint on all has become more visible. The conditions appear to be leading to a “bad” equilibrium without investments in conflict management and high probability of conflict as opposed to a “good” equilibrium with investments in conflict management and low probability of conflict (Genicot and Skaperdas 2002). The times we are now have similarities with the pre-WWI period which combined a high degree of globalization with the absence of institutions of conflict management (instead of their atrophy that we now have). At the time, there was a wide-spread belief that economic interdependence, and the break of that interdependence and other costs that war brings about, would by themselves guarantee peace (see, e.g., Angell 1913). Yet war came unexpectedly and with a vengeance. With the dismantling of previous arms control agreements, without good prospects for their replacement in the future, and the weakening of the UN and other international organizations, the risks and challenges facing the world include the following: Multiple-pronged arms races that go beyond hypersonic weapons to cyberweapons, autonomous weapon systems, other AI technology-enabled systems, and deployments in outer space. The costs and, most important, the multiple uncertainties that such arms races can generate are of immense risk. Highly risk averse leaders, perhaps as a result of a mistake or misunderstanding but not only so, could launch wars from which there might be no going back (Mearsheimer 2001; Wong et al. 2020). In the absence of nuclear weapons treaties, the only restraint on nuclear war is Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD). With new platforms, such as hypersonic missiles, that make possible delivery of nuclear weapons faster than it ever has been, could there be a greater temptation for a first strike (thinking that retaliation would never come)? Many examples of preconceptions, mishaps, and near-accidents from the 1950s and 60s that were not previously known (reported in Ellsberg 2017) show how the world we are now entering is likely more dangerous than the Cold War ever was. A scramble for trading partners and Allies across the world that could go beyond just the offering of carrots. The undermining of governments that are perceived to be unfriendly by one side and their shoring up by the other side often leads to less autonomy, externally-induced political conflicts, increased authoritarianism, and not infrequently to outright civil war. The danger of many countries in Eurasia, Africa, and Latin America becoming battlegrounds for continual proxy conflicts between the superpowers is increasing.

## Case

### 1NC – Top-level

#### No debris:

#### 1] Physics and math proofs prove no impact.

Cairncross 17 [Duncan Cairncross, Retired Planetary Science Engineer, BSc in Mechanical Engineering from the University of Glasgow, Diploma in Management DMS, Business Administration and Management, General from Teeside University, Former Asset Management Officer for the Gore District Council, “Is the Kessler Syndrome Disputed By Some Scientists?”, Quora, 10/25/2017, https://www.quora.com/Is-the-Kessler-Syndrome-disputed-by-some-scientists

Lets look at some numbers - we are talking LEO - so anything very small will de-orbit itself quite fast from atmospheric drag

These lumps are going the same direction - at similar speeds - as our satellites - so we are not talking about km/sec impacts - just rifle bullet speeds - 300 m/sec at maximum and the vast majority would have much much lower speeds

Everything is in a torus

Altitude 100 km to 300 km, - 1000 km North to 1000 km South - and about 40,000 km long

200 x 2000 x 40,000 = volume 16 billion cubic km -

18,000 Big bits - 100 mm - including 1,200 satellites

750,000 “bullets” - 10 mm

150 million bits 1 mm

Small bits we will ignore as they will not be going fast enough relative to our satellite to cause damage - and they will de-orbit quite fast

So one “bullet” for every 21,000 cubic km

That does not sound like too dangerous a neighborhood!

What happens if start some sort of cascade?

There is not much to cascade - 18,000 - “big bits” - if each of them became 1000 “bullets” then we would have 18 million “bullets” + the existing 750,000 bullets

And that is erring on the generous side - these bits are mostly metallic and metals don’t shatter into lots of 10 mm bits when hit by rifle bullets

That would be one “bullet” for every 853 cubic km AND most of the “bullets” will not actually be going very fast

Some time in the future when we have a lot mor,e as in a 100,000 times as much stuff in orbit then the Kessler Syndrome may be possible

If you are worried about communication satellites way up there in geostationary orbit then the situation is even better - there is a LOT more space up there and we have boosted a lot less junk up to those orbits

It is worth tracking the big bits and making sure that most satellites are safely de-orbited? - YES

But worrying about a Kessler Syndrome? - no not really

#### Debris can’t speed up.

Von Fange 17 [Daniel Von Fange is a full stack developer that builds web platforms and engineer, with a particular interest in space applications. Kessler Syndrome is Over Hyped. May 21, 2017. braino.org/essays/kessler\_syndrome\_is\_over\_hyped/]

GEO - If you put a satellite far enough out from earth, the speed that the satellite travels around the earth will match the speed of the surface of the earth rotating under it. From the ground, the satellite will appear to hang motionless. Usually the geostationary orbit is used by big weather satellites and big TV broadcasting satellites. (This apparent motionlessness is why satellite TV dishes can be mounted pointing in a fixed direction. You can find approximate south just by looking around at the dishes in your northern hemisphere neighborhood.) For Kessler purposes, GEO orbit is roughly a ring 384,400 km around. However, all the satellites here are moving the same direction at the same speed - debris doesn’t get free velocity from the speed of the satellites. Also, it’s quite expensive to get a satellite here, and so there aren’t many, only about one satellite per 1000km of the ring. Kessler is not a problem here.