

Con Notes

Opponent's points

Contention 1: space war is the future of war

- Adversaries have the ability to deal damage
 - Response: **Do they have the will to use these weapons?** The US has tested its own anti-satellite launches. It can do the same things the Russians can. And if needed, it can shift funds into space-related R&D
 - are four main types of anti-satellite weaponry. Kinetic missiles, hacking, directed energy weapons, and electromagnetic pulse. Kinetic launches is the least efficient and most costly (debris) of the four types. It creates debris which can harm other countries' satellites as well as our own, and can lead to a case of Kessler syndrome.
- Nuclear warfare
 - It a retaliatory action. They don't shoot at us because they are unsure of how we are going to retaliate. The US has 3800 active nuclear warheads.
- NASA was not meant for time when our adversaries are consolidating their own space technologies
 - Understand that our NASA contention was used to rebut your innovation argument. Also, NASA will be a common ground for us to reach agreements with our adversaries. The Cold War ended with the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force treaty, not by one country overpowering the other.
- Space is already being militarized

Contention 2: critical for innovation

- Before creation of Space Force, there were no management
 - Personnel working in space assignments cannot stay for more than two years.
 - Funding has been decreased by one-third.
 - US Space force only has 15.4 billion dollars in funding... How can it create more innovation??
 - Space Force's market is dominated by large defense contractors.
- According to the official website of the US Space Force, it is the re-designation of the Air Force Space Command, and it did not state anything else.
- We are falling behind as space is being militarized with or without US Space Force
 - With 15 billion dollars....
 - Space is being militarized, and it is the center of information

Contention 3: Net gains, economically, for the long term

- Extensive private investment into the field
 - Large amount of state caps used
 - Wouldn't that just be more taxpayer's dollars spent on

- Smallest of all US services
 - You cite the Space Force as providing net gain for the future. How will it accomplish this with only 15.4 billion dollars in funding?
 - If this will grow in the future, how can you guarantee that it will not turn into more money wasted on bureaucracy and preparation for wars no one will ever fight?
 - The pentagon's budget allocates 178 billion for army, 207 billion for navy, 191 billion for air force. if 15.5 billion is 2 percent of the DoD budget, then the total budget is 775 billion. The Pentagon spends 22% of its budget on army, 26% on navy & marines, 24% on army. If Space Force will become the 5th big thing in the military (after army, navy, marine, air force), then if you take the average of the 3 departments the space force will likely spend 24.7%, or 191 billion in 2021 dollar value. That would push the total DoD budget over 913.2 billion, and the total US spending on military to around 1.125 trillion, or around 5.6% of the national GDP. Why are we going to spend 5.6% of the national GDP when we have 3800 active nuclear warheads and another 2000 awaiting dismantlement? We have more than enough weapons to destroy the world several times over, and people acknowledge that and will not attack us.

Crossfire Questions

- **What has the space force done that hadn't been done before?**
- **Can you give me a list of agencies that previously took orders from a Space Command that is not the Air Force Space Command (predecessor for the US Space Force), but now takes orders or is under direct jurisdiction from the US Space Force, established in 2019?**
- Can you tell me what is the difference between the US Space Force and the US Space Command and the Air Force Space Command?
- The United States Space Force can easily spiral into a DoD pet project that sucks up taxpayers' money and never has to confront a single foreign adversary, whether directly or indirectly. How can you prove that it is not heading in that direction?
- Do you believe that the United States Space Force is too small, shaping up to the right size, or too big? Do you think it will need more funding and if so, why?
- How will the Space Force support the rest of the US military?
- How exactly do you foresee the United States Space Force to go about accomplishing its mission?
- What is the mission of the United States Space Force

Rebuttal

Summary

- My opponents have pointed out the importance of protecting satellites...
 - They pointed out the different ways that we need to defend satellites
 - 1 they pointed out missiles...
 - Missiles that can reach satellites are generally too big to be mobile. There are also no good ways to defend against missiles.
 - What does the space force provide that will defend against missile attacks
 - Not to mention Kinetic missiles that hit satellites create thousands, even tens of thousands of tiny fragments that threaten other satellites, no matter who owns them. This will create a scenario of mutual destruction that nobody wants in the scenario of a conflict involving direct attacks on satellites.
 - 2. My opponents have pointed out the lethality of hacking into satellites...
 - Cyber security is not a role of the space force...
 - The safety of the United States military cyberspace is the responsibility of the United States Cyber Command, established in 2009. Its responsibilities should not overlap with that of the United States Space Force, established in 2019.
 - If the roles do overlap it will lead to bureaucracy
 - Famously being known for crippling efficiency and stifling innovation.
- My opponents have pointed out the ineffectiveness of nuclear capabilities... they have stated that anti satellite attacks are more deadly...
 - How can you say that when the US alone has enough nuclear weapons to destroy the world 7 times over...
 - It is disadvantageous for the US to implement the space force to deter enemies when we have weapons that already do so.
- My opponents have pointed out the importance of the Space Force in regards to efficiency, and have stated that the Space Force can be a precedent for change regarding centralization...
 - Since the Space Force is still under the Department of the Air Force, it will receive less budgetary attention from the Department of the Air Force (because, well it is the department of the Air Force). There are no mentions of plans to create a Department of the Space Force, and doing so would only increase budgetary burdens.
 - Consider that directives for the US Policymakers and defense officials should give SPACECOM the time and resources it needs to operate efficiently over the course of a few years in order to determine its success. Rushing to establish a Space Force by 2020 does not give ample time to test and synchronize SPACECOM with the rest of the combatant commands and the Services' space infrastructures. It may well be that another organizational construct fits the bill better than a Space Force, but without

- first testing—and providing ample time to test—a re-established SPACECOM, policymakers will not be able to make an informed decision on how to move forward.
- My opponents have pointed out the costly effects of The Space Force
 - “The initial costs of setting up the Space Force are likely a small down payment on an undertaking that could cost tens of billions of dollars in the years to come,” says William Hartung of the Center for International Policy.[10] And what exactly will these tens of billions of funding go towards? How do we know the Space Force will put them to good use?
 - The Space Force will likely be another extension of the government that sucks up money from taxpayers and out of the US economy...
 - And with the specific state that the economy is in at the moment we are in no means in a place to spend more than we have previously been spending...
 - My opponents have pointed out that the doubling of the pentagon budget is not specific of the USSF
 - You are correct, it is not, however it is simply another institute that will drive money out of the real innovators in our society, that being the individuals, not the high ranking government bureaucrats...
 - The Space Force is a hollow effort to paint over old establishments in hopes of a popularity surge due to the novelty of the name.
-

Final Focus

- Consolidation of all military space programs
 - Not the case... there is the Naval Space Command, Army Space and Missile Defense Command, and Marine Corps Force Space Command.
 - I was not the one who first said “rebrand” or redesignate. In fact, it was stated by the US Space Force official website itself.
 - Further the innovation of the Space field
 - Wouldn't that be the job of NASA and civilian space agencies? 87% of satellites are owned by private enterprises....
 - Past programs
 - Inability to work with each other
 - Putting money into their own programs
 - How can you prove that a new military service branch will make it better? Wouldn't it compete with others for a slice of the US federal budget? I predicted that the US Space Force can reach up to 191.2 billion dollars in the future, making the US military spending go over 5.6% of national GDP. Why should we spend 5.6% of our national GDP on military, when most other nations spend less than half of that?
 - Have stated that they worked poorly in the past, but have not provided evidence to how they will work better in the future. This is, after all, another government bureaucracy branch. The Air Force Space Command was the de-facto space force after all and was

redesignated the space force. Its conducts and establishments are basically the same.

- Space Force is being created as a reaction...
 - China conducted its first anti-satellite test in January 2007. Why didn't we create a Space Force then? Because the US concluded that it was sufficiently prepared, even if China and Russia were to launch an all out attack. In other words, space force is not needed.
- My opponents were also underprepared for the Crossfire questions... ranging from not being able to provide a list of space agencies out of the 60 stretched across the DoD before the creation of the space force, that is now under directives of the Space Force, to citing budgetary shifts when asked about the potential of the US Space Force for being a money drain.
- Satellites are not job of the military. Space is an offensive domain. Only 13% of satellites are owned by the military. There are also plans by SpaceX to create the Starlink constellation, hoping to deploy over 42,000 satellites into space. If conflict were to break out, the civilians WILL suffer. However, it is unlikely for the existence of the Space Force to be a major factor in the deterring of foreign adversaries.

Judge, in order for the Pro side to carry the argument, they would have to prove not only the benefits of the space force could potentially outweigh the harm, but the benefits of the space force (2019) uniquely outweigh the harm. That is because the US military is already doing it prior to 2019. Since the Pro side has failed to do so, the benefits of creating the US Space Force does not weigh its harms.