

Pro Notes

**Opponent's points**

Contention 1: adopting space force takes resources away from other important government services

- Unemployment, poverty. Real space innovation like NASA
  - You cannot solve unemployment if the US is vulnerable to foreign attacks. Put it simply, why are we only caring about the 6.3% of the labor force that is unemployed or the 11.8% of the population that is under the national poverty line, if 100% of the population risk losing their current way of life as a result of a foreign attack?
  - High-altitude electromagnetic pulse weapons, for later.
- Doesn't lead to innovation
  - Like I cited, Radar, GPS, Nuclear power & medicine, EpiPen, and the Internet. Most of these examples are recent, and we are more aware of their impact than inventions by the military in the past that have benefited us. They are also military-specific and space-related.
- Space Force budget too small
  - It may rise in the future. We are not saying they
    - Technological innovations should stay in the realm of NASA
      - The Internet was originally created for militaries to share information real-time. NASA and its scientists release dissertations and studies that can take time to spread. The internet has a large impact on us.

Contention 2: provoke/arms race... Other countries to develop and purchase weapons to use in Space

- No global cooperation...
  - If we cannot deter other countries, we cannot bring them to the negotiating table.
    - Cold War.
      - Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces treaty, a diplomatic measure because the two countries were evenly matched. If the US was far behind in their military capabilities, the Soviet Union could have crushed us and we would be speaking Russian right now.
- US views space as a potential war fighting domain
  - That is because it is. War is about information. Satellites are a key part of information warfare. Even if the Space Force did not exist, space will remain a war fighting domain nonetheless. To not recognize that fact is to be ignorant, and that can be extremely costly.

### Contention 3: Partisan topic

- Centrifugal force, bringing everyone together
- Partisan topic
  - Politises space exploration
    - Not really. NASA is necessary for space exploration, the US Space Force is a military organization.
    - We can not make space a partisan topic.
      - The military itself is a partisan topic. It is not unique to the Space Force. Military spending has been a partisan issue ever since WWII, and especially during the Cold War.
      - Speaking of the Cold War, it was a nuclear conflict.

---

### Crossfire Questions

- **How are your arguments unique to our framework in preparation for a scientific revolution?**
- **Are you aware of the existence and the dangers posed by High-altitude Electromagnetic Pulse Weapons?**
- **My side argues that due to deterrence theory there have been less wars... Why has there been less war in your point of view??**
- How will the Space Force support the rest of the US military?
- When do you believe that war can be justified?
  - Should we not have fought WW2
- Do you believe that arms races are bad?
- If the Space Force was a problem (or if it was obsolete), it would have been easiest to axe it when it was created, wouldn't it? If it was a bad deal, when would the Biden administration or future administrations tear it down?
  - Or is the US government just stupid?
    - Debatable
- When talking about the United States Space Force, do you refer to the one created by the Fiscal Year 2020 National Defense Authorization Act?
- 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

- My opponents have pointed out that there are more important things to do...
  - My personal ideology has serious qualms with that ideology... And we believe that

- Throughout the history of mankind, technology has always changed world power...
    - Competitive advantage
    - Optimisation
    - Darwinism
  - Space is going to change world power
  - World paradigms crash
    - Rejections of new technologies and values is why no civilization has lasted eternity
      - England in WW1...
        - England wanted to go to war... they were certain that their napoleonic style of warfare that has dominated in the past would dominate once again...
          - Strategists pointed out machine gun and the development of poison gas...
            - They failed to accept this new technology and suffered...
      - Germany in WW2...
        - Didn't accept the atomic bomb...
          - Could have taken over the world...
  - In order to prepare for the scientific revolution we must put in place the Space Force
- My opponents pointed out that the Space Force may provoke other countries, and lead to an expensive arms race
  - Do any of your sources include how much money that will be added to the economy through the implementation of the space force?
    - The GPS satellite, which is run by the Space Force, has contributed at least 1.4 trillion dollars alone to the american economy according to the national institute of standards and technology
      - That number is projected to continue adding and adding to our economy as we continue to grow as a nation
        - It defends it...
  - The budget of the Space Force is miniscule compared to the pentagon's budget
    - The Space Force's first annual budget, for the fiscal year that began in October, was \$15.5 billion. That's roughly 2 percent of the annual Pentagon budget.

- For Fiscal Year 2020 (FY2020), the Department of Defense's budget authority is approximately \$721.5 billion ([Here](#))
- The Space Force is even smaller when compared to the national military budget
  - According to the Balance, the estimated US spending on Military is \$934 billion ([Here](#))
  - The Space Force is even smaller when compared to the total federal spending
    - The US Government spent 4.4 trillion dollars in 2019.
    - The Space force is 0.3% of the federal budget.
- My opponents have provided NATO as a means for there being less war...
  - I completely agree with that statement, and this is why that perspective proves my point...
    - We would not be opposed to the ussf being a subset of NATO
    - Deterrence brings adversaries to negotiation tables
    - Albeit there are some failures to deterrence theory... Deterrence theory has proven to be so effective that even NATO has adopted the policy, and has had access to Nuclear capabilities for 70 years... In an article they published they quote: “Nuclear deterrence has been at the core of NATO’s collective defence for 70 years. In an uncertain world, nuclear weapons continue to play a critical role in NATO’s deterrence and defence. The purpose of NATO’s nuclear capability is to preserve peace, prevent coercion, and deter aggression”
      - [https://www.nato.int/nato\\_static\\_fl2014/assets/pdf/2020/2/pdf/200224-factsheet-nuclear-en.pdf](https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/2020/2/pdf/200224-factsheet-nuclear-en.pdf)
    - Cuban missile crisis of 1962. When it became clear that Washington was ready to defend its core security interests, the Soviet Union withdrew the missiles it had started to deploy in Cuba.
    - During the Cold War, the realization came that strategic deterrence just might be the most successful means of preventing major wars. The long peace that has extended from 1945, when nuclear weapons brought an end to the worst world war in history, continues today
    - It is very difficult to show proof of wars averted...
      - As proof to show the value of deterrence I show historical evidence... Since August 9th 1945 there has not been an atomic weapon dropped.
- 
- My opponents pointed out the partisanship... that is not unique to the space force...

---

### Summary

-

---

### Final Focus

Judge, in order for the Con side to win the debate, they would have had to prove that the Space Force is NOT a precedent for growth, innovation, and greater security in the future as a long-term investment. Since the Pro side has failed to do so, the benefits of creating the US Space Force do outweigh the harms.

- The entire military is a Partisan topic.
  - We can not make space a partisan topic. It is not unique to the Space Force. Military spending has been a partisan issue ever since WWII, and especially during the Cold War. Even if the Space Force did not exist, the Space Force in its fragmented, 60 agencies stretched across the DoD form, will still be politicized.
    - Speaking of the Cold War, it was a nuclear conflict. High-altitude electromagnetic pulse weapons are nuclear weapons detonated in space that can render electronic applications useless. If a HEMP was detonated 300 miles above central US, the entirety of the 48 states would be hit, and we would be sent back to the Middle Ages. It does not cause radiation, nor does it cause direct casualties. It has to do with Space, hence Space Force, and it has to do with the use of nuclear weapons in space.
  - My opponents pointed out the importance of NASA...
    - They stated that they are the primary ones that lead to innovation...
      - What can you say about the many cases where it has not been NASA, but rather the military, and the Harvard research study that agrees with us.
    - Mutually assured destruction is no happy way of going about life, however it gives us a bulwark against a devastating outcome
    - According to a social science research network you are wrong... “A well planned deterrence strategy can be a very effective way of defending a nation. In an uncertain world it can help reassure a nation’s populace, policy makers and allies. But it is a tool for providing a respite from violence. It will be most effective if combined with a foreign policy that promotes the integration of nations and works to counter the problems of the twenty-first century that require nations to adopt strategies of deterrence in the first place “ -  
[https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2055749](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2055749)

- My opponents have failed to respond to my point on the Space Forces role defending US Space assets
- My opponents have stated that deterrence theory is not a happy way of going on living life...
  - Mutually assured destruction is no happy way of going about life, however it gives us a bulwark against a devastating outcome
    - As I have stated throughout this entire debate deterrence theory has been extremely effective, and has
  - Through further development of space weapons war may be more deadly, however war occurs far less often!
    - That is the point i have been attempting to prove this entire debate,....
      - When this theory is paired with the exponential growth of scientific development the lethality of weapons becomes greater, and yet death rates from war have plummeted. According to One Earth Future Research, we see, quote: “war is indeed declining” ([Here](#))... Another research institution titled Our World in Data has done similar research and has come to the exact same conclusion ([Here](#)).

In conclusion, the United States Space Force is necessary because it benefits private enterprises, deters deadly conflict, and guarantees the protection of US assets. It might take time for the US Space Force to show its worth, but that is precisely why we must establish it sooner rather than later. It is for these reasons that, judge, we strongly urge you to pick the Pro ballot.