

Constructive

CI

Subpoint A is Collapsing the Ceasefire

Right now, conflict in Gaza is cooling down.

Haley **Ott**, 02-13-20**25**, "**Hamas** says it **will adhere to Gaza ceasefire** after threat to delay next release of Israeli hostages", CBS

News, <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/hamas-to-release-israeli-hostages-per-gaza-ceasefire/>

Hamas said Thursday that it would continue **releasing hostages according to the terms of the ceasefire** and hostage release deal with Israel, several days after it accused Israel of violating **the agreement** and **said it would delay** the next scheduled exchange of hostages for Palestinian prisoners. Under the terms of the deal between Israel and Hamas, which is a U.S. and Israeli-designated terrorist group, that **exchange is set to take place on Saturday**, with the release of three more Israeli hostages and dozens more Palestinian prisoners.

This is because, despite allegations made against Israel in the ICC, the U.S.-Israel relationship remains stable.

Patricia **Zengerle**; January 10, 20**25**; US House votes to sanction International Criminal Court over Israel;

<https://www.reuters.com/world/us-house-votes-sanction-international-criminal-court-over-israel-2025-01-09/> // ose

WASHINGTON, Jan 9 (Reuters) - **The U.S. House of Representatives voted** on Thursday **to sanction the International**

Criminal Court in protest at its arrest warrants for Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin **Netanyahu** and his former defense

minister **over Israel's campaign in Gaza**. The vote was 243 **to** 140 in favor of the "Illegitimate Court Counteraction Act," which would

sanction any foreigner who investigates, arrests, detains or prosecutes U.S. citizens or those of an allied country, including Israel, who are not

members of the court. Forty-five Democrats joined 198 Republicans in backing the bill. No Republican voted against it. **"America is**

passing this law because a kangaroo court is seeking to arrest the prime minister of our great ally, Israel," Representative Brian Mast,

Republican chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, said in a House speech before the vote. The House vote, one of the first since the

new Congress was seated last week, **underscored strong support among** President-elect Donald Tr**u**mp's fellow Republicans **for**

Israel's government, now that they control both chambers in Congress. The ICC said it noted the bill with concern and warned it could

rob victims of atrocities of justice and hope. "The court firmly condemns any and all actions intended to threaten the court and its officials,

undermine its judicial independence and its mandate and deprive millions of victims of international atrocities across the world of justice and

hope," it said in a statement sent to Reuters. Trump's first administration imposed sanctions on the ICC in 2020 in response to investigations into

war crimes in Afghanistan, including allegations of torture by U.S. citizens.

Problematically, affirming puts the U.S. under the full jurisdiction of the ICC – taking a clear stance

against Israel.

Rome Statute [International Criminal Court; July 17, 1998; Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court;

<https://www.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/2024-05/Rome-Statute-eng.pdf>] //ose

Article 12 Preconditions to the exercise of jurisdiction 1. **A State which becomes** a **Party to this Statute** thereby

accepts the **jurisdiction of the Court with respect to** the **crimes** referred to in article 5. 2. In the case of article 13,

paragraph (a) or (c), the Court may exercise its jurisdiction if one or more of the following States are Parties to this Statute or have accepted the

jurisdiction of the Court in accordance with paragraph 3: (a) The State on the territory of which the conduct in question occurred or, if the crime was committed on board a vessel or aircraft, the State of registration of that vessel or aircraft; (b) The State of which the person accused of the crime is a national. 3. If the acceptance of a State which is not a Party to this Statute is required under paragraph 2, that State may, by declaration lodged with the Registrar, accept the exercise of jurisdiction by the Court with respect to the crime in question. The accepting State shall cooperate with the Court without any delay or exception in accordance with Part 9.

[**Euronews**, 12-31-20**24**, "Where do EU countries stand on ICC's arrest warrant for Netanyahu?",

<https://www.euronews.com/my-europe/2024/12/03/fact-check-where-do-eu-countries-stand-on-iccs-arrest-warrant-for-netanyahu>]

The ICC has no mandate to enforce its warrants and relies on its 124 state parties, which include all 27 EU Member States, to arrest suspects at large. While Hungary is the only EU country that has so far explicitly said it would defy the court's orders, just a handful of European capitals have vowed to arrest Netanyahu should he step on their territories, despite their legal obligation to do so. Many governments have made conflicting statements, claiming they support the court's work but refusing to commit to the arrest. **Human Rights Watch says the non-committal stance of EU states "breeds a**

climate of impunity." Belgium, The Netherlands, Ireland, Lithuania, Slovenia and Spain have given the strongest indications they would enforce the

arrest warrant. Outgoing prime minister Alexander De Croo said last Thursday that Belgium would "assume its responsibility", adding that **there can be "no**

double standards." Dutch Foreign Minister Caspar Veldkamp has told parliament Netanyahu would be arrested in the Netherlands, and cancelled a visit

to Israel in the wake of the ICC issuing the arrest warrant. Ireland and Spain, who have jointly pressed on the EU to sanction Israel for its operations in Gaza and Lebanon, have also suggested they would act on the warrant, as have Lithuania and Slovenia. Related Brussels warns Orbán over Netanyahu visit: it's your duty to comply with ICC warrants **Despite being a firm Israel ally, Austria has also suggested it would be forced to**

comply. In a statement, Foreign Minister Alexander Schallenberg described the warrant as "utterly

incomprehensible" and "absurd", but added that "international law is non-negotiable and applies

everywhere, at all times." Estonia, Sweden and Denmark have also spoken in support of the work of the ICC since the warrants were issued, without explicitly saying they would be willing to arrest the Israeli leader. France, Germany and Italy non-committal But the non-committal stance of many EU states, including its three most populous counties — France, Germany and Italy — risks further eroding the court's authority.

Shapiro 17 [Daniel B. Shapiro, Master's Degree in Middle East Studies from Harvard University, BA in Near Eastern and Judaic Studies from Brandeis University, Principal at WestExec Advisors, Distinguished Visiting Fellow at the Institute for National Security Studies, Former U.S.

Ambassador to Israel and Senior Director for the Middle East and North Africa on the National Security Council during the Obama Administration; "Trump's International Debacles Spell Trouble for Israel"; The Times of Israel Blog; 6/4/2017;
<https://blogs.timesofisrael.com/trumps-international-debacles-spell-trouble-for-israel/> //recut ose

Second, the perception of US strength and its credibility as a reliable ally are critical Israeli assets. So closely aligned with the United States, and reliant on US security assistance, Israel obviously depends on American support to ensure its own ability to defend itself and to deter enemies who might attack. The perception of an unreliable United States, turning away from its closest allies, withdrawing from signed agreements, and calling into question solemn commitments, does Israel no favors. As the US reputation as an ally declines, more of Israel's enemies may be prepared to challenge it, dubious as they will be about how the United States will respond. How can Israel take American pledges seriously, when even the United States's oldest and closest allies cannot? Finally, [means] Israel has good reason to be unnerved by the articulation of a new America First doctrine, outlined most recently by White House Economic Adviser Gary Cohn and National Security Adviser H.R. McMaster in an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal, and exemplified by the Paris Accords decision. Cohn and McMaster describe a theory of international relations that is purely transactional and competitive. To state the obvious, such a model produces relations between nations that are inherently less stable, as the organizing structures of alliances that seek to advance common interests give way to a "winner takes all" mentality, even among friends.

The resulting chaos would collapse the ceasefire.

Emma Graham-Harrison [senior international affairs correspondent @the Guardian; BA @Oxford University], "The devastating impact of 15 months of war on Gaza" January 15, 2025

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2025/jan/15/the-devastating-impact-of-15-months-of-war-on-gaza> // Oliver J

The Israeli response to Hamas's attacks on 7 October 2023 has killed tens of thousands, left most schools and hospitals in ruins, and caused long-term damage to agricultural land in the territory Israel began bombing Gaza on 7 October 2023, after Hamas crossed the border, killed approximately 1,200 people and took 251 others hostage to Gaza. When ground operations began a week later, most observers in Israel and beyond expected the fighting to last weeks. Instead, it extended for 15 months until Wednesday's announcement of a ceasefire, to become Israel's longest war since the 1948 conflict that led to the country's creation. **The majority of those killed** by militants on 7 October

were civilians and the scale and ferocity of the attack was unprecedented. So was the scale and ferocity of Israel's response. After one brief

ceasefire and hostage release deal in November 2023, Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu vowed to keep fighting, promising "total victory" over Hamas. The impact of the campaign on civilians living in Gaza led to accusations of genocide, including from rights groups, scholars and foreign governments. South Africa brought a case to the international court of justice. Omer Bartov, a former soldier in the Israel Defense Forces and historian of genocide, wrote that by May 2024 "it was no longer possible to deny that Israel was engaged in systematic war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocidal actions". The UN Human Rights Office said in November that data on verified deaths indicates "an apparent indifference to the death of civilians and the impact of the means and methods of warfare". Even Israel's staunchest ally, the United States, restricted some weapons shipments over the concerns, and in September the UK suspended some arms export licences owing to Israel's conduct of the war. **Netanyahu and his former minister of defence Yoav Gallant have**

been issued with arrest warrants by the international criminal court for alleged war crimes relating to the conflict.

The Hamas military leader Mohammed Deif has also been issued with an arrest warrant. Below is a

summary of **the cost of the war for Gaza** and its people. The dead and wounded in Gaza **More than 46,000 Palestinians**

have been killed inside Gaza by Israeli attacks, according to health officials in the territory. Most of the dead are civilians, and **the total**

represents about 2% of Gaza's prewar population, or one in every 50. More than 40,000 have been identified,

including 13,319 child victims, the youngest only a couple of hours old. The elderly dead include a 101-year-old great-great-grandfather. Another 110,000 have been wounded, over a quarter of whom now live with life-changing injuries including amputations, major burns and head injuries.

Yet these figures do not tell the full story of Palestinian losses. The official count of the war dead includes only those killed by bombs and bullets, whose bodies have been recovered and buried. About 10,000 **people** killed by airstrikes are thought to be entombed in collapsed buildings,

because of the lack of heavy equipment or fuel to dig through steel and concrete ruins looking for them. A study published this month found the official toll underestimated deaths from traumatic injuries in the first nine months of the war, failing to capture two in every five casualties. That would suggest that by October 2024 "the true mortality figures probably exceeded 70,000", the authors wrote. Authorities plan to count those dead when

the fighting stops, Dr Marwan al-Hams, the director of field hospitals at the ministry of health, has said. Israeli officials question the death toll given by the authorities in Gaza, arguing that because Hamas controls the government there, Gaza's health officials cannot provide reliable figures. But doctors and civil servants in the territory have a credible record from past wars. After several conflicts between 2009 and 2021, UN investigators drew up their own lists of the dead and found they closely matched ones from Gaza. Israel's campaign of intense aerial bombing and mass demolitions has levelled swathes of Gaza, and left whole neighbourhoods barely habitable. **Nine in 10 homes in the territory have been**

destroyed or damaged, the latest UN figures show. Schools, hospitals, mosques, cemeteries, shops **and** offices have also

been repeatedly hit. The devastation is so intense that some experts say that the large-scale destruction of homes and the infrastructure of daily life should be recognised as a new war crime: "domicide". **Even where homes are still standing, many residents have**

been forced to leave. Eighty percent of Gaza's territory was placed under evacuation orders that were still active in late December. Some **1.9 million people have been displaced, 90% of the population,** with many of them forced to move repeatedly. Hundreds of thousands now are living in tent cities and severely overcrowded shelters with poor sanitation and access to little clean water. Shelters have also been attacked.

Subpoint B is Halting Humanitarian Efforts

Joining the ICC would **tie down** the U.S. military, hurting its decisionmaking and effectiveness. Jack

Goldsmith, 2003, "The Self-Defeating International Criminal Court," University of Chicago,

<https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/uclr70&div=14&id=&page=> // RB

I now turn to consider how the **ICC might actually diminish human rights protections.** This perverse result could occur because **the ICC's actions may have a chilling effect on U.S. human rights-related activities.** The main reason why the United States opposes **the ICC** is the fear that its unique international policing responsibilities **will expose it to politically motivated prosecutions before an unaccountable court.** To be sure, the ICC's safeguards to prevent rogue prosecutions are all ultimately subject to ICC interpretation. The most notable safeguard is complementarity. Complementarity requires that the ICC dismiss a case under investigation "unless the State is unwilling or unable genuinely to carry out the investigation or prosecution."⁹ **But the ICC has the final word on what counts as a "genuine" investigation based on its judgment whether the domestic proceedings are "inconsistent with an intent to bring the person concerned to justice."**¹⁰ The perceived efficacy of complementarity and other ICC safeguards turns on the level of trust a nation has toward the ICC. **The United States has little.** This lack of **trust** is magnified by the ICC's assertion of jurisdiction over non-signatory nations and the more favorable immunities the ICC provides to signatory nations (most notably, the option for a seven year immunity from war crimes prosecution"). These are genuine bases for U.S. concern, but they strike me as secondary. **The real concern is that the indeterminateness of international criminal law makes it easy to imagine the ICC and the United States having genuine, principled disagreements about whether a particular act is an international crime.** The most likely basis of disagreement relevant to the United

States concerns war crimes **arising from military strikes**. The ICC has jurisdiction, for example, over a military strike that causes incidental civilian injury (or damage to civilian objects) "clearly excessive in relation to the concrete and direct overall military advantage anticipated."² Such proportionality judgments are almost always contested.

Jack **Goldsmith**, 20**03**, "The Self-Defeating International Criminal Court," University of Chicago,

<https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/uclr70&div=14&id=&page=> // RB

The fatal compromise appears to **expose the only nation practically able to intervene to protect human rights** to the greatest potential liability for human rights violations. **So in the end the ICC** will likely have two ironic consequences. It **will affect the generally human-rights-protecting**, but globally active, **United States more than rogue human rights abusers who hide behind national walls and care little about world opinion** or international legitimacy. And **it will have the greatest chill on U.S. military action** not when important U.S. strategic interests are at stake (as they are now in Afghanistan), **but rather in quasi-humanitarian situations (such as in Kosovo) where the strategic benefits of military action** are lower and thus a remote possibility of prosecution weighs more heavily.

Major W. G. L. **Mackinlay** British Army, 04-10-20**07**, "Perceptions and Misconceptions: How are International and UK Law Perceived to

Affect Military Commanders and Their Subordinates on Operations?", Taylor & Francis,

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14702430601135651> // RB, **brackets in og**

This article set out to 'examine how international and UK law is perceived to affect military commanders on operations'. The evidence suggests that international and UK law is perceived to be having a significant adverse effect on operational capability, yet it has changed little since the end of World War II. What has changed is the context in which service personnel must operate and this context has also placed considerable pressure on the chain of command to show that the military justice system is functioning effectively. This study shows that it is the combination of these two factors which is most likely to be affecting the operational capability of the armed forces on operations and perhaps the most important finding is that many commanders genuinely believe that operational capability has been reduced. Unfortunately, addressing this is not simply a matter of perception management; it requires a well considered action plan to meet the full gambit of issues which are playing on the minds of British commanders. From the literature review it can be seen that there has been little change to UK law since the adoption of ICC legislation, however across the services 49 per cent of commanders believe that UK law has changed significantly as a direct result of incorporating ICC legislation. A similar percentage of commanders also believe that these perceived changes are so considerable they merit a change to military operating procedures and are damaging the operational effectiveness of the armed forces. More than 50 per cent of those surveyed believed they did not receive adequate legal training and this was reinforced by the fact that 58 per cent of [British commanders] in the sample surveyed believed, incorrectly that they could be tried by the ICC even when the UK agrees to investigate and prosecute their case. In order to address these concerns frontline units, particularly those who do not benefit from in-house legal support, must receive a more comprehensive training package. The evidence indicates that legal training prior to operational deployments is no longer adequate and a new package which includes a more general legal education must be developed and spread across the training year.

The impact is global stability.

Absent U.S. humanitarian interventions, **Haftar 25** cautions:

Khalifa **Haftar**, 01-24-20**25**, "Vicious Cycles: How Disruptive States and Extremist Movements Fill Power Vacuums and Fuel Each Other", Critical Threats, <https://www.criticalthreats.org/analysis/vicious-cycles-how-disruptive-states-and-extremist-movements-fill-power-vacuums-and-fuel-each-other>

American war-weariness and **retrenchment** has **open**ed **a power vacuum** across the Middle East and Africa. **Disruptive states such as Iran and Russia**, which **seek to** upend regional or global balances of power and **fundamentally** **alter the current world order**, [i] **have aggressively filled that vacuum by intervening in conflicts in ways that erode international norms.** Such interventions, especially those that become multisided proxy wars, prolong and worsen conflicts by flooding them with weapons, money, and man power, all while raising the conflict's geopolitical stakes and paralyzing the international community's response. This prolonging and deepening of conflict also destroys responsive governance and deepens popular grievances in the host country.

Independently, our military readiness is crucial. **Barnett 11** concludes:

Thomas P.M. **Barnett**, 03-07-20**11**, "The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads", World Politics Review, <https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads/>

It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since

World War II. Let me be more blunt: As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the

world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended.

Indeed, it's entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace. We

introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the

collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation

of women, [in]the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a

profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next

time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military powers the cause of global disorder instead of its

cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and

who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the

world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world

looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century,

a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of

approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000

battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute

drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war.

C2

Right now, artificial intelligence is rapidly developing.

Will Henshall, 03-29-2024, "U.S. Military Spending on AI Surges," TIME,

<https://time.com/6961317/ai-artificial-intelligence-us-military-spending/> //rchen

U.S. government spending on artificial intelligence has exploded in the past year, driven by increased military investments, according to a report by the Brookings Institution, a think tank based in Washington D.C. The report found that the potential value of AI-related federal contracts increased by almost 1,200% from \$355 million in the period leading up to August 2022, to \$4.6 billion in the period leading up to August 2023. This increase was almost entirely driven by the Department of Defense (DoD). The total amount committed by the DoD to AI-related contracts increased from \$190 million in the period leading up to August 2022 to \$557 million in the period leading up to August 2023. The total that the DoD might spend on AI-related contracts if each contract were extended to its fullest terms grew even faster, from \$269 million in the period leading up to August 2022 to \$4.3 billion in the period leading up to August 2023. This potential surge in military spending was so large that "all other agencies become a rounding error," the report's authors note.

However, the Rome Statute allows the ICC to prosecute any individual who designs AI weapons.

Onur Sari, Sener Celik, 2021, "Legal evaluation of the attacks caused by artificial intelligence-based lethal weapon systems within the context of Rome statute," No Publication, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0267364921000376>

<https://sci-hub.se/https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0267364921000376> //jameschen

Artificial intelligence (AI) as of the level of development reached today has become a scientific reality that is subject to study in the fields of law, political science, and other social sciences besides computer and software engineering. AI systems which perform relatively simple tasks in the early stages of the development period are expected to become fully or largely autonomous in the near future. Thanks to this, AI which

includes the concepts of machine learning, deep learning, and autonomy, has begun to play an important role in producing and using smart arms. However, questions about AI-Based Lethal Weapon Systems (AILWS) and attacks that can be carried out by such systems have not been fully answered under legal aspect. More particularly, it is a controversial issue who will be responsible for the actions that an AILWS has committed. In this article, we discussed whether AILWS can commit offense in the context of the Rome Statute, examined the applicable law regarding the responsibility of AILWS, and tried to assess whether these systems can be held responsible in the context of international law, crime of aggression, and individual responsibility.

It is our finding that international legal rules including the Rome Statute can be applied regarding the responsibility for the act/crime of aggression caused by AILWS. However, no matter how advanced the cognitive capacity of an AI software, it will not be possible to resort to the personal responsibility of this kind of system since it has no legal personality at all. In such a case, responsibility will remain with the actors who design, produce, and use the system. Last but not least, since no AI LWS software does have specific codes of conduct that can make legal and ethical reasonings for today, at the end of the study it was recommended that states and non-governmental organizations together with manufacturers should constitute the necessary ethical rules written in software programs to prevent these systems from unlawful acts and to develop mechanisms that would restrain AI from working outside human control.

And the head prosecutor of the ICC wants to regulate AI – he said it himself.

Karim A.A. **Khan** Kc, 08/20/20**23**, "Technology Will Not Exceed Our Humanity," No Publication,
<https://digitalfrontlines.io/2023/08/20/technology-will-not-exceed-our-humanity/> //jameschen

The tools used to commit serious international crimes constantly evolve—from bullets and bombs to social media, the internet, and perhaps now even artificial intelligence. As states and other actors increasingly resort to

operations in cyberspace, this new and **rapidly developing means of statecraft and warfare** **can be misused to carry out or facilitate war crimes**, crimes against humanity, genocide, and even the aggression of one state against another. International criminal justice can and must adapt to this new landscape. While no provision of the Rome Statute is dedicated to cybercrimes, such conduct may potentially fulfill the elements of many core international crimes as already defined. In particular, the International Committee of the Red Cross has reiterated that cyberattacks must comply with the cardinal principles of distinction and proportionality and should only be directed against military objectives. There is an emerging consensus among states that cyberspace is not a special domain free from regulation but rather that international law has a clear role to play. I have repeatedly stated that in all situations addressed by the International Criminal Court Office of the Prosecutor, we need to show that the law is able to deliver for those who find themselves **on the front lines**. And those front lines are no longer just physical: **The digital front** lines can give rise to damage and suffering comparable to what the founders of the ICC sought to prevent.

F. M. **Hassan**, N. D. Osman, xx-xx-20**23**, "AI-Based Autonomous Weapons and Individual Criminal Responsibility Under the Rome Statute", Journal of Digital Technologies and Law, <https://www.lawjournal.digital/jour/article/view/188> // TT

The advancement of technology has reached a high standard and demand by the international community in order to protect its borders and citizens not only from being invaded and attacked by outsiders, but also to protect their troops from being targeted and killed. This led to the creation of the new technology in weaponry of autonomous weapons based on AI. However, **such technology does not free from any responsibility under international law** and has received many criticisms and concerns by the international community due to attacks by to be taken and done by autonomous weapons based on AI which could still incur casualties from the non-military objectives. **Since the creation of the ICC in 2002 via the Rome Statute, the latter provides a solution even to the most advanced weapons such as unmanned autonomous weapons based on AI whereby individuals behind the creation and manning such weapons would be criminally liable** if they went beyond the borders allowed under the law in order to win the war or involved **in armed conflicts**.

Indeed, regulation is the main risk slowing down innovation.

Alexander Sukharevsky, 10-01-2024, "Time to place our bets: Europe's AI opportunity," McKinsey & Company,

<https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/quantumblack/our-insights/time-to-place-our-bets-europes-ai-opportunity> //jameschen

A three-lens approach—on adoption, creation, and energy—is required to assess Europe's competitiveness in the emerging generative AI (gen AI) economy. While much of the current discourse centers around large language models (LLMs), European policy makers and business leaders must look beyond LLMs. Adopting a holistic approach to capitalize fully on gen AI's potential could boost European labor productivity by up to 3 percent annually through 2030. On adoption, European organizations lag behind their US counterparts by 45 to 70 percent. Yet this is where most of gen AI's economic potential lies. With the technology still in its early stages and much of its productivity gains yet to be unlocked, the window of opportunity for Europe remains wide open.

The impact is losing the arms race.

The U.S. is in an AI race with China.

Val Dockrell, 06-25-2024, "AI Arms Race: China could have killer robots on the battlefield in two years," National Security News - Reporting the facts on national security,

<https://nationalsecuritynews.com/2024/06/ai-arms-race-china-could-have-fully-autonomous-weapons-on-the-battlefield-in-two-years/>

//jameschen

Defence analyst Francis Tusa said China was not hindered by the ethical concerns. He said that the communist country's huge investment in military technology meant that the People's Liberation Army was developing AI-based autonomous weapons four to five times faster than potential adversaries. In an interview with National Security News (NSN), Tusa said: "We're at the start of a race in truly autonomous systems. "I would be surprised if we don't see autonomous machines coming out of China within two years including more AI controlled fighter aircraft. They (China) are coming up with new ship designs, new submarine designs, new fighter designs, at a rate which is dizzying. They are moving four or five times faster than the States. "It's the advantage for not being a democracy, not having congressional oversight of the budgets. "The biggest thing which is going to have the most impact is the fact that the West will be constrained by legal issues, and these just will not apply to China."

[Eric **Rosenbach**; Eric Rosenbach is a Senior Lecturer at the Harvard Kennedy School and is the Director of the Defense, Emerging Technology, and Strategy Program at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs. He previously co-led the Belfer Center with former Secretary of Defense Ash Carter; The Autonomous Arsenal in Defense of Taiwan: Technology, Law, and Policy of the Replicator Initiative, 02-03-20**25**; <https://www.belfercenter.org/replicator-autonomous-weapons-taiwan>; accessed, 2-8-2025] //nw

China's military expansion and threats to forcibly reunify with Taiwan undermine U.S. interests in the Indo-Pacific. **Fully autonomous weapon systems**, designed to be attritable and complete missions without human control in denied electromagnetic environments where communications are impossible, **are necessary to support the U.S. military defense of Taiwan.** To accelerate innovation and the fielding of fully and semi-autonomous weapon systems, the U.S. Deputy Secretary of Defense, Dr. Kathleen Hicks, launched the **Replicator Initiative** in August 2023. This effort, **which** aims to **deploy thousands of "all-domain attritable autonomous systems" and other advanced capabilities, is currently helping the United States strengthen its military deterrent against China.** The Department of Defense is making important progress in **addressing autonomous weapon systems' unavoidable and interrelated risks spanning strategy, technology, and law.**

Absent U.S. deterrence,

Guibert 23 [Nathalie Guibert, "If it invaded Taiwan, China would suffer the same logistical failures...",

09/12/2023, archive.md, <https://archive.md/eB2Gi#selection-1809.0-1953.89>] // GFS LZ

Speaking at the Aspen (Colorado) Security Forum on Wednesday, July 20, CIA director William Burns described what China is taking away from the Russian war in Ukraine: "I suspect the lesson that the Chinese leadership and military are drawing is that you've got to amass overwhelming force if you're going to contemplate that [an operation against Taiwan] in the future." While China says it prefers "peaceful reunification," Mr. Burns agrees with the analysis of his military counterparts and said he believes **China "will use force"** at some point to take control of the democratic island. Beijing is convinced that Washington will defend the government of the Republic of China in Taipei. **The conflict [in Taiwan] could result in 500,000**

deaths on both sides, according to the Pentagon's estimate. It remains to be seen how the Chinese Communist Party will use the People's Liberation Army (PLA). It should be noted that the Russian army's considerable logistical difficulties in Ukraine – with supply lines cut off and ships prevented from reaching the coast – are of concern to the PLA. Its challenge is to project across a 180-kilometer strait. Publicly available Chinese documents "describe different operational concepts for an amphibious invasion of Taiwan," according to the US Department of Defense 2021 Report to Congress on China. "The most prominent of these, the Joint Island Landing Campaign, envisions a complex operation relying on coordinated, interlocking campaigns for logistics, air, and naval support, and EW [electronic warfare]."

Rebuttal

Stefan **Skrimshire**, Aug 12, 2010, "Future Ethics: Climate Change and Apocalyptic Imagination,"

Bloomsbury, <https://www.bloomsbury.com/us/future-ethics-9781441189561//>Arnav Mehta's Father

To fully understand these changes, I argue, **we need not** to **discard** but reinvent **apocalypse**. To this end, I have proposed seeing apocalypse as turning paradoxically into way of life (Buell, 2003). Its magnitudes are all about us as we experience and in fact dwell in present risk. This metaphor is in fact a multifaceted one. It does not just underwrite a program for progressive action today; it also provides a tough description of the challenges we face. More complexly still, it indicates a crucial direction that contemporary anti-environmental discourse is already taking. Both description and source of prescriptions, the metaphor is crucial to understanding and also shaping our environmental

circumstances today. It indicates vividly just how the discourse of environmental apocalypse is being, once again, successfully reinvented, and how influential it still is to our environmental-social analysis and activism today. To say that apocalypse has become today a way of life is, of course, to suggest an attitude that undergirds much environmental passivity and quiet desperation today. The metaphor is, in short, a central expression of our current environmental dilemmas. It also is something that, strange as it may seem, can and already is being used to help escort us further and further into catastrophe. The most recent addition to anti-environmental discourse on global warming, for example, is a claim that global warming has already happened; that we cannot stop it; and that we must face facts and adapt to it. Already this wisdom has resulted in (shockingly ironic) attempts by nations to claim likely places for future oil development, in preparation for the time they will emerge from under melting ice-sheets. Geo-engineering - a source of hitherto scary fringe-solutions to climate change is gaining respectability (Tierney. 2009). A pathway for developments like these has already been cleared by this popular culture's fascination with environmental apocalypse, something that began as early as the 1980s. Today, speculative visions of the future in film almost obligatorily present a dystopian vision of environmental-social apocalypse, one as extreme and multifactoral as that of the early environmental prophets. But this vision is not meant to shock us into our senses and make us seek alternatives. Instead it is something audiences are meant to and indeed do consume: sci-fi's obsession with wrecked, militarized, post-natural environments of social meltdown and perpetual high-tech combat (and its invention of special effects to present these scenes and wow audiences) is directed at transforming apocalypse into exciting entertainment for the multitudes. The original Terminator (1984) movie excited many viewers to fantasize their bodies as robotically invulnerable and to go around repeating the famous phrase 'Hasta la vista, Baby' on all sorts of inappropriate occasions. The original Matrix (1999) movie, while making recovery of the human also its official theme, stylized cyberworld violence so vividly as to make that what moviegoers dreamed most of taking part in. not seeking alternatives to. Homologous with this phenomenon in popular culture is thus, I believe, an expansion of what Naomi Klein (2007) has described as 'disaster capitalism' -capitalism that welcomes environmental and social disaster as a source of profit. But the metaphor of apocalypse as way of life can also authorize action more informed, open-eyed and responsive to recent change than before. The creeping spread of crisis into more physical, social and psychological places, and the intimacy with which we feel it, opens up new sites for action and coalitions for change. Risk represents a much more sustainable sense of urgency, and uncertainty fosters experiment, small and large. Perception that the global environment is as sensitively dependent on us as we are on it extends sensitivities and interests in ways difficult to anticipate in advance. Nowhere is the dissemination of such sentiment so important today as in the emergence

of concern about global warming, something that has become today's foremost environmental concern
and thus site for reinventing apocalypse.

Rest were analytics.