### 1AC—FLOATING

### OV

#### 1] Interpretation – The negative must not contest the affirmative framework if its disclosed, not repugnant, and there is 1NC turn ground:

- the brightline for repugnant is if it is repugnant you can go to tab

- ask in cx for 1nc turn ground

#### [A] Ground—can’t predict every NC framework, while the 1AC is disclosed—only way to guarantee AFF ground and ensure indepth education on the AFF and the topic

#### [B] Time skew—anything else moots 6 min of AC offense and skews my time 7-13 which is key to fairness

#### 2] Interpretation: The negative must concede that either Permissibility or presumption affirms. Violations are preemptive and inherent to the interp. A) key to 1AR strat, the 1AR is much too short to win multiple layers such as theory, framework and contention as well as disprove arguments like skepticism so I need creative outs and triggers to substantively compensate. B) Anything else incentivizes the NC to load up with multiple forms of triggers but splitting up the two forces more nuanced engagement as they can be leveraged against one another.

#### Aff gets 1AR theory or negs can be infinitely abusive in the 1N and there’s no way to stop it. Outweighs on magnitude – even if 1AR theory might not be the best, unlimited NIBs are worse. No RVI’s or OCI’s on 1AC shells – they can spend 7 mins answering a 30 sec 1ac shell and win every time.

#### Fairness is a voter – we all adhere to speech times and if it doesn’t matter the judge should just hack for me.

#### 1AC theory o/w since its preventable abuse and it came lexically prior which means any 1nc abuse was self-inflicted.

### 1AC—FRAMING

CW: God.

#### The meta ethic is divine revelation.

#### 1—2nd Law of Thermodynamics.

Craig 10 William Craig earned a doctorate in philosophy at the University of Birmingham, England, before taking a doctorate in theology from the Ludwig Maximiliens Universitat-Munchen, West Germany, at which latter institution he was for two years a Fellow of the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung. He is currently a visiting scholar at the Universite Catholique de Louvain. “The New Atheism and Five Arguments for God | Reasonable Faith.” Reasonablefaith.org, 2010, www.reasonablefaith.org/writings/popular-writings/existence-nature-of-god/the-new-atheism-and-five-arguments-for-god. Accessed 7 May 2023. //Nato

Moreover, in addition to the evidence based on the expansion of the universe, we have thermodynamic evidence for the beginning of the universe. The Second Law of Thermodynamics predicts that in a finite amount of time, the universe will grind down to a cold, dark, dilute, and lifeless state. But if it has already existed for infinite time, the universe should now be in such a desolate condition. Scientists have therefore concluded that the universe must have begun to exist a finite time ago and is now in the process of winding down.

2.3. Conclusion

It follows logically from the two premises that the universe has a cause. The prominent New Atheist philosopher Daniel Dennett agrees that the universe has a cause, but he thinks that the cause of the universe is itself! Yes, he’s serious. In what he calls “the ultimate boot-strapping trick,” he claims that the universe created itself. [7]

Dennett’s view is plainly nonsense. Notice that he’s not saying that the universe is self-caused in the sense that it has always existed. No, Dennett agrees that the universe had an absolute beginning but claims that the universe brought itself into being. But this is clearly impossible, for in order to create itself, the universe would have to already exist. It would have to exist before it existed! Dennett’s view is thus logically incoherent. The cause of the universe must therefore be a transcendent cause beyond the universe.

So what properties must such a cause of the universe possess? As the cause of space and time, it must transcend space and time and therefore exist timelessly and non-spatially (at least without the universe). This transcendent cause must therefore be changeless and immaterial because (1) anything that is timeless must also be unchanging and (2) anything that is changeless must be non-physical and immaterial since material things are constantly changing at the molecular and atomic levels. Such a cause must be without a beginning and uncaused, at least in the sense of lacking any prior causal conditions, since there cannot be an infinite regress of causes. Ockham’s Razor (the principle that states that we should not multiply causes beyond necessity) will shave away any other causes since only one cause is required to explain the effect. This entity must be unimaginably powerful, if not omnipotent, since it created the universe without any material cause.

Finally, and most remarkably, such a transcendent first cause is plausibly personal. We’ve already seen in our discussion of the argument from contingency that the personhood of the first cause of the universe is implied by its timelessness and immateriality. The only entities that can possess such properties are either minds or abstract objects like numbers. But abstract objects don’t stand in causal relations. Therefore, the transcendent cause of the origin of the universe must be an unembodied mind. [8]

#### 2—Contingency.

Aquinas 11 [St. Thomas Aquinas, Reprinted from Thomas Aquinas, “Summa Theologica,” trans. Laurence Shapcote (London: O. P. Benziger Brothers, 1911)]

The Third Way: The Argument From Contingency The Third Way rests on the idea of the "contingent" and the "necessary" and is as follows: (1) Now we find that there are certain things in the Universe which are capable of existing and of not existing, for we find that some things are brought into existence arid then destroyed, and consequently are capable of being or not being. (2) But it is impossible for all things which exist to be of this kind, because anything which is capable of not existing, at some time or other does not exist. (3) If therefore all things are capable of not existing, there was a time when nothing existed in the Universe. (4) But if this is true there would also be nothing in existence now; because anything that does not exist cannot begin to exist except by the agency of something which has existence. If therefore there was once nothing which existed, it would have been impossible for anything to begin to exist, and so nothing would exist now. (5) This is clearly false. Therefore all things are not contingent, and there must be something which is necessary in the Universe. (6) But everything which is necessary either has or has not the cause of its necessity from an outside source. Now it is not possible to proceed to infinity in necessary things which have a cause of their necessity, as has been proved in the case of efficient causes. Therefore it is necessary to suppose the existence of something which is necessary in itself, not having the cause of its necessity from any outside source, but which is the cause of necessity in others. And this "something" we call God.

#### 3 – Fine Tuning. Absent God there is only a 1/1060 chance we exist.

Metcalf 18 [Thomas Metcalf, 05-03-2018, "The Fine-Tuning Argument for the Existence of God", 1000-Word Philosophy: An Introductory Anthology - Philosophy, One Thousand Words at a Time, https://1000wordphilosophy.com/2018/05/03/the-fine-tuning-argument-for-the-existence-of-god/] rc wli

Here’s a simple experiment to help test whether God exists:

Hold a refrigerator magnet about one inch above a paperclip. If the magnet picks up the paperclip, then that tiny magnet was able to overcome the gravity of an entire *planet*.[[1]](https://1000wordphilosophy.com/2018/05/03/the-fine-tuning-argument-for-the-existence-of-god/" \l "_ftn1)

How might this provide evidence that God exists?

Well, if gravity had been as strong as magnetism is now, then you wouldn’t be reading this article, because you never would have existed. The entire universe might just be a huge black hole.

It’s fortunate for us, then, that the *physical constants*, such as the strength of gravity, have the values they do. Similarly, there are *laws of nature* that appear to be necessary for our existence.[[2]](https://1000wordphilosophy.com/2018/05/03/the-fine-tuning-argument-for-the-existence-of-god/" \l "_ftn2)

And a third example of the universe’s being suited for us is its *initial conditions*, for example, that the universe began in a state with lots of usable energy.[[3]](https://1000wordphilosophy.com/2018/05/03/the-fine-tuning-argument-for-the-existence-of-god/" \l "_ftn3) Some philosophers and scientists estimate that some of these constants, forces, and conditions couldn’t have varied by more than one part in 1060 (i.e., a one with sixty zeros after it) and still permitted life.

Therefore, perhaps, we should very strongly expect that a universe in which the constants, laws, and conditions formed mindlessly and purposelessly would be one in which life was almost certainly impossible: not just human life, but anything remotely resembling conscious life as we know it.[[4]](https://1000wordphilosophy.com/2018/05/03/the-fine-tuning-argument-for-the-existence-of-god/" \l "_ftn4) It’s difficult to imagine how any conscious life could be composed of hydrogen alone, or could live in a black hole. And if these facts about the universe are truly *universal*constants and laws, then if life is impossible *anywhere*(because of these features), then it’s impossible *everywhere*.

Arguably, if God exists, then he would intentionally fine-tune a universe’s laws, constants, and conditions so that they permit life like us.[[5]](https://1000wordphilosophy.com/2018/05/03/the-fine-tuning-argument-for-the-existence-of-god/" \l "_ftn5) A morally perfect God would value life, especially embodied human beings with free will, and so ensure the universe’s physical laws, constants and initial conditions allowed for our existence.[[6]](https://1000wordphilosophy.com/2018/05/03/the-fine-tuning-argument-for-the-existence-of-god/" \l "_ftn6) This is the basic reasoning behind the Fine-Tuning Argument for God’s existence.[[7]](https://1000wordphilosophy.com/2018/05/03/the-fine-tuning-argument-for-the-existence-of-god/" \l "_ftn7)

We can summarize the argument as follows:[[8]](https://1000wordphilosophy.com/2018/05/03/the-fine-tuning-argument-for-the-existence-of-god/" \l "_ftn8)

1. If God does not exist, then it was extremely unlikely that the universe would permit life.
2. But if God exists, then it was very likely that the universe would permit life.
3. Therefore, that the universe permits life is strong evidence that God exists.

#### To engage in divine revelation requires a conduit – thus, Jesus is God incarnate. Otherwise, objective ethics fails—weighing becomes regressive as it presupposes there is a higher metric to determine who has the better justifications. That means contestation is vacuous which means a locus of moral duty is sufficient.

#### Math proves his existence.

Williams 15 [David Williams, Computer Systems @ the University of Newcastle, “Mathematical Probability that Jesus is the Christ”, https://www.dannychesnut.com/Bible/Prophecy/Mathematical%20Probability%20that%20Jesus%20is%20the%20Christ.htm, 2015, imp] Peter Stoner = Christian writer and Chairman of the Departments of Mathematics and Astronomy at Pasadena City College] rc wli

If one were to conceive 50 specific prophecies about a person in the future, whom one would never meet, just what's the likelihood that this person will fulfill all 50 of the predictions? How much less would this likelihood be if 25 of these predictions were about what other people would do to him, and were completely beyond his control?

For example, how does someone "arrange" to be born in a specific family?

How does one "arrange" to be born in a specified city, in which their parents don't actually live? How does one "arrange" their own death - and specifically by crucifixion, with two others, and then "arrange" to have their executioners gamble for His clothing (John 16:19; Psalms 22:18)? How does one "arrange" to be betrayed in advance? How does one "arrange" to have the executioners carry out the regular practice of breaking the legs of the two victims on either side, but not their own? Finally, how does one "arrange" to be God? How does one escape from a grave and appear to people after having been killed?

Indeed, it may be possible for someone to fake one or two of the Messianic prophecies, but it would be impossible for any one person to arrange and fulfill all of these prophecies.

John Ankerberg relates the true story of how governments use prearranged identification signs to identify correct agents:

David Greenglass was a World War II traitor. He gave atomic secrets to the Russians and then fled to Mexico after the war. His conspirators arranged to help him by planning a meeting with the secretary of the Russian ambassador in Mexico City. Proper identification for both parties became vital. Greenglass was to identify himself with six prearranged signs. These instructions had been given to both the secretary and Greenglass so there would be no possibility of making a mistake. They were: (1) once in Mexico City, Greenglass was to write a note to the secretary, signing his name as "I. JACKSON"; (2) after three days he was to go to the Plaza de Colon in Mexico City and (3) stand before the statue of Columbus, (4) with his middle finger placed in a guide book. In addition, (5) when he was approached, he was to say it was a magnificent statue and that he was from Oklahoma. (6) The secretary was to then give him a passport.

These six prearranged signs worked. Why? With six identifying characteristics it was impossible for the secretary not to identify Greenglass as the proper contact (John Ankerberg, John Weldon and Walter Kaiser, "The Case for Jesus The Messiah", Melbourne: Pacific College Study Series, 1994, 17-18).

How true, then, it must be that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, if he had 456 identifying characteristics well in advance, and fulfilled them all! In fact, what does the science of probability make of this?

The science of probability attempts to determine the chance that a given event will occur. The value and accuracy of the science of probability has been well established beyond doubt - for example, insurance rates are fixed according to statistical probabilities.

Professor Emeritus of Science at Westmont College, Peter Stoner, has calculated the probability of one man fulfilling the major prophecies made concerning the Messiah. The estimates were worked out by twelve different classes representing some 600 university students. The students carefully weighed all the factors, discussed each prophecy at length, and examined the various circumstances which might indicate that men had conspired together to fulfill a particular prophecy. They made their estimates conservative enough so that there was finally unanimous agreement even among the most skeptical students. However, Professor Stoner then took their estimates, and made them even more conservative. He also encouraged other skeptics or scientists to make their own estimates to see if his conclusions were more than fair. Finally, he submitted his figures for review to a committee of the American Scientific Affiliation. Upon examination, they verified that his calculations were dependable and accurate in regard to the scientific material presented (Peter Stoner, Science Speaks, Chicago: Moody Press, 1969, 4).

For example, concerning Micah 5:2, where it states the Messiah would be born in Bethlehem Ephrathah, Stoner and his students determined the average population of BETHLEHEM from the time of Micah to the present; then they divided it by the average population of the earth during the same period.

They concluded that the chance of one man being born in Bethlehem was one in 300,000, (or one in 2.8 x 10^5 - rounded),

After examining only eight different prophecies (Idem, 106), they conservatively estimated that the chance of one man fulfilling all eight prophecies was one in 10^17.

To illustrate how large the number 10^17 IS (a figure with 17 zeros), Stoner gave this illustration :

If you mark one of ten tickets, and place all the tickets in a hat, and thoroughly stir them, and then ask a blindfolded man to draw one, his chance of getting the right ticket is one in ten. Suppose that we take 10^17 silver dollars and lay them on the face of Texas. They'll cover all of the state two feet deep. Now mark one of these silver dollars and stir the whole mass thoroughly, all over the state. Blindfold a man and tell him that he can travel as far as he wishes, but he must pick up one silver dollar and say that this is the right one. What chance would he have of getting the right one? Just the same chance that the prophets would've had of writing these eight prophecies and having them all come true in any one man, from their day to the present time, providing they wrote them in their own wisdom (Idem, 106-107).

In financial terms, is there anyone who would not invest in a financial venture if the chance of failure were only one in 10^17? This is the kind of sure investment we're offered by god for faith in His Messiah.

From these figures, Professor Stoner, concludes the fulfillment of these eight prophecies alone proves that God inspired the writing of the prophecies (Idem, 107) - the likelihood of mere chance is only one in 10^17!

Another way of saying this is that any person who minimizes or ignores the significance of the biblical identifying signs concerning the Messiah would be foolish.

But, of course, there are many more than eight prophecies. In another calculation, Stoner used 48 prophecies (Idem, 109) (even though he could have used Edersheim's 456), and arrived at the extremely conservative estimate that the probability of 48 prophecies being fulfilled in one person is the incredible number 10^157. In fact, if anybody can find someone, living or dead, other than Jesus, who can fulfill only half of the predictions concerning the Messiah given in the book "Messiah in Both Testaments" by Fred J. Meldau, the Christian Victory Publishing Company is ready to give a ONE thousand dollar reward! As apologist Josh McDowell says, "There are a lot of men in the universities that could use some extra cash!" (Josh McDowell, Evidence that Demands a Verdict, California: Campus Crusade for Christ, 175).

How large is the number one in 10^157? 10^157 contains 157 zeros! Stoner gives an illustration of this number using electrons. Electrons are very small objects. They're smaller than atoms. It would take 2.5 TIMES 10^15 of them, laid side by side, to make one inch. Even if we counted 250 of these electrons each minute, and counted day and night, it would still take 19 million years just to count a line of electrons one-inch long (Stoner, op. cit, 109). With this introduction, let's go back to our chance of one in 10^157. Let's suppose that we're taking this number of electrons, marking one, and thoroughly stirring it into the whole mass, then blindfolding a man and letting him try to find the right one. What chance has he of finding the right one? What kind of a pile will this number of electrons make? They make an inconceivably large volume. This is the result from considering a mere 48 prophecies. Obviously, the probability that 456 prophecies would be fulfilled in one man by chance is vastly smaller. According to Emile Borel, once one goes past one chance in 10^50, the probabilities are so small that it is impossible to think that they will ever occur (Ankerberg et. al., op. cit., 21). As Stoner concludes, 'Any man who rejects Christ as the Son of God is rejecting a fact, proved perhaps more absolutely than any other fact in the world (Stoner, op. cit., 112).' God so thoroughly vindicated Jesus Christ that even mathematicians and statisticians, who were without faith, had to acknowledge that it is scientifically impossible to deny that Jesus is the Christ. our thanks to David Williams, a mathematician who believes in the Lord Jesus Christ.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the teachings of the Catholic Church. We are ideal theory – we only defend what the church’s actions that are part of the moral framework it prescribes.

Magis Center 23 [Center, Magis. “4 Approved Eucharistic Miracles from the 21st Century.” *Magiscenter.com*, Magis Center, 13 Apr. 2023, [www.magiscenter.com/blog/approved-eucharistic-miracles-21st-century. Accessed 29 Feb. 2024](http://www.magiscenter.com/blog/approved-eucharistic-miracles-21st-century.%20Accessed%2029%20Feb.%202024).] //Nato

The **Eucharistic Miracle** in Sokolka, Poland

Before the bleeding host in Legnica, there was another Eucharistic miracle in Poland that occurred in the city of Sokolka.

The miracle took place in 2008 at the church of St. Anthony. That morning during Mass, a priest accidentally dropped a host while distributing Communion. The Host was then put in a small container of water. The pastor, Fr. Stanislaw Gniedziejko, asked the sacristan, Sister Julia Dubowska of the Congregation of the Eucharistic Sisters, to place the container in a safe in the sacristy. After a week, Sister Julia checked on the host. When she opened the safe, she smelled something like unleavened bread, and the host had a red blood stain on it.

Immediately, Sister Julia and Fr. Gniedziejko told the archbishop of Bialystok, Bishop Edward Ozorowski, about the host. The Bishop had the stained host taken out of the container and placed on a corporal, where it stayed in the tabernacle for three years. During this time, the stained fragment of the host dried out (appearing more like a blood stain or clot), and **several studies** were commissioned on the host. The studies found that the altered fragment of the host is identical to the myocardial (heart) tissue of a person who is nearing death. Additionally, the structure of the muscle fibers and that of the bread are interwoven in a way **impossible to produce by human means**.

Learn more about the bleeding Host in Poland here.

Also, continue to learn in the second volume of the Called Out of Darkness Trilogy, read Fr. Spitzer's book, Escape from Evil's Darkness. This book presents evidence that Jesus established just one Church, with Peter as its head. Fr. Spitzer shows that the Catholic Church—with its rich array of sacraments, teachings, prayer traditions, and lived examples of holiness—continues to be fertile ground for profound Christian conversion.

#### Christianity is a binary – either god exists, or he doesn’t.

**RJS 19** [RJS, author, “One True Faith?”, https://www.patheos.com/blogs/jesuscreed/2019/06/06/one-true-faith-rjs/, 6/6/19, imp]

First, respect in **a pluralistic society requires that we take the beliefs of others seriously**. “To say that Christianity and Islam or Islam and Hinduism are just two sides of the same truth coin **reduces pluralism to a patronizing posture** by which we don’t respect others enough to take their beliefs seriously.” (p. 49) Disagreement is neither disrespectful or unkind. More than that, attempts at persuasion can demonstrate respect. Rebecca concludes that “you are treating them as thinking agents with the ability to decide what they believe, not just products of their cultural environment. We should not be offended when people challenge our beliefs: we should be flattered!” (p. 49)

Second, **there is** such a thing as **truth**. Either Christianity is true or it isn’t. It isn’t purely subjective. Rebecca puts it like this: “Physicist Neil deGrasse Tyson famously quipped to Stephen Colbert, “The good thing about science” is that “it’s true whether or not you believe in it.” But this is not limited to science: it’s the good thing about truth. Period.” A consequence of our belief in truth (whether scientific or religious) is that a search for truth and efforts to persuade others of that truth are appropriate.

Third, there are ethical consequences. Either men and women are equally valuable or they aren’t. Either racism is wrong or it isn’t. Either sexual harassment is wrong or it isn’t. Either children deserve protection as individuals or they are possessions of their parents. Our deepest ethical beliefs are worth defending and promoting. Of course, we may find ourselves persuaded by others on some of these issues if we engage in honest discussion. However, none of us really believe that all views are equally valid.

As Christians we believe that there is one God, creator of heaven and earth. We believe that Jesus actually lived and died in the first century and that he was raised from death to life. The resurrection is the central truth claim of Christianity. This is not compatible with the idea that all religions are true – or can be true for you, even if not for me.

Jesus claims rule over all of heaven and earth. He presents himself not as one possible path to God, but as God himself. We may choose to disbelieve him. But he cannot be one truth among many. He has not left us that option. (p. 58)

Attempts at persuasion (but not coercion) flow naturally from honest conviction of truth.

#### Anything else triggers skep.

Craig 96 [William L. Craig, PhD in philosophy at University of Birmingham and Research Professor at Biola University, “The Indispensability of Theological Meta-ethical Foundations for Morality” Presented to the Christian Theological Research Fellowship Meeting at the AAR, November 1996]

Consider, then, the hypothesis that God exists. First, if God exists, objective moral values exist. To say that there are objective moral values is to say that something is right or wrong independently of whether anybody believes it to be so. It is to say, for example, that Nazi anti-Semitism was morally wrong, even though the Nazis who carried out the Holocaust thought that it was good; and it would still be wrong even if the Nazis had won World War II and succeeded in exterminating or brainwashing everybody who disagreed with them. On the theistic view, objective moral values are rooted in God. God’s own holy and perfectly good nature supplies the absolute standard against which all actions and decisions are measured. God’s moral nature is what Plato called the “Good.” He is the locus and source of moral value. He is by nature loving, generous, just, faithful, kind, and so forth. Moreover, God’s moral nature is expressed in relation to us in the form of divine commands which constitute our moral duties or obligations. Far from being arbitrary, these commands flow necessarily from His moral nature. In the Judeo-Christian tradition, the whole moral duty of man can be summed up in the two great commandments: First, you shall love the Lord your God with all your strength and with all your soul and with all your heart and with all your mind, and, second, you shall love your neighbor as yourself. On this foundation we can affirm the objective goodness and rightness of love, generosity, self-sacrifice, and equality, and condemn as objectively evil and wrong selfishness, hatred, abuse, discrimination, and oppression. Finally, on the theistic hypothesis God holds all persons morally accountable for their actions. Evil and wrong will be punished; righteousness will be vindicated. Good ultimately triumphs over evil, and we shall finally see that we do live in a moral universe after all. Despite the inequities of this life, in the end the scales of God’s justice will be balanced. Thus, the moral choices we make in this life are infused with an eternal significance. We can with consistency make moral choices which run contrary to our self-interest and even undertake acts of extreme self-sacrifice, knowing that such decisions are not empty and ultimately meaningless gestures. Rather our moral lives have a paramount significance. So I think it is evident that theism provides a sound foundation for morality. Contrast this with the atheistic hypothesis. First, if atheism is true, objective moral values do not exist. If God does not exist, then what is the foundation for moral values? More particularly, what is the basis for the value of human beings? If God does not exist, then it is difficult to see any reason to think that human beings are special or that their morality is objectively true. Moreover, why think that we have any moral obligations to do anything? Who or what imposes any moral duties upon us? Michael Ruse, a philosopher of science from the University of Guelph, writes, The position of the modern evolutionist… is that humans have an awareness of morality… because such an awareness is of biological worth. Morality is a biological adaptation no less than are hands and feet and teeth… Considered as a rationally justifiable set of claims about an objective something, ethics is illusory. I appreciate that when somebody says ‘Love thy neighbor as thyself,’ they think they are referring above and beyond themselves…. Nevertheless, … such reference is truly without foundation. Morality is just an aid to survival and reproduction, …and any deeper meaning is illusory.

### 1AC—PLAN

#### Plan: The United States ought to become party to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

### 1AC—OFFENSE

#### The archbishop likes the plan.

Zenit Staff, 19 [Zenit Staff, "Holy See Advocates Responsible use of Seabeds," ZENIT - English, 07-29-2019, https://zenit.org/2019/07/29/holy-see-advocates-responsible-use-of-seabeds/#google\_vignette, accessed 12-21-2024] wli

On July 26, Archbishop Bernardito Auza, Permanent Observer of the Holy See to the UN, gave an intervention during the 25th Session of the Assembly of the International Seabed Authority (ISA) taking place in Kingston, Jamaica. He spoke on Agenda Item 11, dedicated to the commemoration of the 25th Anniversary of the ISA. The statement was delivered by Msgr. Tomasz Grysa. In his statement, Archbishop Auza expressed his appreciation for the substantial legal framework the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) has established over the past quarter-century. Nevertheless, he said, the state of the oceans has continued to decline, something he hopes that the Paris Agreement, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and ongoing negotiations toward conservation and sustainable use of materials in areas beyond national jurisdiction and regulations on the exploitation of mineral resources will help remedy. The Holy See offered three points about the way forward. The first is that the oceans are part of the gift entrusted toward our common stewardship and we must approach them with care and responsibility and not just for use and exploitation. Second, we must balance economic benefits with conservation and sustainability. Third, we must be aware of the conflict of interests in the emerging Blue Economy so as to better harmonize sustainability, economic profitability, and compliance with regulations. The Archbishop’s Full Statement Madam President, The Holy See wishes to express its appreciation that for the past twenty-five years the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) has provided a substantial legal framework to regulate our oceans. Various implementing agreements, including that with respect to Part XI, have attempted to amend and supplement provisions in order to make the Convention more effective, particularly in protecting the oceans and making any use of ocean resources sustainable. However, although the Convention has been in place for twenty-five years and in spite of the various implementing agreements, scientific evidence indicates that the state of our oceans has continued to decline. My Delegation hopes that the current negotiations for a new implementing agreement concerning conservation and sustainable use in areas beyond national jurisdiction and for regulations on exploitation of mineral resources in the area, along with the Paris Agreement and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, will turn the tide to restore our oceans to health and sustainability. My Delegation wishes to avail itself of this commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the entry into force of UNCLOS and the establishment of the International Seabed Authority (ISA) by offering three points for further reflection on the way forward. The first point is our relationship with our oceans. The planet, and within it the oceans, is a gift entrusted to us for our enjoyment and stewardship. This is enshrined in the principle of the common heritage of mankind. Because it is a trust, we relate to our oceans from the perspective of care and responsibility, and not from that of exploitation and mere use. An approach focused on ensuring economic rights and benefits without fully imposing the related obligations will ensure neither sustainability nor conservation of our oceans and marine resources nor, consequently, sustained economic benefit. The second point is the importance of achieving a balanced approach to both economic benefits we derive from our ocean resources and the conservation and sustainability of our oceans. While economic benefits help to create the well-being of States and their people, providing food, housing, and livelihoods, obligations to safeguard the health of the oceans should not be simply relegated to secondary importance. Data from scientific research on the state of our oceans must inform every approach to the exploitation of marine resources. Greater harmony between scientific data and business activities in the ocean is imperative to achieve a balanced approach. In this regard, my Delegation appreciates the work of the ISA, in partnership with related organizations and scientific bodies, in improving the assessment of biodiversity and the mapping of the ocean seafloor. Data from the collaborative efforts of both the scientific and business sectors are necessary for good decision-making and good regulations. The third and final point my Delegation would like to raise for further reflection concerns possible conflicts of interest. As the Blue Economy continues to emerge, conflicts between States, overlapping legal instruments, business enterprises, and other users will also more likely to emerge. Conflicts of interest could result in the pursuit of the triple objectives of sustainable use and development of resources, enforcing compliance of safety and environmental regulations, and maximizing revenues. The challenge to decision-makers and regulators is to achieve harmony between sustainability of the oceans and marine resources, economic profitability and compliance to regulations, and, where conflicts of interest arise, to ensure that they are resolved fairly and equitably. As we celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of UNCLOS’s entry into force and ISA’s establishment, my Delegation is hopeful that both the Convention and the Authority will continue to face wisely the ever-greater challenges in regulating human activities in our oceans and seas. Thank you, Madam President.

#### Infinite suffering.

Derek Thomas 09 [Derek Thomas, "What Does the Bible Say about Hell?," Ligonier Ministries, 4-2-2009, https://www.ligonier.org/learn/articles/take-hell-seriously, accessed 9-15-2024] wli

Hell Is a Place Far More Frightful Than We Could Ever Imagine Consider, first, that hell is a place far more frightful than we could ever imagine. The Bible uses many very graphic pictures to describe hell. Each image is terrifying. But the combination is even more horrifying than you can imagine. Hell, God tells us, is a place of “black darkness” ([2 Peter 2.17](https://www.esv.org/verses/2%20Peter%202.17/)). It is a place of “outer darkness” where “weeping and gnashing of teeth” is all that will be heard ([Matt. 25.30](https://www.esv.org/verses/Matt.%2025.30/)). It is “a lake that burns with fire and sulfur” ([Rev. 21.8](https://www.esv.org/verses/Rev.%2021.8/)). Hell is a prison of everlasting chains from which there is no hope of release ([Jude 6](https://www.esv.org/verses/Jude%206/)). It is a furnace of conscious torment where the fire never goes out ([Matt. 13.49-50](https://www.esv.org/verses/Matt.%2013.49-50/)). It is a place of excruciating misery where the worm does not die ([Mark 9.47-48](https://www.esv.org/verses/Mark%209.47-48/)). Hell is a place of agonizing thirst that can never be quenched ([Luke 16.22-24](https://www.esv.org/verses/Luke%2016.22-24/)). The suffering in hell is beyond all comparison to the suffering found in this world. And the variety of images for hell in the Bible tells us that the reality of hell is much more frightful than any one of the Bible’s images considered by itself. Hell, you see, is far worse than we can ever imagine. Does the reality of hell horrify you? Does it terrify you? If you know yourself to be a sinner, it should terrify you; it should horrify you. The reality of hell should cause us to seek a place to hide. The reality of hell should cause us to look for a way of escape.

### 1AC—METHOD

#### Original sin is the root cause of all violence.

Patheos 17 [“Human Nature and the Purpose of Existence.” *Patheos.com*, 20 July 2017, www.patheos.com/library/roman-catholicism/beliefs/human-nature-and-the-purpose-of-existence. Accessed 1 Mar. 2024.] //Nato

Human Nature and the Purpose of Existence

The first time humans appear in the Bible, they are being created "in the image of God" (Genesis 1:27) as the concluding part of a creation that God continually calls "very good." While some Christian theologies hold humans to be intrinsically evil due to the sin committed after this creation, Catholics believe that humans are intrinsically good because they were created in the image of the good God. This is known theologically as the imago dei (Latin for "image of God"), and it is a lynchpin of the Catholic understanding of human nature.

Nevertheless, sin has transformed human nature.  It has broken the mirror, as it were, in which humans were supposed to reflect the divine life. Sin entered the world when humans disobeyed a decree from God; afterward humans were forced to leave the Garden of Eden, the perfect home that had been created for them, and go out into the world to toil and suffer. Catholics believe that the effects of this disobedience were even more far reaching: sin marked the soul of the first humans in such a way that it would be transmitted to all succeeding generations. Original sin, as it is called, **is a state of being** rather than a condition of guilt; from the moment of their birth humans are able to reflect God's holiness only imperfectly. Humans were created to submit instinctively and freely to God in all their actions, but original sin mars their will so that it does not always point in the direction of obedience to God.

St. Augustine believed that original sin so deeply marked grooves of corruption in the human soul that it was actually **unable to choose the good** without the healing effects of God's grace. This has been an influential view, but in general the Catholic Church's understanding of original sin follows the explanation provided by St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), who saw original sin as the inherited tendency of the soul to choose a lesser good rather than the greater good of obedience to God. Humans are therefore flawed images of God, but the goodness of their original creation remains.

The concept of original sin stands as a backdrop to Catholic thought on human nature, with the imago dei front and center. It is actually from their creation in the image of God that humans obtain the freedom of the will that allows them to act sinfully and keep their broken relationship with God from being healed. Catholics reject the idea that humans are predestined to act in one manner or the other: both their sin and their obedience are the result of free choice. God is all-powerful and could simply will humans to be good, but Catholics believe that God chooses to limit divine action in order to preserve human freedom. Similarly, while God's infinite knowledge may foreknow what humans will choose, this does not impinge on the freedom of their choice in any way.

Catholics hold that humans have an innate sense of what is right and what is wrong, called natural law, written into the core of their being. Natural law transcends society and culture; social norms help humans understand what is acceptable in a given society, but natural law gives them a clear knowledge of good and evil. According to St. Thomas Aquinas, natural law allows humans to act in a moral manner, prompting them to choose the greater good of obedience to God rather than the lesser good of following their own desires. What it does not provide is the knowledge of what is necessary for salvation, namely belief in Christ.

Salvation is the goal of human existence. Humans were created to live in harmony with God, a relationship broken through sin. But just as the first humans represented all humanity when they chose sin over obedience, so Jesus the Christ represented all humanity when he chose obedience to God over personal desire. With his death and resurrection, Catholics believe, Jesus the Christ repaired the basis of the human-divine relationship, making it once again possible for humans to attain the goal for which they were created.

The way that humans experience this repaired relationship is through grace, which is the loving benevolence of God freely offered to humans. Grace is a vitally important concept for Catholics, who believe that God offers grace to humans at all times, although in their brokenness they often refuse to accept it. When humans do accept the grace offered to them, their brokenness is overcome and they are able to be co-creators with God in the good.

Catholics believe that a repaired relationship with God leads to actions of goodness since it returns humans to their original purpose of loving and serving God and each other. These are not two separate aims: humans serve God by serving others. This service can take place in very concrete ways, such as teaching children, helping the poor and caring for the sick, or in more meditative ways, such as praying for others and performing penance for their sins.

### 1AC—ADVANTAGE

#### The advantage is China.

#### China ahead now. Absent ratification, Chinese will develop RRPs that will disadvantage the US in the critical mining race.

Bouffard ’24 [Troy; Director, Center for Arctic Security and Resilience (CASR) at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. "No. 30," Wilson Center, published 6-4-2024, accessed 12-10-2024, https://www.wilsoncenter.org/blog-post/no-30-strategic-competition-and-case-unclos] olivia

Critical Minerals

Much of the world’s supply of critical minerals exists on the seabed and below, estimated at 250 trillion tons versus 13 trillion on land. In areas beyond national jurisdiction, the International Seabed Authority (ISA) under UNCLOS maintains responsibility for seabed mining activities and administration, including consideration of managing ecosystem compatibility. Critical minerals are defined by the Energy Act of 2020 as “a non-fuel mineral or mineral material essential to the economic or national security of the US and which has a supply chain vulnerable to disruption”, including rare earth minerals. Current demand for critical minerals is driven by several key material-based applications, including lithium-ion batteries and electrical steel for EVs, compounded demand of rare-earth magnets for offshore wind technology, grid power storage suppressed by lithium, nickel, and graphite supplies, silicon carbide-based power electronics, and LED global lighting and Li-Fi momentum—all identified as leading forces in market growth worldwide, just to name a few.

The ISA is currently developing Rules, Regulations, and Procedures (RRPs) for seabed mining exploitation, due to be established in July 2025, involving a process where the United States is only allowed to observe while China is steering efforts towards authoritarian-like results. Moreover, Beijing is continuing efforts to displace US permit-based seabed mining sites in the Clarion-Clipperton Zone, the world’s largest zone with 40% off limits in designated Areas of Particular Environmental Interest, among other places. The US lack of membership to UNCLOS leaves Washington at a competitive disadvantage, facing distracting and unnecessary legal vulnerabilities while being outmaneuvered elsewhere on related efforts.

Critical minerals are the bedrock of current and future geo-economics as well as crucial technology R&D and manufacturing directly involved with US national security priorities. Membership to UNCLOS remains the easiest step to elevate US access and influence over this critical sector.

#### Reducing dependency shifts manufacturing to India, improving relations.

Ghosh ’22 [Shaumik Samar; December 12; author, journalist and columnist currently based in India. "India-US Semiconductor Cooperation," The Diplomat. <https://thediplomat.com/2022/12/india-us-semiconductor-cooperation/>; lucao]

The United States, in a quest to insulate critical technology supply chains from China, wants to expand its partnerships on building semiconductors with like-minded countries like India and Taiwan. Washington has pledged to assist India in the building of this sector. India is expecting to bring in a total investment of around $25 billion as a result of its incentive scheme, which will aim at boosting the local manufacturing of semiconductors. The goal is to make India a major player in the global supply chain.

How can India make the most of out of this opportunity?

The Modi government has ambitions to make India a leader in cutting-edge technology, with semiconductors as the “foundational building block” of that goal. In December 2021 the government passed a program to spend $10 billion developing the semiconductor industry in the country. With the United States as the world leader in that regard – and with both countries uneasy about China’s growing influence in the semiconductor sector – the India-U.S. partnership seems like a natural step.

Indian industry is largely optimistic about the India-U.S. deal. Sunil G. Acharya, vice president at India Electronics & Semiconductor Association (IESA) says that most American semiconductor majors, including Intel, Texas Instruments, Micron, and others already have a good presence in India. The Indian units of these majors are involved in semiconductor design and validation and other support services. Additionally, there are several established fabless domestic players who offer design services to global companies across industry segments.

Indian academics have some interesting points to make in this regard. Dr. Abhinav Kumar Sharma, a professor of operations and data science at NMIMS University in Mumbai, feels that there are still too many unknowns to predict the scope and future of this India-U.S. semiconductor partnership. “India is currently nascent in the semiconductor manufacturing industry,” Sharma said. “The government of India is focused on providing impetus to the manufacturing sector through Production-Linked Incentives (PLI) scheme.”

Acharya believes that when American semiconductor companies, incentivized by the CHIPS and Science Act, look to expand or establish semiconductor manufacturing in the United States, there is a good possibility that they will consider expanding their design, R&D, and support services footprint in India. This will help overall innovation in the industry.

It is true that many global giants are adopting a “China Plus One” policy to reduce their dependency on China for manufacturing. India is becoming one of the key beneficiaries of this policy, particularly in the semiconductor and allied industries. The Indian semiconductor industry has received pledges of multimillion-dollar investments from domestic conglomerates such as Tata Group and Adani. Further, in recent years, world-class academic institutes in India have increased their focus on research in the field of advanced semiconductor technologies. An outcome of this was SHAKTI, an open-source processor developed by IIT Madras.

Having been worth $27.2 billion in 2021, the Indian semiconductor industry is projected to grow to $64 billion by 2026, representing a compound annual growth rate of 19 percent. But none of these chips are manufactured end-to-end in India so far. And though American companies have shown a lot of hope for India, there still seems to be a disparity between what has been assured in rhetoric and what has been committed to on paper.

Critics of the collaboration in India state that in the last seven to eight years, India seems to be lost in the global market. It is just attempting to mimic the West without understanding the differences between the two.

When it comes to semiconductors specifically, India has not been able to commit the needed capital to such a complex and capital intensive industry. As a sign of continued weakness in the domestic sector, in 2019, India’s semiconductor imports were at $21 billion, and that figure has grown by an average of 15 percent every year.

The Indian National Congress, India’s main opposition party, feels that the MOU signed between industry representatives of the United States and India looks like a step in the right direction, but falls short of delivering anything of substance.

“This government might have big ambitions; however it does not have the competence to fulfill them,” said Pawan Khera, national spokesperson of the Indian National Congress.

“On the face of it, this deal seems to be more of a geopolitical game rather than a trade deal,” Khera added.

The opposition feels that the United States just wants to undercut the Chinese dominance on semiconductor manufacturing and is luring India to play the role of a regional proxy in this game. India has unwisely agreed to a deal that offers them nothing other than assurances. The right way for India to emerge as a global supplier of semiconductors is to strengthen its own industry. “We must assist, protect, and preserve our semiconductor industry,” concluded Khera.

The United States has always focused on developing its own industry. India must not lose focus while dealing with big players. India’s political opposition points out that the country must focus on building an independent industry of its own rather than being a junior partner in insubstantial MOUs and one-sided deals. They believe that if India allows this deal to go forward, it will cause a major breakdown in its own semiconductor industry, which will have a major repercussion for the country’s small and medium enterprises in the sector.

This is India’s chance to be a global player in the semiconductor sector, but success is not guaranteed. India’s government must provide its homegrown industry with the needed help, both financially and material-wise, and strike the right balance between accepting U.S. partnership while not letting Washington dictate terms.

The recent semiconductor manufacturing incentives rolled out by the government of India offer an opportunity for American companies to expand their capacities in India and also de-risk their supply chains. It also allows American companies to leverage the skilled workforce in India to build capacity and invest in catalyzing R&D in the semiconductor and related industries. “Both the government of India and the governments in [Indian] states have instituted policies to help assist in ease of doing business for American companies,” said Acharya.

“Historically, the electronic manufacturing sector in India suffered because of a lack of adequate infrastructure, domestic supply chain and logistics, high cost of finance, and limited focus on R&D by corporate[s],” said Sharma. “With the Production-Linked Incentive scheme and national policy on the electronics manufacturing industry, the government is encouraging the industries to develop core components and compete globally. The PLI scheme aims to encourage local manufacturing and make India self-reliant. The Indian government is trying to position India as one of the most appealing destinations in Asia for electronics and semiconductors.”

India seems to be on the right path with its PLI scheme, which extends an incentive of 4 percent to 6 percent on incremental sales (over the base year) of goods produced in India for a period of five years following the base year. A separate Design-Linked Incentive (DLI) scheme offers monetary incentives and design infrastructure support across various stages of development and deployment of semiconductor and chip designs for a period of five years.

Khera feels that the future is bright if India plays its cards right. “We must not fold under pressure and agree to deals that do more harm than good. The collaboration between the U.S. and India makes sense if both are equal players, which is not the case in this deal,” he argued.

“India must choose the independent path, build its industry, make it strong and bulletproof and then we can sit on the table for a deal where the interests of India are furthered along with the United States’, rather than India being merely fodder for a geopolitical supply chain war.”

India-U.S. cooperation cannot be perceived as restricted to any particular field. India is expected to be a hotbed of semiconductor industry innovation, which will help advance technologies in many different fields, including construction, logistics, etc. Sharma said that the current logistics cost vis-à-vis the GDP is around 16 percent in India, which will significantly go down with the improvements expected due to the expansion of this field. The United States can be a significant partner for India in ensuring smoother supply chains. This is evident from their current logistics cost as compared to the GDP, which is close to 7.5 percent.

“Any economy prospers with efficient supply chains and the industrial development that comes along with it,” Sharma said. “The bottom line here is that our government has proactively taken steps in the direction that will evidently bring prosperity to our people through development.”

The atmosphere looks positive and India is hopeful of building the right supply chains worldwide in the future. Semiconductors are more of a necessity than a mere ambition and the government looks set to deal with all kinds of challenges that will come in the way. India has made it clear – it wants homegrown semiconductors that will allow it to end its reliance on other nations for chips.

But it won’t all be smooth sailing. Sharma pointed out that “the Russia-Ukraine war resulted in an acute shortage of inert gas, which is critical to manufacturing a semiconductor chip. The Indo-U.S. cooperation has a great scope in mitigating the exacerbating problems arising from such volatile global conditions.”

With the war not showing any signs of stopping, the collaboration and its expected output may be adversely affected. How does India plan to deal with it?

Acharya thinks the nascent state of India’s industry might actually be a strength in this regard. “These materials are used primarily in semiconductor manufacturing and here we don’t manufacture semiconductors, except for what happens at SCL [the Semi-Conductor Laboratory]. So, from an Indian perspective, we are not directly impacted by this shortage as we do not consume these chemicals for semiconductor production.”

India claims that they had evaluated this right when the war began, and that the shortage of neon and other gases is greatly going to affect countries like the United States and South Korea that manufacture semiconductors. If the war continues there could be an impact on manufacturing in the long term, and not just due to shortages on inert gases.

One must note that more than 60 percent of the raw materials needed for this industry – chemicals, minerals, and gases – go through China.

India claims to have a core interest group comprising various leaders who are already focusing on this space to see if they can develop a policy to end dependency on China for sourcing. “I think India can play a vital role in the supply of raw materials. It is a long process but we need to start working on it,” Acharya said.

According to sources, the Indian government has had meetings with the country’s major steel plants and is trying to come up with a solution to the shortage of raw materials, though right now, there is no immediate dearth. Plans to deal with a potential shortage are going to be rolled out soon.

Overall, the industry looks to be highly satisfied with the way the India-U.S. semiconductor partnership is being acted out. The opposition has raised some pertinent concerns, which the government is also aware of. Now the proof will be in the results. India wants to build its own raw materials industry and remain firm on its China-Plus-One strategy. The action has begun and huge investments are being made to help India become self-reliant in the chips industry. If the United States stays true to its promise, India may become a big player in the semiconductor arena.

#### That solidifies Indian SOPO.

Hemant Taneja & Fareed Zakaria 23. CEO and managing director of global VC firm General Catalyst, backers of legendary companies like Stripe, Snap, Samsara, Airbnb, Kayak and Gusto; Fareed Zakaria is the host of Fareed Zakaria GPS on CNN and a columnist for The Washington Post.. “The U.S.–India Relationship Is Key to the Future of Tech.” 4-17-2023. https://web.archive.org/web/20230417135802/https://hbr.org/2023/04/the-u-s-india-relationship-is-key-to-the-future-of-tech //EM

[TITLE: The U.S.–India Relationship Is Key to the Future of Tech]

We are entering a new era of economic relations, one we have previously referred to as re-globalization. With the end of American hegemony and the return of great power competition, as well as compounding global crises like climate change, Covid-19, and the 2008 financial crisis, countries have begun to seek more national resilience in their economies and reduce reliance on other countries in critical sectors like defense, energy, and manufacturing. Re-globalization is distinctive from the economic systems which preceded it: During the period before World War I, and then again over the past 30 years, global interconnection was the norm, as goods and services proliferated easily across the world thanks to open markets and favorable regulatory environments. By contrast, during the Cold War, we saw the complete uncoupling of economies due to inflamed tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union. Now, however, we’re seeing something very unusual and complex. It is neither complete interconnection nor complete decoupling, but rather a mix of the two.

While globalization will continue as normal for certain industries — basic consumer goods where consumer surplus is high and existential risk is low, for example — other sectors are moving toward some degree of decoupling, chief among them technology. The world of technology platforms has already begun to fissure into two zones belonging to the two hegemons, the United States and China. What does this mean for India? On a systematic level, India cannot give up extensive amounts of commerce with either country. Trade relations with the United States are important at $100 billion a year but trade with neighboring China is double that. So, India will continue to trade actively with China as will the United States. But when it comes to technology, a sector in which clear decoupling has begun, India must choose which partner it wants to prioritize.

The history of India’s technology ecosystem shows the centrality of international collaboration to its ongoing development. The growth of India’s technology sector began in earnest in the 1990s, when India emerged as a major player in the global IT outsourcing industry. Thanks to the establishment of technical education through the Indian Institutes of Technology in the 1950s and 60s, India was able to cultivate a large pool of skilled professionals. With a high supply of labor, low costs, and a shared language in English, India became an attractive location for multinational companies to outsource their IT services. The growth of the outsourcing industry encouraged a vibrant startup ecosystem in India, with many entrepreneurs leveraging the opportunities created by the IT industry to start their own companies. By the 2010s, India had a strong presence of SaaS (software-as-a-service) platforms that operated as low-cost alternatives to technology companies in other parts of the world. Now, India has moved one step further still, promoting its own home-grown unicorns to become global market leaders and innovators. If India’s technology sector wants to continue expanding and modernizing, public officials in India need to think strategically about India’s relations with international partners in this next stage.

Many actions of the New Delhi government suggest that it wants to escape China’s technological hegemony as a way to bolster India’s national security. In 2020, after a series of border disputes with China, the Indian government banned dozens of well-known Chinese apps, including TikTok, from India. Chinese investment into India is also much more tightly scrutinized and limited compared to other foreign money. By contrast, there are strong signs of positive collaboration between the United States and India, with India’s National Security Advisor, Ajit Doval, working with Biden’s national security advisor, Jake Sullivan, to launch the United States-India initiative on Critical and Emerging Technologies in January 2023. Policymakers and business leaders from the world’s two largest democracies must continue to focus on strengthening a partnership between the United States and India that connects technological development and promotes innovation and growth in both countries.

Developing the United States/India Technology Corridor

As countries begin thinking about how to build for national resilience, particularly in the technology sector, it will become increasingly important to develop collaborations with strategic partners abroad. For the United States and India, building a bilateral system of positive technology transfer will be crucial to succeeding in this next stage. India’s ambition must be to establish its role as a global innovator in technology. With some important exceptions, Indian companies have so far focused on scaling and deploying technological innovations that were created elsewhere. But by collaborating with American companies and encouraging reciprocal cycles of innovation, more Indian companies can become genuine technological leaders, developing original intellectual property with its deep wells of talent. American companies must shift their perception of Indian companies from one of outsourcing to one of radical collaboration. This includes engaging in higher order tasks in the value chain through multinational teams and deeper legal integration. As a result, India will be able to expand local capabilities in evolving industries like artificial intelligence and health care. On the other end, as the technology world experiences decoupling, the United States will need India’s to reach its potential in it’s the technology sphere. India is poised to be an increasingly influential economic actor, and its growth can help compensate for America’s loss of trade with China under re-globalization.

There are already blueprints emerging. As Indian companies gain more access to American-protected technologies like semiconductors, they will also begin innovating on them.  We’ve already seen this beginning to happen with software. While, at first, Indian companies were merely replicating software from other markets through IT outsourcing, Indian companies are now leading with new software innovations. Take India’s Aadhaar, for example, the world’s largest and most sophisticated biometric identification system that remarkably enables efficient and secure payments using just an ID number (compared to the near-century old American Social Security number standard). Or the Indian telecom company Jio, which disrupted the industry in 2016 with its low-cost, high-speed data services. Jio has broadly expanded digital services in India, bringing 5G access to each of India’s 18 states and allowing people to truly operate in a smartphone universe, with cell phones as their only computers at some of the most affordable prices in the world. We should expect the same degree of innovation in India with emerging critical technologies, often leapfrogging inventions made in the United States. Both India and the United States have much to learn from each other in this regard, and they should position themselves to be the primary beneficiaries of each other’s innovations. But current mindsets and policies in both countries are outdated to these ends.

Business leaders in the United States must move beyond the mindset of doing business in India purely as a result of labor arbitrage. Instead, they should view India as being a genuine hub of innovation, and they should encourage increased collaboration with business leaders in India. They must also think in more ambitious terms, planning for massive expansions that would rival China in terms of the size and scope of their factories, fabrications, labs, and operations. Investors, including venture capital firms that have driven so much of technology investment in the United States, have to reserve larger shares of capital for investment in India and build real local knowledge. Policymakers in the United States and India should both work to reform trade policies and promote an open system of technology transfer and innovation between the two countries. The United States still has significant export controls on India (instituted after India’s violation of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1998), inhibiting the free transfer of technology.

Similarly, Indian policies toward the outside world are overly protectionist, with considerable barriers to entry for foreign investment and legal codes too convoluted for foreigners to navigate. As a first step, the United States must openly communicate the path for reduced controls toward India, and India should dismantle barriers through exceptions for American technology companies to enable true partnerships to form. In a re-globalized order, protectionism is a short-term band-aid that only exacerbates the wound. The ultimate goal must be to build a dynamic economy that can compete with any in the world. The United States-India technology corridor will give India the skills, technology, markets, and confidence to become a global player.

#### Solves climate, cyber, & AI.

Shyam Saran 21. Former Foreign Secretary and Senior Fellow and Member of the Governing Board at the Centre for Policy Research, Life Trustee of India International Centre, Member of the Governing Board of the Institute of Chinese Studies, Trustee at the World Wildlife Fund (India) and Member of the Executive Council of the Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry; The Tribune India, “Seize the Moment.” October 7. https://www.tribuneindia.com/news/comment/seize-the-moment-321202

An indispensable requirement to charting India’s path to power is getting the country back on a high growth trajectory. It is the substance of economic muscle rather than mere posture of strength which will expand room for manouevre in an era of geopolitical contestation. This requires not only sustaining but also expanding the outward orientation of the economy and its becoming part of both regional and global supply chains. Atmanirbhar Bharat must not mean a relapse into a high-cost and low-quality economy which prevailed before the 1990s. India’s future as a great power requires its integration with the regional and global economy and India must position itself as the engine of growth for the entire subcontinent. The Neighbourhood First policy needs to be underpinned by regional economic integration and SAARC should be utilised as an important platform for achieving this, even if Pakistan does not cooperate. Sidelining SAARC carries the risk of other member countries inviting China to be a full member which will only serve to complicate the security challenge for India. China has already set up a grouping consisting of Afghanistan, Pakistan, Nepal and Sri Lanka for cooperation with China on regional connectivity and development. India could become a preferred partner to its South Asian neighbours in their pursuit of social and economic development, drawing upon the advantage of proximity, the size of the Indian market and the deep cultural affinities that bind the people of the subcontinent together.

India is at a stage of its development cycle when it needs large infusions of capital and technology. India can leverage its benign partnerships with the key knowledge and financial centres of the world, in particular, the US, Europe and Japan, to build a stronger and modern economy. The evolving geopolitical situation places India in a sweet spot because of concerns about a rising challenge from China. Recent domestic developments in China, with growing hostility towards its hitherto vibrant private sector, is raising uncertainties and fears about the safety and viability of western investment in China. India’s economy alone offers a scale comparable to China. This would help transform India into one of the most dynamic and modern economies by the end of the current decade. The critical policy decisions to achieve this must be taken now.

The paper acknowledges that China will remain the biggest challenge for India in virtually all metrics of power. The collusion between China and Pakistan has acquired an even greater salience due to the recent withdrawal of US troops from Afghanistan and the Taliban takeover of the country. India’s strategy to meet this collusive threat needs a review. There is no option but to raise the level of military preparedness on our land frontiers but leveraging, in parallel, the country’s maritime assets and its partnerships with other naval powers in the Indo-Pacific, including through Quad.

Most of the challenges that confront the country are global in scope and not amenable to national or even regional solutions. These include public health challenges such as the Covid-19 pandemic that is still ongoing and the impending threat of global climate change which may have catastrophic consequences. These demand global and collaborative responses infused with a spirit of internationalism. India has a tradition of supporting multilateral institutions and processes and can play a leadership role in reviving them. This will mean reorienting India’s foreign policy towards mobilising the large constituency of emerging and developing countries with which India shares concerns and interests on a large number of issues. This also points to the importance of India’s traditionally close relations with Russia and Iran. These include the growing salience of cyber security and data privacy and the regulation of advanced technologies such as Artificial Intelligence.

India possesses a great asset in its visionary and liberal Constitution as a guidepost to the country’s destiny as a great power. It draws upon India’s civilisational attributes while envisioning a modern and democratic society. It commits the state to extending security, health and education to all its citizens through policies that are inclusive and egalitarian. The individual rights and duties inscribed in the Constitution recognise the immense diversity of India as one of its greatest strengths, with citizenship transcending but not rejecting individual or community identities. It is these intrinsic national strengths which convince the authors that India is the only country which in terms of area, size of population and scientific and technological capabilities can match, and even surpass, China and emerge as a parallel civilisational state, as has been the case through most of recorded history.

#### Reg fails. Extinction.

Robert A. Freitas 22. JD from the University of Santa Clara, School of Law, Research Fellow at the Institute for Molecular Manufacturing, Won the 2009 Feynman Prize in Nanotechnology for Theory, BS in Physics and Psychology from Harvey Mudd College. “Molecular Manufacturing: Too Dangerous to Allow?” Nanotechnology Perceptions, Volume 2, Number 1, Republished at The Lifeboat Foundation.

Attempts to block or “relinquish” [3, 12] molecular manufacturing research will make the world a more, not less, dangerous place [13]. This paradoxical conclusion is founded on two premises. First, attempts to block the research will fail. Second, such attempts will preferentially block or slow the development of defensive measures by responsible groups. One of the clear conclusions reached by Freitas [4] was that effective countermeasures against self-replicating systems should be feasible, but will require significant effort to develop and deploy. (Nanotechnology critic Bill Joy, responding to this author, complained in late 2000 that any nanoshield defense to protect against global ecophagy “appears to be so outlandishly dangerous that I can’t imagine we would attempt to deploy it.” [12]) But blocking the development of defensive systems would simply insure that offensive systems, once deployed, would achieve their intended objective in the absence of effective countermeasures. James Hughes [13] concurs: “The only safe and feasible approach to the dangers of emerging technology is to build the social and scientific infrastructure to monitor, regulate and respond to their threats.”

We can reasonably conclude that blocking the development of defensive systems would be an extraordinarily bad idea. Actively encouraging rapid development of defensive systems by responsible groups while simultaneously slowing or hindering development and deployment by less responsible groups (“nations of concern”) would seem to be a more attractive strategy, and is supported by the Foresight Guidelines [10]. As even nanotechnology critic Bill Joy [14] finally admitted in late 2003: “These technologies won’t stop themselves, so we need to do whatever we can to give the good guys a head start.”

While a 100% effective ban against development might theoretically be effective at avoiding the potential adverse consequences, blocking all groups for all time does not appear to be a feasible goal. The attempt would strip us of defenses against attack, increasing rather than decreasing the risks. In addition, blocking development would insure that the substantial economic, environmental, and medical benefits [15] of this new technology would not be available.

Observes Glenn Reynolds [16]:

To the extent that such efforts [to ban all development] succeed, the cure may be worse than the disease. In 1875, Great Britain, then the world’s sole superpower, was sufficiently concerned about the dangers of the new technology of high explosives that it passed an act barring all private experimentation in explosives and rocketry. The result was that German missiles bombarded London rather than the other way around. Similarly, efforts to control nanotechnology, biotechnology or artificial intelligence are more likely to drive research underground (often under covert government sponsorship, regardless of international agreement) than they are to prevent research entirely. The research would be conducted by unaccountable scientists, often in rogue regimes, and often under inadequate safety precautions. Meanwhile, legitimate research that might cure disease or solve important environmental problems would suffer.

#### Warming causes extinction.

Krosofsky 21 [Andrew, freelance writer for over two decades] “How Global Warming May Eventually Lead to Global Extinction,” Green Matters, March 11, 2021, <https://www.greenmatters.com/p/will-global-warming-cause-extinction> TG

Will global warming cause extinction?

Eventually, yes. Global warming will invariably result in the mass extinction of millions of different species, humankind included. In fact, the Center for Biological Diversity says that global warming is currently the greatest threat to life on this planet. Global warming causes a number of detrimental effects on the environment that many species won’t be able to handle long-term.

Extreme weather patterns are shifting climates across the globe, eliminating habitats and altering the landscape. As a result, food and fresh water sources are being drastically reduced. Then, of course, there are the rising global temperatures themselves, which many species are physically unable to contend with. Formerly frozen arctic and antarctic regions are melting, increasing [sea levels](https://www.greenmatters.com/news/2019/01/15/bPhgWvMpZ/oceans-warming-climate-change) and temperatures. Eventually, these effects will create a perfect storm of extinction conditions.

What species will go extinct if global warming continues?

The melting glaciers of the arctic and the searing, unmanageable heat indexes being seen along the Equator are just the tip of the iceberg, so to speak. The species that live in these [climate zones](https://www.greenmatters.com/p/what-is-a-climate-zone) have already been affected by the changes caused by global warming. Take polar bears for example, whose habitats and food sources have been so greatly diminished that they have been forced to range further and further south.

Increased carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere and oceans have already led to [ocean acidification](https://www.greenmatters.com/p/what-causes-ocean-acidification#:~:text=According%20to%20the%20Natural%20History,for%20some%20species%20to%20survive.). This has caused many species of crustaceans to either adapt or perish and has led to the mass bleaching of more than 50 percent of Australia’s [Great Barrier Reef](https://www.greenmatters.com/p/coral-great-barrier-reef), according to [National Geographic](https://www.nationalgeographic.com/magazine/article/explore-atlas-great-barrier-reef-coral-bleaching-map-climate-change).

According to the Center for Biological Diversity, the current trajectory of global warming predicts that more than 30 percent of Earth’s plant and animal species will face extinction by 2050. By the end of the century, that number could be as high as 70 percent.

#### Cyber war causes extinction.

Lindsey 19 — (Nicole Lindsey, Nicole Lindsey is a journalist and writer for more than 10 years, focusing on the intersection of technology, innovation and privacy. She has a background in information technology and has worked with various software companies and tech startups on their public relations and communications initiatives., “The Rise of the Global Cyber War Threat“, CPO Magazine, 8-5-2019, Available Online at https://www.cpomagazine.com/cyber-security/the-rise-of-the-global-cyber-war-threat/, accessed 9-6-2020, HKR-AR)

The prospect of an all-out cyber war involving the United States, Russia, China and a host of other nations including Iran, North Korea and Saudi Arabia sounds like something out of a Hollywood blockbuster movie. Yet, based on the growing sophistication and aggressiveness of state-sponsored cyber attacks around the world, a cyber war involving attacks on the critical infrastructure of nations can no longer be ruled out. Of even more concern is that China, Iran and Russia may be presenting a united front in the cyber domain as part of a very visible response to what they perceive as aggressive unilateralism from the United States.

Signs that Russia, China and Iran might be preparing for a cyber war

Russia, China and Iran each have their own separate reasons for uniting against the United States. As a result, they are taking steps to unite in order to resist the hegemony of the United States. Not only is the United States the world’s foremost military and economic power, but also it is now the world’s leading cyber power. And the National Security Agency (NSA) of the U.S. has been carefully articulating a more robust and more offensive-minded cyber doctrine that would enable it to act much more aggressively than in the past by using cyber weapons.

To combat this hegemony, Russia has been advancing the notion of “national sovereignty” when it comes to the Internet. The Kremlin is particularly disturbed that the United States appears ready and willing to impose its will on how the Russian Internet develops – especially when it comes to issues such as freedom of speech for government opponents. Russia has even gone so far as to threaten that it would disconnect from the global Internet and form its own national Internet. At the same time, Russia and the United States have been raising the stakes on their offensive cyber war capabilities. According to reports that have appeared, for example, both Russia and the United States have been carrying out very aggressive probes of each other’s power grids, and may even have “implanted” malicious code and other malware that can be activated in the event of an all-out cyber war.

China, too, has been regarding U.S. unilateralism in the cyber realm with a wary eye. Much like Russia, China has embraced the concept of “national sovereignty” when it comes to the Internet. This policy, of course, enables China to carry out censorship initiatives, block certain websites or apps, and crack down on anti-government speech across social media. At the same time, China is looking for a way to make an end run around the “pre-judgments” of the U.S. when it comes to the way its IT companies are perceived. Right now, the U.S. has imposed its version of unilateral sanctions against Chinese tech giants Huawei and ZTE, and China is looking for some way to hit back in the cyber realm.

And don’t forget about Iran, either. Now that economic sanctions have transformed into military action – including the shoot-down of a U.S. Navy drone – Iran is looking for ways to act behind the scenes in order to inflict damage on the United States, both in the Middle East and on U.S. soil. The state-sponsored hacking group APT33 is leading the charge here, with calculated spearphishing attacks carried out against U.S. economic targets. And Iran’s Revolutionary Guard Corps has also been dialing up the rhetoric about its ability to hit back in the cyber realm with Iranian cyber weapons. For its part, the U.S. under President Donald Trump has shifted its strategic posture from military action to cyber war. Instead of retaliating with aerial bombing raids, for example, the U.S. is retaliating with the equivalent of cyber war carpet bombs.

Cyber war diplomacy

In the first seven months of 2019, the three nations of Russia, China and Iran have gone beyond just supporting each other with rhetoric and state propaganda to outlining actionable cyber warfare approaches. Key figures from all of these nations are now meeting one-on-one with each other, in order to hammer out a potential cyber war strategy. For example, a delegation from the Cyberspace Administration of China (CAC) recently met in Moscow with Russia’s state IT watchdog agency, Roskomnadzor. The Chinese IT delegation will be meeting with at least two huge Russian tech companies – Yandex (Russia’s version of Google) and Kaspersky Labs – that are in the crosshairs of U.S. cyber authorities.

At one level, these meetings might just be another way to present a united front when it comes to restricting or limiting certain freedoms on the Internet. Both Russia and China appear to be on the same page about the need to limit radical, anti-state commentary from appearing on the Web. But there could be a more sinister explanation for why top representatives from these nations are now meeting face-to-face: they are preparing for a cyber war.

When it comes to cyber war diplomacy, what has changed is the way people think about offensive cyber capabilities. As one national security official in the United States has noted, the question is no longer: “Should we do this?” The question is now: “Can we do this?” Under the Trump administration, the U.S. Cyber Command has been allowed to flex its muscles. A brand-new 2018 National Cyber Strategy clearly spells out that the U.S. is no longer unwilling to use cyber offensive weapons. Moreover, the U.S. White House is much more willing to carry out preemptive cyber strikes if doing so would help to minimize collateral damage to the nation’s critical infrastructure.

A new paradigm for cyber war

The concern, of course, is that history might be repeating itself in a completely unexpected way. In the mid-20th century, the whole concept of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) became the dominant paradigm for how the world’s two superpowers – the United States and the Soviet Union – avoided a cataclysmic world war. By threatening to obliterate each other many times over with powerful nukes, they prevented low-level conflicts around the world from ever going too far. Nobody wanted to be brought to the brink of total destruction.

Key figures from Russia, China and Iran are meeting one-on-one with each other to hammer out a potential cyber war strategy against U.S. #cyberattacks #respectdata

That same thinking is now starting to appear in white papers and other documents pertaining to advanced cyber war doctrine. Stratfor, for example, has described a “hair-trigger” world in which the most powerful cyber nations could unleash war on each other with lightning speed and with no advance warning. A massive attack on one nation’s power grid might lead to a tit-for-tat attack on the electrical grid of the other. And, to avoid this scenario of having to hit back hard after already being hit, a nation like the United States might decide to develop a “first strike” capability. This would be tantamount to being able to let fly hundreds of intercontinental nuclear weapons, all at the same time, in order to destroy a nation before it ever has a chance to respond. As a result, the next generation might grow up under the constant risk of a cyber attack taking down the national energy grid, in the same way that generations before lived with the constant risk of nuclear war.

### 1AC—SPEC

#### Nothing that auto-affirms in the aff absent contention level offense.

#### CSA: God is Evil – https://www.reddit.com/r/DebateReligion/comments/67rc1a/christianity\_god\_is\_actually\_evil/

#### ROTB Spec: The role of the ballot is to vote for the better debater.

* “how offense links back to the role of the ballot:” Offense links back by winning a turn under the ac framework or offense under another framework and a reason the ac framework fails.
* “whether post-fiat offense or pre-fiat offense matters:” The distinction is arbitrary. No performative offense as of the 1AC.
* “implications on how to weigh:” answered above, but an argument that is more in line with gods thesis is an example of how one could weigh offense.
* Role of the negative: to find and propose better ideas than the ones the affirmative has proposed.

#### Enforcement/Implementation: The plan is fiated.

#### Funding: Normal means.