# Autonomous Weapons

## Neg

### Bans

#### Outright ban lacks support and is time consuming

Newstex Blogs, 10/4/2020 "A Partial Ban on Autonomous Weapons Would Make Everyone Safer". [advance-lexis-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:612G-GW81-JCMN-Y1T3-00000-00&context=1516831](https://advance-lexis-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:612G-GW81-JCMN-Y1T3-00000-00&context=1516831).

Oct 14, 2020( Foreign Policy: [http://www.foreignpolicy.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu](http://www.foreignpolicy.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/)/ Delivered by Newstex) The United Nations Convention on Certain Conventional **Weapons** Group of Governmental Experts met late last month to discuss lethal, **autonomous** **weapons**. The semiannual meetings are the first serious effort by global governments to control **autonomous** **weapons**. And the **weapons** pose serious risks to global security: Even the best artificial intelligence isn't well suited to distinguishing farmers from soldiers and may be trained only on laboratory data[1] that is a poor substitute for real battlefields. As U.N. Secretary-General António Guterres[2] wrote on Twitter, '**Autonomous** machines with the power and discretion to select targets and take lives without human involvement are politically unacceptable, morally repugnant and should be prohibited by international law.'

Organizations such as the Campaign to Stop Killer Robots[3], the International Committee for Robot Arms Control[4], and Human Rights Watch[5] advocate for a comprehensive ban on all autonomous weapons, but such a ban is unlikely to succeed. The military potential of autonomous weapons is too great. Autonomous weapons guard ships[6] against small boat attacks, search for terrorists[7], stand sentry[8], and destroy adversary air defenses[9]. Just a few weeks ago, an AI simulation[10] defeated a living, breathing F-16 pilot five to zero in a simulated dogfight. Such an AI system could conceivably command a future aerial drone. No doubt the technology will grow and mature. No serious military power would give up such potential—especially when concerns are theoretical and adversaries may not follow suit. Russia didn't even show up to the experts' meeting. Instead of a broad ban on all autonomous weapons, the international community should identify and focus restrictions on the highest-risk weapons: drone swarms and autonomous chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weapons, known as CBRN weapons. A narrower focus would increase the likelihood of global agreement, while providing a normative foundation for broader restrictions. In 2018, the tech company Intel[11] flew 2,018 drones at once in a Guinness World Record-breaking light show in Folsom, California. Earlier this year, Russia[12] and China[13] flew light shows of more than 2,000 drones too. The drones carried flashy lights and were meant as modern fireworks, but similar drones could be designed for war with thousands of guns, bombs, and missiles.A thousand-drone swarm has a thousand points of potential error. And because drones in a true swarm communicate with one another, errors may propagate throughout the swarm. For example, one drone may misidentify a cruise ship as an aircraft carrier, then unleash the full might of the swarm on a few thousand civilians. The same may occur if the drone correctly identifies the cruise ship as not a target, but the word not is lost, due to simple accident or adversary jamming. Swarm communication also leads to emergent behavior—collective behaviors of the swarm that do not depend on the individual parts—that further reduces both the predictability and understandability[14] of the **weapon**. As P.W. Singer, a strategist and senior fellow at New America, wrote in his book Wired for War[15], 'a swarm takes the action on its own, which may not always be exactly where and when the commander wants it. Nothing happens in a swarm directly, but rather through the complex relationships among the parts.' Drone swarms pose a greater threat to powerful militaries, because cheap drones[16] can be flung one after another against expensive platforms until they fall. In 2018, a group calling itself the Free Alawites Movement claimed responsibility for launching 13 drones[17] made largely of plywood, duct tape, and lawnmower engines that attacked Russia's Khmeimim Air Base in Syria. The movement claimed the successful destruction of a $300 million S-400 surface-to-air missile system. (The exact identity of the 'Free Alawites Movement' is unclear. The only attacks it has claimed are the Khmeimim attacks and another drone attack on a Russian naval base[18] in Syria on the same day. Sources[19] have also attributed the attacks to the Islamic State, Hayat Tahrir al-Sham, and Ahrar al-Sham.) Russian officials acknowledged the drones flew **autonomously** and were preprogrammed to drop bombs on the base but claim no damage was done. (The Russian officials did not comment on whether the drones communicated with one another to make a true drone swarm.) However, in Libya, Turkish Bayraktar TB2 drones[20] disabled at least nine[21] Russian air defense systems. The Bayraktar drones are considerably more advanced than those used in Syria, but they illustrate the same principle: Drones pose major threats to air defenses and other expensive systems. An adversary could fling tons of drones[22] against a $1.8 billion USS Arleigh Burke-class guided-missile destroyer in an attempt to disable or destroy it and still have a cost advantage. Facing such a threat, great powers should choose to lead—rather than resist—the arms control charge for certain **weapons**. Yes, great powers would give up the potential to unleash their own massive swarms, but swarms are likely to favor weaker powers. If swarms are most effective when used en masse[23]against big, expensive platforms, then major powers that possess such expensive equipment stand to lose the most. Swarms might also be easier to control. A key arms control challenge for **autonomous** **weapons** is knowing if a **weapon** is actually **autonomous**. At root, autonomy is just a matter of programming the **weapon** to fire under given conditions, however simple or complex. A simple landmine[24] explodes when enough weight is put upon it; an **autonomous** turret fires based on analyzed information collected from sensors and any design constraints. With **autonomous** **weapons**, an outside observer cannot tell whether the **weapon** operates under predesigned rules or is being controlled remotely. However, no human can reasonably control a swarm of thousands of drones. The complexity is simply too much. They must monitor hundreds of video, infrared, or other feeds, while planning the swarm's actions and deciding who to kill. Such a massive swarm must be **autonomous**, may be a **weapon** of mass destruction[25] in its own right, and could carry[26] traditional **weapons** of mass destruction. Discussion of **autonomous** **weapons** takes place under the auspices of the Convention on Certain Conventional **Weapons**, assuming the **weapon** fires bullets, bombs, or missiles. But an **autonomous** **weapon** could just as readily be armed with CBRN agents.**Autonomous** vehicles are a great way to deliver chemical, radiological, and biological **weapons**. An **autonomous** vehicle cannot get sick with anthrax, nor choke on chlorine. Drones can more directly target enemies, while adjusting trajectories based on local wind and humidity conditions. Plus, small drones can take to the air, fly indoors[27], and work together[28] to carry out attacks. Operatives from the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria[29] were reportedly quite interested in using drones to carry out radiological and potentially chemical attacks. North Korea also has an arsenal of chemical, biological, and nuclear **weapons** and a thousand-drone fleet[30]. When robots make decisions on nuclear **weapons**, the fate of humanity is at stake. In 1983[31], at the height of the Cold War, a Soviet early warning system concluded the United States had launched five nuclear missiles at the Soviet Union. The computer expressed the highest degree of confidence in the conclusion. The likely response: immediate nuclear retaliation to level U.S. cities and kill millions of American civilians. Fortunately, Stanislav Petrov, the Soviet officer in charge of the warning system, concluded the computer was wrong. Petrov was correct. Without him, millions of people would be dead. New restrictions on **autonomous** CBRN **weapons** should be a relatively easy avenue for new restrictions. A wide range of treaties already restrict production, export, and use of CBRN **weapons** from the Geneva Convention to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Chemical **Weapons** Convention. At minimum, governments could collectively agree to incorporate **autonomous** **weapons** in all applicable CBRN **weapons** treaties. This would signal a greater willingness to adopt restrictions on **autonomous** **weapons** without a requirement to resolve the question of **autonomous** **weapons** with conventional payloads. Of course, a **ban** may require giving up capabilities like a nuclear 'dead hand[32]'—in the words of proponents, 'an automated strategic response system based on artificial intelligence'—but nuclear **weapons** experts[33] are overwhelmingly[34] against[35] the idea. The risks to great powers of increased CBRN **weapons** proliferation and accidental nuclear war are far greater than any deterrent advantage already gained with a robust conventional and nuclear force. Placing **autonomous** **weapons** on the global agenda in the first place is a definite success—a global treaty can never be made if no one cares enough to even talk about it—but the question is what happens next. Do government experts simply keep talking or do these meetings lead to actionable treaties? What combination of inducements, export controls, transparency measures, sanctions, and, in extreme events, the use of force are best suited to preventing the threat? Historically, comprehensive bans took decades—the global community took about 70 years to go from the Geneva Protocols against chemical weapons usage to states giving up the weapons—but autonomous weapons are growing and proliferating rapidly. Countries might not be willing to ban the weapons outright, but banning the highest-risk autonomous weapons—drone swarms and autonomous weapons armed with CBRN agents—could provide a foundation for reducing autonomous weapons risks. Great powers would give up little, while improving their own security.

# AI Subs

## Neg

### 1NC – L – Unpopular

#### Congress hates increasing funding for submarines

**Larter 19** [David Larter, David B. Larter was the naval warfare reporter for Defense News. Before that, he reported for Navy Times., 12-19-2019, accessed on 7-5-2022, Defense News, "Congress slashes funding for the Navy’s LCS sensors — again", <https://www.defensenews.com/naval/2019/12/19/congress-slashes-funding-for-the-navys-lcs-sensors-again/> mimou]

WASHINGTON — Congress again [slashed funding for the littoral combat ship](https://www.defensenews.com/naval/2018/09/18/congress-to-buy-3-more-lcs-than-the-navy-needs-but-gut-funding-for-sensors-that-makes-them-valuable/)’s mission modules in this year’s defense appropriations bill, which will likely create further delays in fielding capabilities designed to plug into the hulls that would enable the ships to hunt submarines or destroy mines — the missions they were built to perform in the first place.

With 35 ships funded, Congress has every year since at least 2015 cut funding to the long-delayed [mission modules](https://www.defensenews.com/naval/2018/12/05/us-navys-littoral-combat-ship-program-inches-closer-to-fielding-new-capabilities/). As the program is currently structured, each ship is either a mine sweeper, submarine hunter or small anti-surface combatant, all made possible by mission modules still under development.

Appropriators are set to slice 77 percent from the Navy’s mine countermeasures module, shuffling part of it to another section of the budget. But the bulk of that slicing involves cuts to Knifefish minesweeping drones and unmanned surface vehicles that are intended to deploy sensors, according to a readout supplied by appropriators.

The surface warfare mission module, which has partially met its initial operational capability goal but not fully, saw a 45 percent cut, or $12 million, coming from surface-to-surface missile modules. And the anti-submarine warfare mission module saw a more modest 11 percent cut to address cost overruns with the variable depth sonar.

In total, Congress slashed about $145.5 million from the mission modules when you include general equipment that comes with all the modules, or 52 percent of the total Navy request.

### 2NC – L – Unpopular

#### Democrats and republicans both hate the plan

**Cohen 22** [Steve Cohen, Mr. Cohen is an attorney at Pollock Cohen in New York. He is a former member of the Board of Directors of the United States Naval Institute., 4-2-2022, accessed on 7-5-2022, New York The Sun, "Don’t Sink the Navy To Save It", https://www.nysun.com/article/dont-sink-the-navy-to-save-it mimou]

The Navy just [submitted](https://archive.ph/o/2BLyQ/https:/news.usni.org/2022/03/28/fy-23-budget-navy-wants-to-shed-24-ships-for-3-6b-in-savings-over-next-five-years) its Fiscal Year 2023 budget request. It calls for decommissioning 24 active warships, ostensibly to save $3.6 billion over the next five years — in order to use the savings to start building a mere nine new ships. The first problem is that both the Navy’s top officer and two successive civilian administrations have repeatedly [said](https://archive.ph/o/2BLyQ/https:/news.usni.org/2022/02/18/cno-gilday-we-need-a-naval-force-of-over-500-ships) that the Navy must grow to 500 ships, up from 298 vessels today. Otherwise, the Navy will simply not be equipped to do the jobs demanded of it.

The logic of cutting the fleet size today in order to fund its future growth is not finding traction among knowledgeable observers on either side of the aisle. It simply doesn't make any sense. “HINT: If you want to grow the Navy, stop decommissioning more ships than you build,” tweeted Representative Elaine Luria, a Democrat from Virginia who serves as Vice Chair of the House Arms Services Committee.

Ms. Luria is a Naval Academy graduate who spent twenty years as a surface warfare officer. She didn’t hold back or couch her tweets in conventional political rhetoric, “I have delayed putting out a statement about the Defense Budget because frankly it would have been mostly full of words you might expect from a Sailor, but here goes: It sucks.”

Ms. Luria added: “The Navy will be losing 1000-plus vertical launch system missile cells, with no plan to replace them. Instead, the Navy is investing in the next ‘Gucci’ missile and technology that will not be mature for 20-plus years. The Navy has no strategy.”

Senator Inhofe, the ranking Republican on the Senate Armed Services Committee not only questioned the Navy’s logic but believes the real number may be only eight new builds because  the Pentagon may be [double-counting](https://archive.ph/o/2BLyQ/https:/breakingdefense.com/2022/03/navys-shipbuilding-request-may-be-violation-of-law-inhofe-warns/?mc_cid=de8752221a&mc_eid=4bc9404c92) an earlier approval.

The Navy’s portion of the proposed $773 billion Defense budget is $180.5 billion. That is only 4.8 percent higher than last year’s enacted funding and insufficient to keep up with the current inflation rate of 7.9 percent. Given this level of spending, the Navy will actually shrink to 280 ships by fiscal year 2027.

#### //Plans for new AI submarines are widely unpopular

**Gooding 22** [Mike Gooding, Mike is the senior military and political reporter at 13news now, 5-13-2022, accessed on 7-5-2022, 13newsnow.com, "Navy 'not sized' to handle two wars at once: CNO", https://www.13newsnow.com/article/news/national/military-news/chief-naval-operations-says-navy-not-prepared-to-handle-two-wars-at-once/291-89e465f9-1f34-4748-b1a6-a2980ace86c1 mimou]

The current fleet stands at 298 ships. However, Gilday told the Senate Armed Services Committee on Thursday that he supports the Biden Administrations' proposal to reduce the fleet to 280 ships by 2027.

Gilday said it's smarter to invest now in newer, more sophisticated and more lethal ships, rather than wasting money on older, less capable vessels.

"We cannot field a fleet larger than one we can sustain," he said. "And in today's fiscal levels, quantity simply cannot substitute for quality."

Committee Republicans slammed the Navy's FY23 budget proposal and its new 30-year Shipbuilding Plan.

Sen. James Inhofe (R-Oklahoma) called the budget "inadequate." Sen. Josh Hawley (R- Missouri) said it is "disturbing" that only one of the Navy's three 30-year shipbuilding plan options would get the Navy to the Congressionally-mandated level of 355 ships by 2052.

"I mean, if that's not a wake-up call to the committee, I don't know what is," he said.

### 1NC – L – Infighting

#### Replacing existing submarines for modern ones like the plan ignite fights in congress

**Donnelly and Clevenger 22** [John M. Donnelly and Andrew Clevenger, John M. Donnelly is a senior writer for CQ Roll Call who specializes in defense. He has served as president of the Military Reporters & Editors Association, chairman of the National Press Club board of governors, and secretary of the Standing Committee of Correspondents in Congress. Andrew is a defense policy writer for Roll Call, 5-11-2022, accessed on 7-5-2022, Roll Call, "Tensions rise in House over Navy shipbuilding - Roll Call", https://rollcall.com/2022/05/11/tensions-rise-in-house-over-navy-shipbuilding/ mimou]

Sharp divisions over the adequacy of President Joe Biden’s fiscal 2023 request for the Navy’s shipbuilding budget emerged at two House hearings Wednesday.

The differences, which fell largely along party lines, were manifest at a House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense budget hearing with the Pentagon top brass and a House Armed Services Committee hearing with the leaders of the Navy and Marine Corps.

At the Defense Appropriations hearing, the top Republican appropriator, [Kay Granger](https://www.rollcall.com/members/469?utm_source=memberLinks&utm_medium=memberlinks&personid=469) of Texas, and the ranking Republican member of the Defense panel, [Ken Calvert](https://www.rollcall.com/members/70?utm_source=memberLinks&utm_medium=memberlinks&personid=70) of California, complained the Navy would decommission significantly more ships in fiscal 2023 than it plans to procure, while China’s fleet is already larger — and growing more rapidly — than America’s.

But [Betty McCollum](https://www.rollcall.com/members/8151?utm_source=memberLinks&utm_medium=memberlinks&personid=8151), D-Minn., the Appropriations subcommittee’s chairwoman, sought to rebut these arguments by noting that nearly half of China’s larger Navy is made up of relatively small, support ships. She also noted that America’s allies in Asia have plenty of warships to bring to any fight.

A similar debate took place Wednesday at the House Armed Services Committee. Virginia Democrat [Elaine Luria](https://www.rollcall.com/members/118568?utm_source=memberLinks&utm_medium=memberlinks&personid=118568) joined several of her GOP colleagues in taking issue with the declining U.S. fleet size.

The $27.8 billion fiscal 2023 Navy budget would fund nine new warships, the administration has said. But 24 ships are being retired, for a net loss of 15.

The nine ships in the Freedom class of Littoral Combat Ships are a high-profile example of the decommissionings.

But Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Michael Gilday said at the committee hearing that the Navy is using the $3.6 billion saved from retirements over the next five years on new ships and more modern weapons — which he called “systems that matter."

The decision on which ships to retire was driven largely by whether the Navy could “count on them to actually move the needle in a high end fight with an adversary like China," Gilday said.

From Ukraine to China

The House Appropriations subcommittee hearing ran the gamut of subjects, from troops’ housing costs to cyberwarfare.

The conflict in Ukraine was a hot topic. Asked if the war could escalate into a conflict between Russia and NATO, Defense Secretary Lloyd J. Austin III said Russian President Vladimir Putin “doesn’t want to take on the NATO alliance.”

Army Gen. Mark Milley, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said Russia has fired hypersonic missiles in Ukraine, but the weapons have not created “significant or game-changing effects.”

McCollum, meanwhile, said at the end of the hearing that she supports another round of base closings to reduce excess infrastructure, which she said is 20 percent by one estimate.

But the shipbuilding issue was front and center for members of both parties at both House hearings Wednesday.

At the Appropriations hearing, Calvert predicted “glaring capability gaps” as a result of a shrinking fleet, noting also that hundreds of military aircraft would be retired under Biden’s fiscal 2023 plan. Calvert said China is building 22 ships this year to America's nine.

China has 355 ships in total and is projected to have 460 by 2030, according to a Pentagon report last fall.

The U.S. Navy, by comparison, would drop from 298 ships today to 280 by 2027 under the Biden plan.

Granger asked the department’s leaders why they would “mothball” the LCS ships under these circumstances, saying she has “serious concerns about the way that was determined.”

Milley replied that the issue "comes down to balance in terms of what's affordable and what the Navy can afford and what the Department of Defense can afford.”

Austin said the overall budget “maintains our edge but does not take that edge for granted.”

Numbers game

McCollum, meanwhile, said she is interested in exploring possible new uses for at least some of the Littoral Combat Ships that are facing early retirement.

But she pushed back at length against the GOP argument that America’s Navy is a shadow of China’s. And she made a rarely heard point: that trying to catch up in quantity is a vain effort.

“There’s a simple fact here: The United States does not have the shipbuilding industrial base to manufacture, let alone maintain, a Navy that can completely — numerically — compete with China,” McCollum said. “But quantity alone is not the point. It’s quality and capability that matter, as you gentlemen pointed out,” she said to Austin and Milley, who were joined by Defense Department Comptroller Mike McCord.

She then noted that China’s fleet — which she put at 500 ships — is comprised of 230 smaller support vessels. She also noted that three of America’s allies in the region — Japan, South Korea and Australia — have fleets totaling more than 350 ships combined, though she acknowledged some of those are smaller too.

“The debate I believe needs to be very substantiated, and not just picking a number that we think might be for the right number of ships for the U.S. to have,” she added.

She also alluded to the need to get ships in and out of maintenance faster, so that the actual number of deployed ships can grow.

‘Systems that matter’

Meanwhile, at the House Armed Services Committee, several Republicans joined Luria in voicing concern about the U.S. fleet size: [Mike D. Rogers](https://www.rollcall.com/members/15323?utm_source=memberLinks&utm_medium=memberlinks&personid=15323) of Alabama, the panel’s ranking member, plus [Rob Wittman](https://www.rollcall.com/members/27705?utm_source=memberLinks&utm_medium=memberlinks&personid=27705) of Virginia, [Mike Gallagher](https://www.rollcall.com/members/98216?utm_source=memberLinks&utm_medium=memberlinks&personid=98216) of Wisconsin and [Michael Waltz](https://www.rollcall.com/members/119499?utm_source=memberLinks&utm_medium=memberlinks&personid=119499) of Florida.

But Gilday, the Navy’s top admiral, replied that the radar on older cruisers being retired can’t see the threat, leaving them vulnerable. Similarly, the anti-submarine warfare system on the nine Littoral Combat Ships the Navy wants to decommission “did not work out technically,” he said.

“After about a year and a half [of] study, I refuse to put an additional dollar against a system that would not be able to track a high-end submarine in today’s environment,” Gilday said.

### 2NC – L – Infighting

\*be careful using this – it’s a tightrope between a link and thumper – BUT, you can work around it b/c the UQ ev assumes current fights, not new additions

#### The plan only further tensions between the White House and Congress – funding and decommissions

Harris 7/13 – Congress reporter covering U.S. foreign policy and national security. (Bryant, “White House wrangles with Congress over ship, aircraft retirements,” Defense News, 7-13-2022, https://www.defensenews.com/smr/budget/2022/07/13/white-house-wrangles-with-congress-over-ship-aircraft-retirements/)// STC

WASHINGON — The White House on Tuesday doubled down on a brewing fight with Congress over legislative efforts that would prevent the retirement of several ships and aircraft as well as the scrapping of a nuclear modernization program.

With the House set to vote on the National Defense Authorization Act later this week, the White House’s Office of Management and Budget released a statement that said it “strongly opposes” congressional efforts to block its retirement and divestment plans.

The White House argued that blocking its efforts “to divest or retire lower priority platforms” inflated the top line of the $840 billion defense authorization bill, which already stands at $37 billion more than President Joe Biden’s budget request.

“The President’s budget request for [fiscal 2023] was developed in a thoughtful and deliberate way to match resources to strategy and strategy to policy,” the Office of Management and Budget wrote. “Any funding increase should be oriented to ensure the right balance of forces essential to advancing modernization while sustaining readiness.”

Democrats and Republicans alike have also rejected the Navy’s plans to decommission 24 ships, 16 of them ahead of schedule. The White House statement hit back at that, noting it “opposes” statutory requirements on the minimum number of amphibious ships and that it “strongly opposes incrementally funding a third Arleigh Burke class destroyer in FY 2023.”

Similarly, the House bill would also block the Air Force’s request to cut 33 Block 20 F-22A Raptor fighters.

The White House also said it “strongly opposes” a provision that would provide $45 million in continued funding for the sea-launched cruise missile nuclear development program, or SLCM-N, which Rep. Jim Cooper, D-Tenn., introduced as an amendment when the House Armed Services Committee voted 57-1 to advance the bill last month.

“Further investment in developing SLCM-N would divert resources and focus from higher modernization priorities for the U.S. nuclear enterprise and infrastructure, which is already stretched to capacity after decades of deferred investments,” the Office of Management and Budget wrote.

However, the fate of SLCM-N remains unclear, given the House Appropriations Committee last month advanced a bill that would defund the program.

The White House also decried a provision that would prevent the Navy from retiring five littoral combat ships. The service requested to retire nine of the vessels, citing breakdowns among the fleet as well as a $59 million annual maintenance cost.

### 2NC – L – Congress Blocks

#### Congress blocks Navy requests to decommission ships for new updates – lawmakers focus on growing gap between US and Chinese fleets

Oren Liebermann et al. 22 -- CNN Pentagon correspondent. Ellie Kaufman is a Producer in CNN's Washington DC bureau. Brad Lendon is the Senior Global Military Affairs Writer for CNN Digital Worldwide. (“US Navy chief defends plan to scrap troubled warships even though some are less than 3 years old,” CNN, 5-12-2022, https://www.cnn.com/2022/05/12/politics/us-navy-scrap-warships/index.html)// STC

(CNN)The chief of the US Navy defended the service's plans to scrap nine relatively new warships in the coming fiscal year even as the service tries to keep up with China's growing fleet. Three of the littoral combat ships slated for decommissioning are less than three years old.

Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Michael Gilday told the House Armed Services Committee Wednesday that the anti-submarine ships could not perform their primary mission.

"I refuse to put an additional dollar against a system that would not be able to track a high-end submarine in today's environment," Gilday told the committee. He said the main reason for the early retirement was that the anti-submarine warfare system on the ships "did not work out technically." The decommissioning of the ships would save the Navy approximately $391 million, according to the service's proposed FY23 budget.

But that recoups only a fraction of the cost of the nine littoral combat ships, which totaled about $3.2 billion.

The USS Indianapolis, USS Billings and USS Wichita were all commissioned in 2019, which means the Navy plans on decommissioning ships that are only a fraction of the way into their expected service life. The Navy also plans to retire six other littoral combat ships, all of the single-hull Freedom-variant, as opposed to the trimaran Independence-variant. Both variants can achieve speeds of 40+ knots.

Under a 2016 Navy plan, the Freedom-class variants were all homeported Mayport, Florida, mainly for use in Atlantic Ocean operations. The Independence-class variants were homeported in San Diego, and designated for mainly Pacific operations.

The decision amounts to an embarrassing admission that some of the Navy's newest ships are not fit for modern warfare.

Despite the Navy's plans to scrap the warships, Congress has the final say on the military budget and has balked at previous requests to decommission ships. Reducing the number of warships may be even more difficult as lawmakers focus on the growing size of China's navy and the gap between the US and Chinese fleets.

#### Republicans obstruct the Navy from investing in new ships – they’d rather fix existing LCSs

--LCS = littoral combat ship

Burke 7/14 – Washington correspondent covering Congress. (“U.S. House debates future of littoral combat ships including the USS Detroit,” Detroit News, 7-14-2022, https://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/politics/2022/07/14/house-debates-future-littoral-combat-ships-uss-detroit/10055378002/)// STC

Washington — U.S. House lawmakers debated Wednesday whether to keep or retire a troubled class of warships that includes the USS Detroit, ultimately rejecting a measure that would have let the Navy retire nine of them.

The amendment to the defense authorization bill by Armed Services Chairman Adam Smith, D-Washington, failed by a vote of 208-221 late Wednesday, though that alone won't save the USS Detroit from the scrap heap.

The House later approved the underlying defense package Thursday that would permit the retirement of four Freedom-class littoral combat ships but block the Navy from decommissioning five others.

Smith argued none of the nine LCS ships are worth saving, even though most are just a few years old, noting their "significant" maintenance problems and operating costs. Also, the anti-submarine warfare system made for them is incapable because it didn't fit onto the Freedom-class ships.

"These ships are not that old. They're not. But they have also not turned out to perform the way they were expected," Smith said. "The Navy has determined that it is better to invest in newer, more modern, more capable platforms, and we are blocking their ability to do that."

Rep. Rob Whittman, R-Virginia, countered that getting rid of the ships is wrong-headed, pointing out the LCS's fast-attack and mine-hunting capabilities and insisting they would be capable to counter China's fleet.

"If you get rid of

## Aff

### 2AC – No Link – Luria Shields

#### No link – Luria fights for the Navy and protects Democratic majority, especially in light of Taiwan and midterms

Gould 7/13 -- senior Pentagon reporter for Defense News, covering the intersection of national security policy, politics and the defense industry. (Joe, “Elaine Luria wants to fight for a stronger Navy — but first she has to get reelected,” Defense News, 7-13-2022, https://www.defensenews.com/congress/2022/07/13/elaine-luria-is-fighting-for-a-stronger-navy-but-first-she-has-to-get-reelected/)// STC

WASHINGTON — Rep. Elaine Luria is one of the U.S. Navy’s staunchest proponents — and one of its most ruthless critics.

Luria first drew attention in 2018 as one of seven Democrats with national security backgrounds who flipped red House seats to blue. But the Virginian at times finds herself aligned with Republicans, as she champions defense spending hikes, even flatly saying earlier this year President Joe Biden’s defense budget “sucks.”

Now, the 46-year-old former Navy commander serving as the House Armed Services Committee’s vice chairwoman faces her toughest political battle yet as she works to hold onto her seat this fall.

To Democrats, Luria is a pivotal player in their quest to maintain a majority in the House — even as she finds herself at odds with fellow members of her party. To shipbuilders and sea power supporters, she’s an ally; to the Navy, she’s both a supporter and a skeptic. Last month, she led a bipartisan coalition to boost defense spending, and she often uses her military experience to grill officials on both the size and readiness of the Navy’s fleet, and whether those factors are sufficient enough to win a war against China.

It’s a role some Navy supporters say is much needed, as the service has borne the fallout from budget fights since 9/11 that favored the military branches closer to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Retired Navy Capt. Lory Manning, now the government relations director of the Service Women’s Action Network, said Luria is helping the Navy “make up for 20 years of being underfunded or under-resourced.”

“We need people like her who really know what they’re talking about with Navy ships because there’s not that many Navy officers in Congress, and they need to know they can’t bullshit,” Manning said.

It’s a focus Luria’s betting will resonate in Virginia’s 2nd District, home to a high concentration of shipyard workers, service members, veterans and their families. The district is adjacent to the Hampton Roads area, whose local economy is tied to Naval Station Norfolk, home of the most U.S. Navy personnel, and to Norfolk Naval Shipyard, which services nuclear-powered aircraft carriers and submarines on the East Coast.

“I spend the majority of my time talking about defense and veterans issues, and it affects everybody in my community,” Luria, who also serves on the House Veterans’ Affairs and Homeland Security committees, told Defense News during a June 24 interview in her office.

“The way I look at it is if we don’t get this right with defense, especially with China’s increased aggression against Taiwan, investing in the right Navy and air forces, none of the other stuff matters.”

### 1AR – No Link – AT: Luria Loses

#### Luria generates support to win – appeals to local issues, military advocacy, and Republican distress – prefer recency

Weisman 6/7 -- congressional correspondent, veteran Washington journalist for over 30 years. (Jonathan, “The Jan. 6 Inquiry’s Only Endangered Democrat Prepares Herself for a Fight,” The New York Times, 6-7-2022, https://www.nytimes.com/2022/06/07/us/politics/elaine-luria-jan-6-hearings.html)// STC

But if voters regard their ballots as a choice between two political parties — one trying but failing, the other veering dangerously toward extremism — those losses could be mitigated. In the coming weeks — with the Jan. 6 hearings, an expected overturning of Roe v. Wade by the Supreme Court and the new focus on gun violence — Democrats are hoping that choice will be crystallized.

A new ABC News-Ipsos poll found that while voters still broadly rate inflation and gas prices as huge issues, their single most important concerns are diffuse. Inflation was chosen by 21 percent and the economy more broadly by 19 percent, but gun violence was the top priority of 17 percent and another 12 percent cited abortion.

The Jan. 6 hearings could raise still more doubts about returning power to the Republicans, said Celinda Lake, a Democratic pollster who has been conducting focus groups with swing voters.

“People think it’s part and parcel of a faction of Republicans who are just going way too far,” she said of Jan. 6. Voters, she added, “do have an ability to link it to other pieces of the agenda.”

Ms. Luria, who served as a naval officer for 20 years, is by no means making her service on the committee her calling card for re-election. She said she was most likely the only Democratic incumbent campaigning on her fight to increase the budgets of the Navy and the Air Force, while hitting Mr. Biden on foreign policy.

On the campaign trail, she is more likely to be talking about flood mitigation in Hampton Roads, the deepening of commercial shipping channels around Norfolk Harbor or the renaming of a post office in Virginia Beach than her work on the Jan. 6 committee.

But like it or not, her role is getting notice. As she walked into a local eatery in Virginia Beach on Monday, a young law student was waiting to buttonhole her about price gouging of infant formula and to thank her for her efforts around the Capitol attack.

“The other day, my husband was stopping to get a piece of pizza at Costco for my daughter, and I went ahead and took the groceries out,” Ms. Luria recalled. “He had three people come up to him after I walked out, and they said, ‘We didn’t really want to bother Elaine, but please tell her thank you.’”

It is purely anecdotal, she admitted, but in her district, one in five voters are either active-duty military or veterans. They took an oath to defend the Constitution, and in 2020, Virginia Beach voted for a Democratic presidential candidate for the first time since 1964. They care about the institutions of the United States and the fate of its democratic traditions.

The Republicans challenging Ms. Luria see it differently, but they face their own divisions. Jen Kiggans, a state senator and Navy veteran, is running as a traditional Republican with the backing of the House leaders in Washington.

Jarome Bell, another Navy veteran who has the backing of Representative Bob Good, the most conservative member of the Virginia House delegation, and much of the Trump world, unapologetically describes himself as “ultra-MAGA.”

### 1AR – No Link – AT: Luria = Skeptic

#### Luria provides constructive criticism while garnering Republican support – Navy budgets, Taiwan, and proposals prove

Gould 7/13 -- senior Pentagon reporter for Defense News, covering the intersection of national security policy, politics and the defense industry. (Joe, “Elaine Luria wants to fight for a stronger Navy — but first she has to get reelected,” Defense News, 7-13-2022, https://www.defensenews.com/congress/2022/07/13/elaine-luria-is-fighting-for-a-stronger-navy-but-first-she-has-to-get-reelected/)// STC

Luria is one of the House Armed Services Committee’s most biting inquirers, especially when it comes to Navy matters. Less than a year into office, she grilled service officials on complex issues, often with coolly withering or rapid-fire questions, rarely glancing at her notes.

At a naval readiness hearing in 2019, Luria peppered the three-star chief of Naval Sea Systems Command with questions about maintenance delays for carriers.

Though Navy plans called for the carrier George H.W. Bush to sit in drydock for 16 months of a 36-month cycle, Luria wanted to know why it would instead take 28 months, forcing another carrier to extend its deployment.

NAVSEA’s commander said the Bush faced unique repair issues and that Norfolk was overburdened by other work. Luria told him she’d talked to the shipyard commander personally; the work didn’t seem unique to her.

“Are you going to say it was successful if we complete it in 28 months, or is it already a failure because it’s 28 instead of 16, which it should have been?” Luria asked pointedly.

The larger issue to her was that seven out of 11 Navy carriers were not deployable, including the problem-plagued carrier Gerald R. Ford. She roasted that ship as “a $13 billion nuclear-powered berthing barge.”

Luria has also regularly argued Navy officials do not advocate enough for their service and budget. She has criticized the Navy for backtracking on plans to build a 355-ship fleet.

For their part, service officials have said fleet size is not all that matters. Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Mike Gilday and Navy Secretary Carlos Del Toro have, for example, tried to convince Congress to let the service decommission its old and worn-out cruiser fleet, arguing the ships are irrelevant to future fights, unsafe and a drag on the Navy’s budget.

“They’re eating us alive in terms of our ability to get maintenance back on track, which is where we need to be,” Gilday said at an industry event in March. “We are paying tens of millions of dollars beyond what we expected to because of growth work and new work on ships that are beyond their service life.”

To be clear, Luria hasn’t called for a specific number of ships; she agrees with the sort of aim Michèle Flournoy — former undersecretary of defense for policy — has espoused, that the U.S should be able to “credibly threaten to sink all of China’s military vessels, submarines, and merchant ships in the South China Sea within 72 hours.”

“With such a defined goal, we could design a fleet not based on size, but based on capability,” Luria said in 2020. “Deterrence must be credible and is only effective when an adversary believes, through our daily actions, that the cost of their armed aggression will be met with such overwhelming force (damage) that the loss would be too extreme for the benefit.”

Hawkish on China

Republicans in Washington have sought to paint Democrats as weak on China, but it’s hard to draw a line between those Republicans and Luria, who has called on the Biden administration to end U.S. ambiguity about whether it would defend Taiwan against a Chinese attack.

When Navy officials appeared on Capitol Hill last year to defend plans to decommission 15 ships, Luria was among lawmakers who pointed to assessments from two successive Indo-Pacific Command chiefs that China wants to be able to seize Taiwan by 2027. Beijing considers the island a breakaway province and has vowed to incorporate it back into the mainland, by force if necessary.

The U.S. Navy’s focus on the future, Luria and other lawmakers said, would leave it too small to face that fast approaching threat.

“We’re looking at this Battle Force 2045, a plan that’s far off, a 355-ship goal that we’re never going to get to when we decommission more ships every year than we actually build. … What are we going to do in 2025 to counter this threat?” Luria asked. “We’re creating a gap, and I’m afraid that the Chinese will find a way to exploit that gap.”

When this year’s budget proposal aimed to retire 24 ships, Luria made headlines in April for calling it out in a Twitter thread that invoked Taiwan.

“The Navy owes a public apology to American taxpayers for wasting tens of billions of dollars on ships they now say serve no purpose,” she said, adding the Navy has “NO PLAN” to replace lost firepower quickly enough to make a difference against China. “Lastly, the Navy has no strategy. Stop saying you do, because if you did you would be able to explain how this Fleet size will allow us to defend Taiwan.”

Luria followed up with a lengthy analysis published by the Center for International Maritime Security that decried the “catastrophic loss” of firepower she said would result from that budget.

According to Luria’s number crunching, those plans would translate into a loss of MK 41 Vertical Launching System cells, which fire a variety of missiles. She forecast a loss of 756 cells by 2024, 1,668 cells by 2027 and 1,980 by 2035.

To convince China it can’t outgun the U.S. and its allies in the Pacific region, Luria offered several options, including keeping and extending the lives of 12 cruisers, refitting expeditionary fast transport ships with a 64-cell capacity, and building eight additional ships.

That approach has won her plaudits from some Republicans.

Republican Rep. Mike Gallagher, a former Marine intelligence officer on the House Armed Services Committee, is a frequent collaborator. Also a China and sea power hawk, Gallagher was Luria’s co-sponsor on an amendment to establish a congressional commission to review the Navy’s force structure plans.

“She’s really knowledgeable and wants to build a bigger Navy,” said Gallagher, crediting her as the committee’s most vocal member about the Navy’s shrinking firepower. “I feel like we’ve done a billion amendments together.”

Luria’s budget inspiration stems from the Reagan administration. Then-Navy Secretary John Lehman’s 600-ship plan was meant to signal strength to the Soviet Union. As Luria sees it, the Democrat-run White House no longer grasps the urgency of a bigger naval budget, and the Navy’s not helping its own case.

“The administration was not prioritizing this with that sense of urgency and view, so I just continue to be loud about it,” Luria said. “I know that it’s frustrating to people in the administration that here you have a Democrat just continuously criticizing the administration on defense-related things.”

The previous Republican administration said “the right words,” she added, when then-Defense Secretary Mark Esper unveiled plans to boost the Navy’s fleet to 500 manned and unmanned ships by 2045, and a fleet of 355 traditional battle force ships by 2035.

Still, in October 2020, it came too late, she said.

“It was a commitment to an investment,” Luria said. “It needs to come from the top … and I just don’t feel like it’s been high enough of a priority.”

Though Biden has signed a flurry of executive orders that seek to revive America’s manufacturing and industrial base, the Navy’s budget submission is out of step and doesn’t offer any certainty of consistent work for shipbuilders, according to Luria.

“If we really want to make a commitment to grow the industrial base, we have to send a steady demand signal about what we are going to build,” she said.

### 2AC – No Link – Bipartisan Report

#### No link – Congress has called on the DoD to win the AI race to counter Russia and China – tech development, budget spending, and military integration

Seck ’20 – award-winning investigative and enterprise reporter who has been covering military issues since 2009. (Hope Hedge, “Congress Wants a 'Manhattan Project' for Military Artificial Intelligence,“ Military.com, 9-29-2020, https://www.military.com/daily-news/2020/09/29/congress-wants-manhattan-project-military-artificial-intelligence.html)// STC

A new bipartisan congressional report calls for the Defense Department to get a lot more serious about the race to acquire artificial intelligence and autonomous capabilities, modeling efforts to become dominant in these spheres after the "Manhattan Project" initiative to test and develop nuclear weapons in the 1940s.

On Tuesday, the House Armed Services Committee released the results of a yearlong review, co-led by Reps. Seth Moulton, D-Mass., and Jim Banks, R-Ind., aimed at assessing U.S. military capabilities and preparedness to meet current threats. The 87-page Future of Defense Task Force Report contains some expected findings -- China and Russia are identified as the top security threats to the U.S. and modernization is described as an urgent need -- but there are surprising points of emphasis.

The report leans hard into technological development and growth, particularly in the fields of machine learning and autonomy, going so far as to call for the Defense Department to evaluate an AI or autonomous alternative prior to every major future defense buy. And it also calls for the military to treat these technologies like a game-changing new weapon, establishing clear rules of the road and guardrails for their use.

"Using the Manhattan Project as a model, the United States must undertake and win the artificial intelligence race by leading in the invention and deployment of AI while establishing the standards for its public and private use," the report's authors wrote. "Although the Department of Defense has increased investment in AI and established the Joint Artificial Intelligence Center to assist with the transition and deployment of AI capabilities, cultural resistance to its wider adoption remains. Congress and the Department of Defense must take additional action to overcome these barriers."

The Manhattan Project, undertaken from 1942 to 1947, was a U.S.-led effort to obtain and test a nuclear bomb, a world-changing enterprise that led to the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan, at the end of World War II.

The task force report emphasizes that, now as then, the United States is against the clock to obtain and master tools that could make or break future dominance. It noted that China has publicly set the goal of becoming the world's leading AI power by 2030, just a decade from now.

In addition to considering AI or autonomous alternatives for new DoD acquisitions, the task force recommended that the Pentagon be required to make all new major purchases AI-ready and able to "nest with existing and planned joint all-domain command and control networks." It also called for the DoD to be given greater authority to evaluate advanced technologies that might accomplish military objectives better and at a lower cost.

To back up this push for innovation, the task force called for a requirement that the military services each spend at least 1% of their budgets on the integration of new technology.

In concert with this effort, the task force said, the U.S. should lead efforts to draft and approve an international treaty with rules for the civilian and military use of AI. That treaty, it said, should be "in the vein of the Geneva Conventions, the Chemical Weapons Convention, and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty," with a goal of having all nations that plan to develop and use AI sign on.

As the U.S. military invests in leap-ahead technologies, it must also divest aggressively from old and outdated programs, the task force said. In 2030, the report's authors noted, a "staggering" 70% of military capabilities will still consist of legacy systems, according to current projections.

To cut all the dead weight, the lawmakers recommended that Congress commission Rand Corp. or a similar organization to study existing legacy platforms and determine their continued relevance over the next half-century.

"Following completion of the studies, a panel should be convened, comprising Congress, the Department of Defense, and representatives from the industrial base, to make recommendations on which platforms should be retired, replaced or recapitalized," they said.

And along with technology, the task force said, the military must modernize its aging personnel policies and infrastructure and attract fresh talent. It incorporated some of the recent recommendations from the National Commission on Military, National and Public Service, calling for more volunteer opportunities; greater incentives for military service, including student loan deferment and forgiveness; and the creation of paid year-of-service programs -- military, civilian and private-sector -- for young people.

"Although the U.S. military personnel system produces outstanding leaders, it must grow its ability to produce more service members with expanded capabilities to meet emerging threats," the task force wrote. "History repeatedly shows that technological superiority does not guarantee victory and that new ways of thinking can be more powerful than new weapons.

"Future leaders and strategists will need to embrace emerging warfighting concepts such as joint and multi-domain warfare. They will further need a comprehensive understanding of national power and how to integrate military tools into a whole-of-government effort," it added.

### 2AC – No Link – Congress Wants Nukes

\*I think this is answered by “2NC – L – Infighting”

#### No link – Congress wants nukes despite Biden’s disapproval and the Navy’s budget denial

Gault 6/27 – contributing journalist and editor at Vice focused on conflict and politics. (Matthew, “Congress Wants to Spend $45 Million on Nukes the Navy Said it Doesn’t Need,” Vice, 6-27-2022, https://www.vice.com/en/article/akedz4/congress-wants-to-spend-dollar45-million-on-nukes-the-navy-said-it-doesnt-need)// STC

The House Armed Services Committee (HASC) added an amendment to the 2023 military budget that would continue to fund the development of sea-launched nuclear cruise missiles. This despite the Navy’s own budget zeroing out the item, saying it didn’t need the nukes, and the Biden White House saying the weapons were unnecessary.

The HASC amendment is $45 million dollars and Rep. Jim Cooper of Tennessee sees it as a compromise option between people who want the program cut entirely and those who want it bolstered. “We all know there are lots of pros and cons about actually deploying these on attack submarines,” Cooper said, according to Breaking Defense. “No one can tell in an uncertain world what we will need, but it’s important to keep this option available.”

The program would create a nuclear sea-launched cruise missile (SLCM-N). At the moment, the only U.S. nukes at sea are in submarines. These new cruise missiles could be launched from the decks of ships. It’s not the first time the United States has sailed the seas armed with nuclear cruise missiles, it first deployed them in the mid 1980s. George H.W. Bush ordered the dissolution of the missiles after the end of the Cold War. Obama followed up in 2010 by recommending the missiles be retired entirely, a task the Navy completed in 2013.

In its budget request for the fiscal year of 2023, the Navy zeroed out the line referring to the program, effectively asking to kill it. According to a Congressional Research Service report on the issue, the cancellation would save $2.1 billion over five years. “The Navy indicated that the program was ‘cost prohibitive and the acquisition schedule would have delivered capability late to need,’” the report said.

The Biden Nuclear Posture Review—an official White House report that outlines how an administration plans to develop and deploy nuclear weapons—allegedly supported the decision. The review is complete but hasn’t been publicly released, but people who’ve read it have told journalists that it supported canceling the SLCM-N. “Really this decision came out of the Nuclear Posture Review,” an official told Breaking Defense. “There was direction from the president to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in our defense strategy. That [decision to cancel SLCM-N] was a component.

Now the HASC has injected $45 million into the flagging program. The Senate Armed Services Committee also authorized spending $25 million to continue to develop nuclear cruise missiles that the Navy and Biden don’t want. The two groups will come together soon to settle on a final number and there is a chance that they’ll decide to cut the program.

There’s been a push in recent years for the U.S. to develop new and more “tactical” nuclear weapons. This typically means lower-yield weapons that could be, the argument goes, used in al limited nuclear war. The Trump administration actually deployed these lower-yield nukes on submarines in 2020. It’s hard to know if China or Russia would accept the logic that a “low-yield” nuke is less provocative than a typical nuclear weapon.

### 2AC – No PC – Nuclear Plans

#### No PC – bipartisan fights over Biden’s nuclear rollback

Ukenye and O’Brien 7/6 – Laurence Ukenye is an editorial intern covering defense. Connor O’Brien is a defense reporter covering Congress. (“Congress poised to shoot down Biden’s nuclear rollback,” POLITICO, 7-6-2022, https://www.politico.com/news/2022/07/06/congress-biden-nuclear-rollback-00044344)// STC

Progressives were already disappointed with President Joe Biden’s plans for the nation’s nuclear arsenal. Now they’re poised to lose one of the few things about the White House’s blueprint that they liked.

In recent weeks, Democrats have joined Republicans in adding money back into the Pentagon budget to continue developing a sea-launched nuclear cruise missile that former President Donald Trump initiated in 2018. Biden proposed canceling the missile, which arms control advocates say is redundant, costly and potentially destabilizing.

Yet testimony from top military leaders, including Joint Chiefs Chair Gen. Mark Milley, in support of the missile prompted other Democrats to join Republicans in rebuking Biden’s plans.

“No one can tell in an uncertain world what we will need, but it’s important to keep this option available,” Rep. Jim Cooper (D-Tenn.), who authored the House proposal to keep the missile, explained during a committee markup in June.

The Pentagon’s still-classified Nuclear Posture Review, which lays out a long-term roadmap for the nuclear arsenal, spurred the decision to zero out funding for the missile in Biden’s most recent budget. The public split between top civilians and military commanders amounted to a “green light” for Democrats to hedge on the program, according to Tom Collina, policy director at Ploughshares Fund.

“If the president was making [the missile] a high priority, he’d tell the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to oppose the [missile],” Collina said. “So I think the administration made a decision that this simply wasn’t a high priority for them.”

“Once you have the administration saying one thing and the military brass saying something else, in this case, supporting continued development of the [missile] … then you’re not going to have the Democrats falling in line behind the system,” he said.

The situation marks a retreat from the campaign pledges of then-candidate Biden, who long advocated for reducing reliance on nuclear weapons, only to turn around and dedicate tens of billions of dollars to the modernization of all three legs of the triad for two years in a row. Arms control advocates also called on him to establish a “no first use” policy and cancel two weapons added on by the Trump administration: the cruise missile and a low-yield submarine-launched missile, which has already entered the fleet.

Biden’s nuclear plans, outlined in a brief summary released in March, omit a “no first use” policy. The low-yield warhead introduced during the Trump years remains a part of the arsenal.

As for the cruise missile, now that both the House and Senate Armed Services committees have authorized funding, albeit with differing conditions, Congress will likely send Biden a compromise defense policy bill this year that foils his plan to cancel the program.

### 2AC – No PC – Approval

#### No PC – lowest approval rates in 40 years from key young populace, and gaining support requires taking down Republicans

Davis 7/15 – works in political data in Washington DC. He worked on the data team for the Bernie Sanders 2020 campaign. (“Democrats are facing asymmetrical warfare. It’s time to wake up and fight back,“ 7-15-2022, https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2022/jul/15/democrats-are-facing-asymmetrical-warfare-its-time-to-wake-up-and-fight-back)// STC

The New York Times recently published a poll that marks an exclamation point on months of bad news for the rapidly faltering Biden presidency. Biden’s meager 33% approval rating is in line with other polls, but the shocking and worrying number for the White House is that fully 64% of Democrats believe he should not run for another term in 2024. That number rises to an absurd 94% among Democrats under 30.

While younger voters have consistently given Biden lower marks than other cohorts this year, that number now stands at a miserable 19%. Young voters are not a group that can be ignored as flighty non-voters: they are the backbone of the Democratic party’s recent wins. In 2020, the youth vote surged to record numbers, and young voters gave Biden a 24-point margin. Without both high turnout and high margins from young voters, Biden would have easily lost every swing state. Increased turnout among the young also provided much of the margin for Democrats in the 2018 midterms.

Biden’s low approvals, especially among the young, have caused a crisis in confidence not seen in a sitting president’s party since at least Jimmy Carter. Should Biden step down in 2024? Unless the administration and the Democratic party radically change posture, he may need to retire to prevent the election of a man who only last year attempted a coup. Most importantly, though, he has within his power the chance to turn his presidency around.

It’s clear to Americans of all political stripes that we are in a crisis. Many of the basic rights and principles of our democracy have been completely overruled by a party that hasn’t won the popular vote in a presidential election in 18 years. There is a massive disconnect between the will of the people and the actions of the state. This is a situation unprecedented since the Civil Rights Era or potentially even Reconstruction, but the president has not treated it as such. Fundamentally, people, especially young people, want to feel like the president is fighting for them.

The Biden administration and the leadership of the federal Democratic party seem dedicated to broken and undemocratic institutions. Given the power these institutions are wielding, this feels hopelessly out of touch. The primary solution offered by the Administration has been to show up to vote in the midterms to potentially codify Roe, or more likely, stave off a federal abortion ban by the Republican party. None of the solutions proposed even come close to addressing the situation.

This is asymmetrical warfare, with the Democrats playing by an entirely different set of rules. While the Democrats remain dedicated to antiquated institutions and procedures, the Republican party has remade the state in its image without even commanding a majority of voters. The Republican party has long wanted to undermine many of America’s institutions: numerous serious presidential candidates, sitting senators, and sitting judges have proposed repealing the 14th amendment (the foundation of modern American law), the 16th amendment creating the income tax, the 17th amendment directly electing Senators, and more. Democrats have not seriously countered at all. They are dedicated to playing by the rules of a game everyone has long since stopped playing.

The primary response to the rollback of several fundamental rights has been “vote and donate”. Voting is of course necessary, and so are donations and all sorts of political activism. That doesn’t make it less insulting. People have voted. The last two elections have seen record turnout for Democrats. The party has unified control of government, despite all the caveats. The problem is, in the current system, voting will not work, and people know that.

It would take decades of uninterrupted Democratic control of the presidency to flip the US supreme court. With the current coalitions and political structure, it’s effectively impossible for Democrats to ever win a filibuster-proof majority in the Senate. Even a simple governing majority requires a clear Democratic wave in the popular vote, and that majority would almost certainly require more red-state Democrats like Sinema and Manchin who would block legislation.

In short, “just vote” and using the current institutions is impossible, and voters recognize that. It is not possible to win back the right to abortion, basic environmental protection, schools free of religious indoctrination, basic regulation on guns, protect rights to contraception, marriage equality, and personal sexual activity without radical changes to the basic structure of American governance.

Winning elections doesn’t hurt anything, but it is not enough in an anti-democratic system that has been gamed to truly absurd extents. There’s no winning in this system, and that is apparent to most Americans, and to the vast majority of young Americans who disapprove of Biden. To rescue his presidency, and mobilize a real force at the midterms and in the future, Biden needs to boldly champion radical democratic reforms, use his power and dare the supreme court and the Senate to stop him.

While in other times, disempowering institutions and taking unilateral action as a president may be unpopular, Americans recognize that our system is utterly broken. The supreme court has approval of only 25% of the populace, by far the lowest measured. This is an institution that can exercise power only so long as it has buy-in from the people. Supermajorities support serious reforms to the supreme court.

Young Americans in particular see their future collapsing before their eyes and understand the stakes. They know Biden can’t unilaterally pack the court, or make any significant reforms to the legislative or judiciary. That’s beside the point, however; he needs to put this on the agenda. He has been faced with a crisis of legitimacy, where the vast majority of the people vocally oppose the order being imposed on them. He has to stand with the people and lead the charge for their rights. There’s no way through these rigged institutions. Only around. To save his presidency, this needs to be at the very forefront of his agenda.

Biden needs to reverse course and show aggression as soon as possible to counter the lackluster response to Dobbs that has damaged his standing among Democrats and the young. Americans know the president doesn’t have this unilateral power, though they know he can do more. Most of all they want a fight. They want to know that the president recognizes the gravity of the crisis . We’ve seen the most serious rollback in rights for American citizens since Plessy v Ferguson in 1896. The majority of Americans are under attack by a minority, and they need a president who recognizes this and will respond in kind.

Biden has the opportunity to change course and be a two-term president who righted the country in a crisis of democracy. If Biden can’t do this, he will need to be replaced. Not only because it’s necessary, but because it’s the only way to recover his popularity and win reelection.

The Democratic party must reorient itself around radical democratic reforms and disempowering the supreme court, the Senate, and state governments. This is both necessary and inevitable. If Biden doesn’t do it, the next Democrat will need to. If they don’t, it will be impossible to exercise power of any sort, no matter the opinions of citizens.

Anti-democratic government institutions are fundamentally reshaping society and people have no recourse without a radical change. As a smaller and smaller minority exert more and more power, something has to come to a head. A state cannot operate so unmoored from popular sovereignty without a real rupture. Modern governments rely on at least some degree of consent of the governed.

There is no future where the Democratic party doesn’t embrace serious reforms to the current constitutional order, because radical resistance to the anti-democratic onslaught is required for their continued existence as a party. If Biden wants to lead the country, he must take the lead. Without an aggressive and radical reposturing, he will be unable to recover his standing. Nearly all Americans understand the country is in a crisis that requires a radical reshaping of our institutions. The Republicans are leading it. Biden is a man out of step with the world around him unless he recognizes this and acts decisively.

# Biotech

## Neg

### L – Biotech Investment

#### Biotech investment draws political controversy – picking favorites perceived as undermine public efforts and a corporate handout

Servick 19 [Kelly Servick is a staff writer at Science, "Controversial U.S. bill would lift Supreme Court ban on patenting human genes", Science, https://www.science.org/content/article/controversial-us-bill-would-lift-supreme-court-ban-patenting-human-genes] GBS-HW

A congressional proposal that would overturn a landmark U.S. Supreme Court decision that barred the patenting of human genes and ease other restrictions on patenting software and biomedical inventions is drawing fierce criticism from some scientific societies and patient advocates. Yesterday, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) in Washington, D.C., along with more than 100 other signatories from research institutes and advocacy groups, released a letter to lawmakers arguing the changes would stifle medical research and hinder patients' access to diagnostic tests.

The draft bill "would result in a quagmire of patent claims and legal impediments to the normal scientific exchange," said Harold Varmus, a cancer biologist at Weill Cornell Medicine in New York City and former director of the National Cancer Institute, in a press conference yesterday. "It's in the interest of virtually everyone to keep ideas and basic discoveries about the laws and products of nature in the public domain."

The ACLU letter comes as the Senate Committee on the Judiciary kicks off the first in a series of three hearings that will examine potential changes to U.S. patent law. Today's hearing is expected to include discussion of the draft proposal, released last month by a bipartisan group of lawmakers, which would overturn current restrictions on patenting products and processes that occur in nature, including human genes.

The bill aims to address a complaint that has been brewing for years in the biotechnology and software industries: that recent Supreme Court decisions have created confusing and overly stringent patent eligibility rules. In particular, critics point to three recent rulings:

The 2012 decision in Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Laboratories invalidated a patent on adjusting drug dosage based on levels of metabolites in a patient's blood because it relied on a "law of nature."

The landmark 2013 ruling in Association for Molecular Pathology (AMP) v. Myriad Genetics Inc. said that human genes can't be patented because they are a "product of nature."

In 2014, software patents took a blow from the Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International decision, which found a financial trading program to be an unpatentable "abstract idea."

The new bill "makes it clear in no uncertain terms that all the Supreme Court [decisions] are just gone," says Arti Rai, a patent law expert at Duke University in Durham, North Carolina. It says decisions about patent eligibility should not rely on "judicially created exceptions … including ‘abstract ideas,' ‘laws of nature,' or ‘natural phenomena.'"

The bill's sponsors in the Senate, Thom Tillis (R–NC) and Chris Coons (D–DE), have described it as a way to restore incentives for U.S. innovation by making the process for protecting new inventions more predictable. (Competition with China, where no comparable restrictions exist in the patent system, may have motivated the lawmakers, Rai says.)

But opponents say the bill would enable monopolies on discoveries that should be widely available for research and medical use. In the 2013 Myriad case, the diagnostic company Myriad Genetics of Salt Lake City claimed that its broad patents on two human genes gave it exclusive rights to clinical tests for cancer-associated mutations in those genes. In striking down the patents, the Supreme Court allowed other diagnostic companies to offer such tests without fear of infringement lawsuits. Signatories on the new letter—including plaintiffs who challenged the Myriad patents, and ACLU, which represented them—argue that if the proposed law is enacted, "We will again see high prices for tests with no competition in the market."

#### Biotech investment---congress has backed off BECAUSE of fears of inflation and price controls

Alex Keown, 6-15-2022, Keown is a journalist for Biospace with 20 years of experience in the field of biotechnology "Biotech Industry Seeks Congressional Greenlight for NOL Sales," BioSpace, https://www.biospace.com/article/biotech-industry-seeks-congressional-greenlight-for-nol-sales-as-source-of-income//DG

The San Francisco Business Times reported that industry lobbyists are [urging Congress to approve a plan](https://www.bizjournals.com/sanfrancisco/news/2022/06/14/net-operating-losses-nol-tax-credit-biotech.html) that will allow companies that are not yet generating revenue from the sales of their assets to be allowed to sell net operating loss carryforwards to larger companies. In other words, the biotech companies are looking to sell their losses to larger companies to provide them with a tax credit that would allow them to lower their tax burden.   Currently, net operating loss (NOL) carryforwards allow businesses that have suffered financial losses within a fiscal year to deduct them from profits in future years. This will enable businesses to be taxed on average profitability. The plan floated by biotech leaders would certainly be appealing to some of the larger companies. As the Business Times explained, NOL carryforwards are attractive to merger and acquisition specialists because of their practical applications in decreasing tax burdens. But, those are NOLs that are gained through an acquisition. The current plan seeks to give small companies the ability to sell those losses on the open market without going through the M&A process.  If a company gains a commercial revenue stream, it can take up to a decade and hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue that can offset those net operating losses.  While the sale of NOLs is not an option across the country as a whole, there are places where the practice is already in place. For years, the state of New Jersey has allowed tech and life sciences companies to sell up to $20 million in state net operating losses or R&D tax credits to buyers, which the purchasers can use to reduce taxable income. California has also reinstated the sale of NOLs as the state faced a budget deficit of $34 billion. It appears to have been successful as the state is now projected to have a surplus. But, at the federal level, the idea of NOL sales has not seen much movement.  This plan would allow early-stage companies with a new source of capital, mainly if they have been unsuccessful at finding significant funding from venture capitalists. The Business Times report comes the same day that Third Rock Ventures announced a new $1.1 billion fund aimed at supporting startup companies. The approach would provide a new source of funding for these early-stage companies. The supporters of the plan also noted that larger companies would benefit through a new tax-reduction tool.  The Business Times speculated that these NOLs are worth hundreds of millions of dollars. If the carryforward sale is allowed, the biotech industry hopes this could also serve as a catalyst for investors to return to supporting these early-stage companies to drive the development of new therapies, diagnostics and medical devices.  Investors have largely backed away from biotech and pharma over the past year due to market uncertainty caused by inflation, supply chain disruptions, the ongoing war in Ukraine and continuing talks about drug price controls. Since the start of the year, the Nasdaq Biotechnology Index has been down nearly 30%.

### L – Industry Scandals

#### Biotech projects get associated with pricing scandals---politicians love bashing the industry

Jackson Moses, 10-19-2016, Moses is a venture capitalist and head of partnerships at MainStreet "Biotech Bashing: Pills, Politics, & Endless Potential," No Publication, https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/biotech-bashing-pills-politics-endless-potential-jackson-moses//DG

The Blame Game: How Tit-For-Tat Thinking Is Sinking Biotech Long the ire of Clinton, Warren, Sanders, and (now) Trump, Mylan's EpiPen pricing scandal provided politicians a prime excuse to attack the biotech sector for all healthcare-related problems. After news broke of Mylan's 500% EpiPen price hike, seasoned politicians (Democrat and Republican) took to [Twitter](http://www.linkedin.com/pulse/followers-dilemma-how-game-theory-explains-twitters-most-moses), bashing the biotech industry for egregious price-gouging practices. As such, in an attempt to curb her impending PR nightmare, Mylan CEO Heather Bresch responded to media accusations by stating annual EpiPen price hikes were justified due to ongoing R&D costs (strike one), discounted public school rates (strike two), and Obamacare's failed incentive structure (strike three). Unsurprisingly, the aforementioned rationale didn't resonate with middle-class voters. The American public had quickly reached a populous conclusion, which also established a dangerous precedent: corporate greed is a punishable offense. The message was clear, if U.S. Representatives wanted to remain employed, Congress would hold "greedy" executives accountable for their private sector "crimes." Rightfully realizing the rare opportunity to acquire significant political capital, Hillary Clinton [Tweeted](http://www.linkedin.com/pulse/followers-dilemma-how-game-theory-explains-twitters-most-moses) the following: "EpiPens can be the difference between life and death. There's no justification for these price hikes." She then released an official follow-up statement and demanded "Mylan immediately reduce the price of EpiPens." Market participants responded by dumping Mylan stock to the tune of 10%.

### L – GMOs Backlash

#### GMO investment gets massive backlash---it tanks industries AND catalyzes backlash by appealing to public fears

Kojo Ahiakpa, 6-6-2018, Ahjakpa is an agribusiness advisor and a data analyst "THE POLITICS OF GMOs," No Publication, https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/politics-gmos-kojo-ahiakpa?trk=portfolio\_article-card\_title//DG

Opposition to GMOs and science in general across the world has hitherto been a matter of political interests, usually led by corporate, religious and political actors. Journalist Marc Gunther has highlighted the conspiratorial narrative about GMO technology favoured by some corporate supported anti-GMO activists. Marc Gunther has recounted the extent to which corporate and political sponsorship for anti-GMO activism has driven most of the campaigns across the world. Nonetheless, the introduction of GMOs into any country has its own political and business implications. Those supplying fertilisers to governments, suppliers of pesticides, weedicides and insecticides will be taken out of business. Political actors who may be hunting for avenues to make some political capital, may take advantage of such issues and join the protest without necessarily pointing out cogent reasons for their oppositions.

#### GMO development requires heavy PC expenditure---debates are ferocious

Nathaniel Johnson 1-24-2014, Johnson is a senior staff writer at Grist"OK, GMOs matter," https://grist.org/food/ok-gmos-matter-but-the-noisy-fight-over-them-is-a-distraction//DG

I’ll confess to some sensationalism in claiming in the title of my last piece on the GMO controversy that “none of it matters.” Of course it does matter to some degree, and it matters very much to those who have dedicated their lives to the issue. It would have been more punctilious (and less fun) to instead title the piece: “The ferocity of the GMO debate makes it seem much more important than it really is.” It’s not that we should all resign ourselves to apathy. I’m simply suggesting that — whether your primary concern is the environment, or health, or poverty, or feeding the world — heavy expenditure of political capital on GMOs isn’t going to move you all that far toward your goal. Both Ramez Naam and Tom Philpott take me to task for underplaying the importance of GMOs, and I actually agree with almost all of what they’ve written here. I agree with Naam that we should be pursuing moonshot technologies like C4 and self-fertilization. But we shouldn’t be counting on those big breakthroughs to solve our problems: They may not ever come. I agree with Philpott that GMO crops have been overhyped and that discussion should stick to the facts on the ground.

#### GMOs---proposals are partisan, dividing industries and the public

Adam Chandler, 3-8-2016, Staff Writer at The Atlantic "How the GMO Debate Became a National Nightmare," Atlantic, https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/03/gmo-debate-congress/473664//DG

The battle over GMOs encompasses some of our worst political instincts. The public overwhelmingly fears GMOs and supports labeling. Owing to its partisan nature, the bill to be debated has been given two names: the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act (SAFE), by those against mandatory labeling, and Deny Americans the Right to Know Act (DARK), by those who support labeling. (Making matters worse, there is also a competing bill that would try to split the difference between supporting state-mandated labeling and attempting to limit label confusion on the national level.)An informal consortium of government organizations and science academies say that genetically modified foods pose no health threat to consumers and yet their interests are associated with pernicious-seeming big agricultural stalwarts like Monsanto and ConAgra. Meanwhile, the FDA isn’t so sure about the environmental impact of genetically engineered crops, which is a different issue altogether that is being lumped within the conversation.

#### Gene drives---they lack any type of institutional support AND require political tradeoffs

Jesse Reynolds, 11-21-2020 Jesse Reynolds is an expert in international environmental policy. He researches and advises on how norms, rules, procedures, and institutions can help manage environmental opportunities and challenges, particularly those involving emerging technologies. “Engineering biological diversity: the international governance of synthetic biology, gene drives, and de-extinction for conservation," No Publication, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877343520300890//DG

The emerging technologies of conservationist synthetic biology present high-stakes risk-risk tradeoffs, with sub-stantial potentials to further sustainability and to cause environmental harm. Governance is vital, but existing mechanisms, institutions, and processes have gaps. The further development of governance is a political process. Although critics often frame emerging technologies as being hyped by firms and boosters, this is not the case with conservationist synthetic biology. Those who advo-cate for its research and development seem to do so despondently [3,19] and emphasize caution over speed [12]. Furthermore, few to no business interests are pro- moting the endeavors. This is likely a consequence of these biotechnologies’ largely nonexcludable character, in which their effects cannot be limited to those who payfor the services [46]. Consequently, there is little poten- tial for profit in providing such public goods (in the economic meaning, not the normative one).

# Cyber Security

## Neg

### General

#### Cybersecurity is not bipartisan – the plan consumes too much PC

**Baksh 22** [Mariam Baksh reports on the development of federal cybersecurity policy for *Nextgov*. She started covering technology governance in 2014, during the heat of the Net Neutrality debate, and focused her graduate studies at American University on investigative journalism. April 6, 2022. https://www.nextgov.com/cybersecurity/2022/04/partisan-rift-stalls-efforts-secure-critical-infrastructure-cyberattack/364120/]

Senior House Democrats and Republicans disagree on legislation Rep. John Katko, R-N.Y., has proposed that calls on the Department of Homeland Security to identify “systemically important critical infrastructure”—SICI—for prioritizing the government’s efforts to improve the nation’s cybersecurity.  “It is not enough to simply identify these most critical entities, nor is it consistent with what the solarium Commission proposed,” Rep. Yvette Clarke, D-N.Y., chair of the House Homeland Security Committee’s panel on cybersecurity, infrastructure protection and innovation, said during a hearing Wednesday. “We need to be able to answer the question, ‘what do these companies need to do as a result of their designation?’ And ‘what does the federal government need to do for them?’” The [Katko bill](https://www.nextgov.com/cybersecurity/2021/10/national-cyber-adviser-lays-out-goals-upcoming-30-nation-meeting-ransomware/185867/), and identical legislation proposed by Sen. Angus King, I-Maine, in the upper chamber, draws from a recommendation of the congressionally mandated Cyberspace Solarium Commission. The commission, which was composed of members of Congress from across the political spectrum, executive-branch officials and major private-sector representatives, proposed that entities designated systemically important critical infrastructure be allowed some protection from liability and access to information in exchange for implementing appropriate cybersecurity controls. Katko is ranking member of the House Homeland Security Committee. His legislation, which has [a Democratic co-sponsor](https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/5491/cosponsors?r=39&s=1)–Rep. Abigail Spanberger, D-Va.—who has not been active on cybersecurity policy, covers the first part of the Solarium Commission’s bargain by calling on DHS to identify the entities and outlining benefits they would receive. But it does not approach a discussion of appropriate security controls companies should be required to implement. CISA, meanwhile, has made a point of noting the agency is taking on the work of identifying the entities in question, regardless of whether there is legislation instructing them to do so. “It's clear that CISA's Systemically Important Entities effort is engaged in a rigorous identification process, but the next steps of what to do with the list appear less clear to me than the Solarium Commission's vision of SICI, which calls for specific benefits and obligations to SICI entities,” Rep. Jim Langevin, D-R.I., said.Langevin chairs a key cybersecurity panel on the House Armed Services Committee and is co-chair of the House Cybersecurity Caucus. He and King were both members of the Solarium Commission.   Agreement also broke down along partisan lines regarding the use of regulatory enforcement versus the voluntary approach that has been at the center of cybersecurity policy over the last decade. Rep. Andrew Garbarino, R-NY, who is on Katko’s SICI legislation and is ranking member of the committee’s cybersecurity panel, asked CISA Executive Director Eric Goldstein to speak to the importance of CISA’s voluntary approach in working with the private sector. Katko also noted, regarding CISA’s work with the private sector: “We can't lose sight of the value of those voluntary relationships.” Clarke, in contrast, said, “I think it's time to be candid about the limits of these voluntary partnerships and authorities … The throughline for all these efforts, is that at some point, Congress or the administration, or both, decided to punt on the question of benefits and burdens. That will not happen on my watch." “There are conflicting opinions between my colleagues and myself on the right direction for SICI,” Katko acknowledged. Testifying before the committee, the Government Accountability Office’s Tina Won Sherman said, “The diffuse and voluntary nature of the critical infrastructure landscape continues to pose a range of challenges to this community,” including for implementing security standards.

#### DoD cybersecurity programs are contentious—spurs backlash from businesses due to confusion.

Jon **Harper**, 4-26-2022, Jon Harper is the Managing Editor of DefenseScoop, he covers the Pentagon and military technology. "Industry still faces ‘a lot of ambiguity' around CMMC implementation," FedScoop, https://www.fedscoop.com/industry-still-faces-a-lot-of-ambiguity-around-cmmc-implementation//brian

Federal contractors still face a lot of unknowns about how the Pentagon’s **controversial Cybersecurity** Maturity Model Certification program will be implemented, the head of a leading trade association told lawmakers Tuesday. The CMMC program is an effort to prod the defense industrial base to improve their cybersecurity with new certification-based standards and better protect controlled unclassified information from adversaries. After receiving major pushback from contractors about the burdens and cost of implementation and conducting an internal review, the **D**epartment **o**f **D**efense in November announced that it was **revamp**ing its plans and would eventually implement what it called CMMC 2.0. Additionally, earlier this year Deputy Defense Secretary Kathleen Hicks moved responsibility for the program from the Pentagon’s acquisition and sustainment office to the Office of the CIO. “The requirements are in the early stages of the rulemaking process. And so we anticipate a revised Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement to … come out. We’ve heard various estimates that it could be as early as late this spring or as late as a year from now,” David Berteau, president and CEO of the Professional Services Council, said during a Senate Armed Services Committee hearing on the health of the defense industrial base. He continued: “What we don’t know is, **what’s the next standard** we’re gonna have to comply with? **What’s the timeline** in which the flag will go down and you’ve got to be in compliance? And what can you do now to be ready for that when you don’t know … what standards you’re gonna have to meet? So, **there’s still a lot of ambiguity there.”** **Delays** in the program have implications for cybersecurity, he noted. “One of the problems or concerns that we’ve raised from the beginning is the threat is not waiting for this implementation, if you will, and every day that threat grows,” he said. “The real question is, do those standards go far enough in order to protect us against the evolving threat? And nobody really knows the answer to that.” CMMC 2.0 is intended to simplify the standards, minimize barriers to compliance, provide additional clarity on regulatory, policy and contracting requirements, increase department oversight of “professional and ethical standards in the assessment ecosystem,” and improve the overall ease of execution, according to a DOD press release issued in November. Key changes include a reduction in the number of security compliance levels from five to three, and a reduction in the number of contractors that will be required to get third-party verification of their compliance. The DOD plans to specify a baseline number of requirements that must be achieved by contractors prior to contract award. CMMC won’t be implemented until after the completion of the rulemaking process for the Code of Federal Regulations and the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement. However, the Pentagon has encouraged contractors to beef up their cybersecurity while the rulemaking is underway. Berteau noted that many contractors are already moving to come into compliance with the cybersecurity standards laid out in National Institute of Standards and Technology Special Publication 800-171 (NIST SP 800-171), which are expected to inform CMMC. “Almost every company I know and that participates in the defense business today at the prime contractor level, whether large, medium or small, is already investing and has a plan on record for compliance with and meeting those standards,” Berteau said. “It’s not being incorporated into contracts [now as part of CMMC] … but a lot of people are moving forward anyway.”

#### Fights over cybersecurity funding in legislation thumps

[Joseph **Marks**](https://www.washingtonpost.com/people/joseph-marks/), 11-2-20**21**, "Analysis," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2021/11/02/cybersecurity-funding-is-stake-democrats-spending-battles/

The bipartisan infrastructure bill and the Democrats’ $1.75 trillion social spending deal together would commit about $2.5 billion to cybersecurity. Provisions would boost federal government cyber operations and raise protections against ransomware and other cyberattacks for state and local governments and critical infrastructure, such as the energy grid. The spending would effectively reverse course on a decade of inadequate cyber spending that’s been out of step with the surging threats to government and industry. But that investment is in limbo as moderate and progressive Democrats tangle over the size of the spending package. “We have significantly underinvested in cybersecurity for decades at this point, and this would be the first time in a long time that we’re really upping our investment and perhaps meeting the need in some areas,” Ari Schwartz, a former top White House cyber official during the Obama administration, told me. The largest-ever investment in the nation's cybersecurity is hanging in the balance as Democrats continue to spar over two mammoth spending bills.

#### Cybersecurity policy links---massive partisan divide regarding means AND enforcement

Mariam Baksh, 4-6-2022, Cybersecurity Policy reporter for nextgov "Partisan Rift Stalls Efforts to Secure Critical Infrastructure from Cyberattack," Nextgov, https://www.nextgov.com/cybersecurity/2022/04/partisan-rift-stalls-efforts-secure-critical-infrastructure-cyberattack/364120//DG

Senior House Democrats and Republicans disagree on legislation Rep. John Katko, R-N.Y., has proposed that calls on the Department of Homeland Security to identify “systemically important critical infrastructure”—SICI—for prioritizing the government’s efforts to improve the nation’s cybersecurity.    “It is not enough to simply identify these most critical entities, nor is it consistent with what the solarium Commission proposed,” Rep. Yvette Clarke, D-N.Y., chair of the House Homeland Security Committee’s panel on cybersecurity, infrastructure protection and innovation, said during a hearing Wednesday. “We need to be able to answer the question, ‘what do these companies need to do as a result of their designation?’ And ‘what does the federal government need to do for them?’”  The [Katko bill](https://www.nextgov.com/cybersecurity/2021/10/national-cyber-adviser-lays-out-goals-upcoming-30-nation-meeting-ransomware/185867/), and identical legislation proposed by Sen. Angus King, I-Maine, in the upper chamber, draws from a recommendation of the congressionally mandated Cyberspace Solarium Commission. The commission, which was composed of members of Congress from across the political spectrum, executive-branch officials and major private-sector representatives, proposed that entities designated systemically important critical infrastructure be allowed some protection from liability and access to information in exchange for implementing appropriate cybersecurity controls.  Katko is ranking member of the House Homeland Security Committee. His legislation, which has [a Democratic co-sponsor](https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/5491/cosponsors?r=39&s=1)–Rep. Abigail Spanberger, D-Va.—who has not been active on cybersecurity policy, covers the first part of the Solarium Commission’s bargain by calling on DHS to identify the entities and outlining benefits they would receive. But it does not approach a discussion of appropriate security controls companies should be required to implement.  CISA, meanwhile, has made a point of noting the agency is taking on the work of identifying the entities in question, regardless of whether there is legislation instructing them to do so.  “It's clear that CISA's Systemically Important Entities effort is engaged in a rigorous identification process, but the next steps of what to do with the list appear less clear to me than the Solarium Commission's vision of SICI, which calls for specific benefits and obligations to SICI entities,” Rep. Jim Langevin, D-R.I., said. Langevin chairs a key cybersecurity panel on the House Armed Services Committee and is co-chair of the House Cybersecurity Caucus. He and King were both members of the Solarium Commission.     Agreement also broke down along partisan lines regarding the use of regulatory enforcement versus the voluntary approach that has been at the center of cybersecurity policy over the last decade.

### New Agency Link

#### Cybersecurity is notoriously problematic in politics – only solution is to sacrifice limited political capital.

Newmeyer ’12 - Adjunct Faculty at Excelsior College and the Inter-American Defense College (Kevin P. Newmeyer, “Who Should Lead U.S. Cybersecurity Efforts?,” Prism Vol. 3, Issue 2, 03/01/2012)   
The challenges to a new department are daunting. Starting something in Washington at the Cabinet level normally requires a dramatic trigger event along the lines of 9/11 or an indefatigable champion willing to expend the political capital necessary to carry the battle. To date, this has not occurred on the cyber front. Other issues have occupied the political space and pushed cybersecurity to the rear. A new department would also face significant growing pains. In the current budget and political climate, it is unlikely to garner the support needed in Congress. While it may provide the best operational and constitutional solution, it is the least likely in the near to mid term. Retaining cybersecurity leadership within the Department of Homeland Security is the most likely alternative among the Cabinet level organizations. As previously discussed, the department has the basic regulatory functions necessary and significant experience in cybersecurity issues. The relationship with DOD has improved significantly in cybersecurity and a cooperative strategy is in place. What Homeland Security lacks in the cybersecurity leadership role is consistent Presidential and congressional focus. It has a coordination role given to it by the President in a series of decision documents, but coordination is not control. Homeland Security cannot truly compel other departments to adhere to its policies and decisions. The department itself is still growing and developing. Less than 10 years old, it does not have the longstanding policies and cultures of the Department of State or DOD. Congress has not helped the problems at the department and must clarify its committee jurisdiction issues regarding not only cybersecurity but also all of the missions assigned to Homeland Security. At present, more than 80 committees have a role in the department’s oversight.18 The other significant hurdle for Homeland Security is building the human capital necessary to establish and implement policy and operations in support of cybersecurity. The department has announced ambitious plans for growing its cyber forces, but it will not be easy. Recruiting and retaining these specialists will be a constant challenge. Recommendations Cybersecurity is a daunting policy problem, and a simple solution is not apparent. The choice will be a compromise among various options that must occur within a political environment with a limited attention span and several competing priorities. The President and Congress should do the following:

### Reducing Reliance on OCOs

#### Legislators rail against possible rollback of DoD cybersecurity enforcement

Suzanne Smalley, 4-5-2022, "Legislators rail against potential rollback of flexible DOD cyber powers," CyberScoop, https://www.cyberscoop.com/nspm-13-senate-armed-services-nakasone-king-gallagher-rounds/

Plans to review and potentially scale back a Trump-era rule providing broad authorities to the Department of Defense to launch offensive and defensive cyber operations without White House permission sparked concern from legislators at a Senate Armed Services Committee hearing Tuesday. National Security Agency and U.S. Cyber Command leader Gen. Paul Nakasone testified at the hearing, responding to concerns from senators troubled by [CyberScoop reporting last week that the White House has launched an “interagency review process”](https://www.cyberscoop.com/biden-trump-nspm-13-presidential-memo-cyber-command-white-house/) with an eye on taking back some of the broad authorities Cyber Command has held since the Trump administration issued National Security Policy Memorandum-13 (NSPM-13) in September 2018. Sen. Angus King, I-Maine told Naksone at the open session hearing that he was very concerned about a potential scaling back of NSPM-13, which he called “a grave mistake [that] would undermine deterrence at the worst possible moment.” Other senators also expressed worry about a possible weakening of NSPM-13, with Sen. Mike Rounds, R-S.D., pointedly asking Nakasone if losing the authority to use “persistent engagement” to defeat adversaries in cyberspace would harm national security. Nakasone said that prior to Cyber Command receiving NSPM-13 cyberspace authorities, his agency was forced to do less to defend American interests in cyberspace. Specifically, Nakasone said he is unaware of any examples of so-called cyber effects operations — which DOD defines as operations “where the primary purpose is to externally defend or conduct force projection in or through cyberspace” — prior to Cyber Command gaining [NSPM-13](https://www.cyberscoop.com/tag/nspm-13/) authorities in 2018. Nakasone also told Rounds that NSPM-13 authorities helped protect the 2018 and 2020 U.S. elections from cyber interference by hostile foreign governments. While careful to say he’ll review the proposed changes from the White House before making a final judgment, Nakasone allowed that, “significant changes to that NSPM, it could affect what we need to do.” King’s remarks opposing revisions to NSPM-13 followed a letter to President Joseph Biden that he and Rep. Mike Gallagher, R-Wis., sent Monday in their capacity as chairs of [the congressionally created panel designed to recommend cybersecurity legislation and best practices that was formerly known as the Cyberspace Solarium Commission.](https://www.cyberscoop.com/cyberspace-solarium-commission-csc-2-0/) The executive director of the commission, Mark Montgomery, [previously relayed his objections to CyberScoop.](https://www.cyberscoop.com/debate-u-s-cyber-command-lose-cyber-ops-authorities/) “One of the most important improvements in our national cyber capability over the past four years has been the development of effective, timely planning processes for the execution of offensive cyber operations,” [the letter says.](https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/21576892-220404solariumwhletter-1) “As the co-chairmen of the National Cyberspace Solarium Commission we are very concerned by press reporting that your administration may be considering changes to the governing policy document, National Security Policy Memorandum-13, with an intent to limit the Secretary of Defense’s freedom of action to plan and conduct offensive cyber operations.” In their letter, King and Gallagher hailed NSPM-13 for allowing more “agile” cyber operations. They said the policy enabled the Department of Defense to better thwart Russian information operations in the 2018 and 2020 elections and asserted that it plays an important role in “signaling our willingness to use cyber capabilities, a key aspect to an effective national cyber strategy.” “Any effort to weak and possibly alter NSPM-13 signals to our adversaries a lack of credible willingness to use offensive cyber capabilities which undermines the credibility of our deterrent,” the letter concluded.

### L – OCOs 1nc

Plan costs pc – Intelligence hasn’t been shared for a reason – NGOs, big tech, and the military backlash to the plan

Jacobsen 2021

Jeppe T., Ph.D. candidate at the Danish Institute for International Studies and the Center for War Studies at the University of Southern Denmark, “Cyber offense in NATO: challenges and opportunities,” 12 May 2021 https://academic.oup.com/ia/article/97/3/703/6205395 by 81695661 dmr

This does not mean that states that face hostile hybrid activities below the threshold of armed conflict will be left alone. Intelligence cooperation between allied countries does exist, and threat information is occasionally shared. In addition to the current political collaboration facilitated by NATO to improve network security and resilience, the EU is engaging in similar civilian activities, as well as developing and implementing a cyber-diplomatic toolbox to create a common basis for responding to a variety of malicious activities against member states. Further strengthening the political partnership between the EU and NATO is thus the most appropriate way forward to avoid further militarization of cyberspace. Sustaining the intelligence norm as the dominant norm is not without potential problems. Openly embracing the fact that cyberspace is a domain in which intelligence agencies are constrained only by domestic laws, and where takedowns of servers in foreign countries are not necessarily perceived as serious breaches of sovereignty, is likely to lead to an increase in the exploitation of IT vulnerabilities in commercial software used in both enemy and allied networks. For smaller states, this could increase the risk of retaliation by larger adversaries, and it could increase the risk of divisions between allies—divisions that are not aligned with the United States’ political ambition to use cyber coordination in NATO as part of its attempt to ‘defend forward’.74 More exploitation could also ultimately make cyberspace less free, less open and less secure, rendering civilian populations more susceptible to cybercrime, surveillance and disruptions of everyday services.75 This is why some states, NGOs and private corporations such as Microsoft continue to promote norms that emphasize restraint on the part of states’ intelligence agencies and militaries in cyberspace, and why other states promote more sovereign control of cyberspace.76

### L – OCOs 2nc/1nr

#### The link is massive and outweighs the link turns – their ev is that development of OCOs is politically popular – that is our argument – the plan’s sharing of those highly coveted mechanisms guarantees the backlash is substantial – a host of other political obstacles magnify the link – interoperability, sovereignty, and attribution requirements mean the link alone turns the case – these fights doom standardization and cohesion

Blessing 2021

Jason Blessing is a Jeane Kirkpatrick Visiting Research Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute. During the 2020-2021 academic year, he served as a DAAD Post-Doctoral Fellow in the Program on “The United States, Europe, and World Order” at the Foreign Policy Institute of Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS). Blessing has previously worked as a Consulting Fellow for the Cyber, Space and Future Conflict Programme at the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) and was a USIP-Minerva Peace and Security Scholar with the United States Institute of Peace. He holds a PhD in Political Science from the Maxwell School of Citizenship & Public Affairs at Syracuse University, an MA in Political Science from Virginia Tech, and a BA in Government from The College of William & Mary. “Fail-Deadly, Fail-Safe, and Safe-to-Fail: The Strategic Necessity of Resilience in the Cyber Domain,” NATO 2030: Towards a New Strategic Concept and Beyond, (172-191) 2021. <https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=4oBaEAAAQBAJ&pg=GBS.PT171&hl=en> dmr

Attribution difficulties present further challenges to the ‘who’ of deterrence. Adversaries with rapidly changing tactics, techniques, and procedures—along with the ability to easily conceal an operation’s origin and perpetrator—can pose hurdles to technical attribution.41 Technical difficulties can weaken deterrent postures by delaying the timeliness of retaliatory punishment. Moreover, the effects of an operation that a defender notices may actually be second- or third-order effects. This can add additional time between attribution and punishment.42 The larger attribution issues, however, are political. NATO lacks common standards or guidance for attributing cyber operations in either a technical or political sense. Indeed, attribution remains a member state prerogative. Not only are the targeted member states responsible for attribution, but those members looking to contribute to collective defense must perform independent attribution assessments, and the political decision for a collective defense response must come from the NAC.43 Reaching a consensus decision to trigger collective defense in response to cyberspace operations is likely to be politically contentious, and member states will have few incentives to risk revealing the intelligence sources and methods that underlie attribution decisions. These dynamics are likely to intensify when additional links in the attribution chain are required, such as when a perpetrator is encouraged or sponsored by an adversarial state but lacks direct ties. Attribution is less likely to be politically controversial across the Alliance once a conventional conflict is underway as contextual clues from kinetic attacks can reduce uncertainty. This discussion points to a greater role for deterrence-by-denial. Deterring an adversary by taking measures to deny potential gains does not hinge on attribution and thus possesses a potentially wider scope of application.44 A second and related hurdle for cyber deterrence is determining which actions the Alliance seeks to deter. Much of the activity in cyberspace falls below the physical effects thresholds associated with the disruption, degradation, or destruction of computers and networks. Such considerations complicate decisions to invoke Article 5—specifically, the types of cyberattacks to which Article 5 should apply. Indeed, cyber operations targeting military assets or critical civilian infrastructure can be incredibly costly but may not reach damage levels associated with conventional attacks.45 Moreover, espionage via network exploitation is widespread, varied, and falls well below the threshold of armed conflict.46 Problematically, such exploitation can be nearly indistinguishable from operations that eventually seek to attack computers or networks and produce effects. Network exploitation can even be precursor to conventional military operations.47 Determining how to deter presents a third obstacle to NATO’s cyber deterrence efforts. Threatening conventional military means in response to cyber operations poses dilemmas of proportionality and can risk unintended escalation.48 Retaliation with cyber tools carry their own problems. First, the Alliance faces issues of political reliability, particularly in the context of the SCEPVA framework. Legally, Allies retain different constitutional restraints on offensive cyber operations that can hamper the ability to volunteer sovereign effects. Strategically, states may be hesitant to volunteer their ‘best’ cyber effects for fear of burning an exploit that could have had a greater payoff when used in a national context. Volunteering sovereign effects can also inadvertently give unwanted insight to an adversary regarding an Ally’s techniques, tactics, and procedures. Second, the temporary and transient nature of cyber capabilities makes it incredibly difficult to establish repeatable and predictable effects required of deterrent threats.49 Finally, signaling in cyberspace is generally ambiguous and rarely straightforward.50 For instance, an adversary may not even recognize a signal, believing it instead to be a technical glitch. Even if a costly signal is received, there is no way to ensure that it has interpreted as intended. In addition to deterrence, NATO’s fail-safe cyber defense efforts face political and technical challenges. Because NATO will not undertake any active defense measures, actions to mitigate the effects of a cyberattack are limited to NATO networks or to individual member state networks when requested. This forecloses the possibility of developing an institutional strategy to mitigate the costs of a cyberattack upstream by disrupting the source of an attack, much like US Cyber Command does with its “defend forward” posture.51 More problematically, Allies have and will continue to have different legal, strategic, doctrinal, and threat frameworks for cyberspace that complicate defensive measures for the Alliance. Most immediately this means that Allies will locate resources to different aspects of cyber defense based on individual country circumstances. Different strategic focuses have the potential to intensify disparate threat perceptions, capabilities, and skillsets. This can also exacerbate interoperability problems; for example, during an operation or crisis, some systems will be controlled by NATO while others will be controlled by an ally or a group of allies with different skill and knowledge levels. In the longer term, disparate legal understandings, particularly regarding sovereignty in cyberspace, will become more impactful as a greater number of allied nations develop forward defense strategies and the requisite capabilities for out-of-network operations. An out-of-network operation can in and of itself cause operational friction. However, differing definitions of sovereignty in cyberspace—and what violates it—inevitably create political friction between Allies as some look to operate and produce effects on other Allies’ networks.52 This political friction will contribute to even greater hesitancy over cyber-intelligence sharing and complicate the coordination of defensive mitigation measures across the Alliance.

### L – Secrecy Concerns 🡪 Backlash

#### US cyber capabilities are kept top secret – any systems sharing will spark backlash from the NSA

**Vinik 15** – former assistant editor of The Agenda (Danny, “America’s secret arsenal, The Agenda, 12-9-15, “https://www.politico.com/agenda/story/2015/12/defense-department-cyber-offense-strategy-000331/) //sg

That’s not what happened. In fact, cyber weapons exist in a realm not unlike the early days of the nuclear program, **shrouded in secrecy**, with plenty of curiosity but very little public information. In part this secrecy is integral to the whole concept: a cyberattack is useful insofar as the enemy is unaware of it. The more the government reveals about what’s in its arsenal, the more our adversaries can do to protect themselves.

"If you know much about it, [cyber is] very easy to defend against," said Michael Daniel, a special assistant to the president and cybersecurity coordinator at the National Security Council. "Therefore, that’s why **we keep a lot of those capabilities very closely guarded**."

#### Intell sharing concerns deck political and public support

Porter ’19 [Christopher and Klara Tothova Jordan; Feb 14; nonresident senior fellow at the Atlantic Council; assistant director of the Atlantic Council’s Cyber Statecraft Initiative; Lawfare, “Don’t Let Cyber Attribution Debates Tear Apart the NATO Alliance,” https://www.lawfareblog.com/dont-let-cyber-attribution-debates-tear-apart-nato-alliance]

The United States still struggles to find effective policies for deterring cyberattacks. Suggestions run the gamut from more widespread use of indictments and economic sanctions, despite their lackluster record of success, to less traditional but more risky policies that emphasize the asymmetric advantage America has in conventional military power. Most of the discussion of cyber deterrence focuses on preventing a single catastrophic or cascading cyberattack that would threaten lives (like disruptions to electricity transmission or clean water)—or our way of life—altering election outcomes or grinding global finance to a halt. Yet the reality is that in the event of such an attack, the response would likely not come from the U.S. alone but from the NATO alliance in concert. NATO’s cyber-defense mandate has evolved over time to update its collective defense commitment under Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty for the era of cyberattacks. In the latest effort to collectively impose costs on adversaries, the 2018 NATO Summit saw a commitment from heads of state and government “to integrate sovereign cyber effects, provided voluntarily by Allies, into Alliance operations and missions, in the framework of strong political oversight.” The newly updated White House National Cyber Strategy likewise envisions working together with a “coalition of like-minded states” to “ensure adversaries understand the consequences of their malicious cyber behavior.” Therein lies the rub. Both formal alliances, such as NATO, and more ad hoc arrangements, such as what the Cyber Deterrence Initiative imagines, will require members to share intelligence and eventually, to the best of their ability and perhaps in different domains, contribute to joint action against a presumably well-armed foreign aggressor. States including the United States, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Estonia, and Denmark have publicly declared their willingness to lend sovereign offensive cyber effects to deter, defend against and counter the full spectrum of threats. Sharing intelligence and information is a key element of NATO’s core decision-making process enshrined in Article 4 of the Washington Treaty. Political consultations are part of the preventive diplomacy between member states, but they are also an avenue to discuss concerns related to the security threats member states face. These consultations can be a catalyst for reaching a consensus on policies to be adopted or actions to be taken—including those on the use of sovereign cyber effects to support a NATO operation. The alliance has a track record of collective action and cooperative security measures. For example, Operation Active Endeavour helped to deter, disrupt and protect against terrorist activity in the Mediterranean in the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, in solidarity with the United States. For the seventh time, the Atlantic Council’s Cyber Statecraft Initiative will be among the organizations privileged to organize an event on the sidelines of the Feb. 15–17 Munich Security Conference. This year in particular, the Atlantic Council’s event, “Defending Human Dignity: Limiting Malicious Cyber Activity Through Diplomacy,” will complement the topics high on the agenda of the main conference, such as transatlantic collaboration, the consequences of a resurgence of great power competition and the future of arms control. In the United States, the greatest failures of response and deterrence to foreign aggression in cyberspace have not been caused by a lack of intelligence, capability or imagination. Rather, U.S. policy has been serviceable in theory but impotent in practice because of an inability to translate technical findings and intelligence into public support for sufficiently tough responses ordered by elected political leaders. North Korea’s repeated operations targeting U.S. companies and critical infrastructure have been met with public skepticism over their culpability, limiting the strength of retaliatory options needed to deter further events. Chinese cyber economic espionage continued for years despite widespread knowledge of China’s activities because political leaders found it difficult to confront Beijing without undermining U.S. companies in return. Russian information operations did not sow enough doubt to mislead experts, but they succeeded in exacerbating the partisan polarization of an already-divided electorate and its leaders. That inability to translate the findings of cyber experts into public sentiment and therefore political action has sidelined America’s cyberwarriors, by far the most technologically advanced and well-resourced in the world. Imagine the political response of an ally that is asked to burden-share in response to cyber aggression but is probably much closer to any resulting kinetic fight than the United States. Now imagine the response of that ally when it’s being asked to take causus belli on faith: The United States is presenting attribution for a cyberattack elsewhere in the world, but perhaps is depending on the ally lacking critical details due to classification, and is presenting that information alongside a request for help that might well put the ally in the crosshairs of its own cyberattack or lethal action. How can allies with different capabilities to collect, analyze and understand intelligence be part of a consensus on using sovereign cyber effects to support a NATO operation? How can a commander achieve a common operational picture to authorize the use of sovereign effects in a NATO operation if all the allies are not on the same page with respect to critical attribution and other technical information needed for a use of effect in an operation? We all know what a tank looks like on a shared satellite image, but if you ask three cyber experts to interpret the attribution for a set of indicators, you are likely to get at least four answers. For most U.S. allies in Europe and elsewhere, there is simply a dearth of technical know-how within the government when it comes to cyber attribution and operations. This is already a challenge for the United States, with a massive defense budget, Silicon Valley innovation and an educated workforce to pull into government service. But for many U.S. allies, tech-savvy public servants will have long fled for the private sector, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and academia before reaching ministerial positions. To its credit, the U.S. National Cyber Strategy does propose capacity-building measures to support allies. This means building up law enforcement, intelligence, and military operational and investigative capability. But even with successful capacity-building programs, many nations could, in a crisis, end up in the same place the United States is—with good options stuck on the shelf while political leaders and their electorates lack a critical mass of informed voters to trust, understand and act on expert findings. For countries weighing whether to risk their own blood and treasure in support of an ally’s cyber attribution findings, this hurdle could well prove insurmountable if not addressed well before a crisis emerges. Many such countries will no doubt recall being burned when placing too much confidence in U.S. technical and human sources without an ability to evaluate the evidence for themselves, as with the Iraq weapons of mass destruction findings. The private sector will probably play a crucial role in providing intelligence to support alliance responses to cyberattacks, especially as a stopgap over the next few years. FireEye and its peer competitors and partners regularly produce analyses of major world cyber events—many that fly below the radar of Western leadership, in fact—sometimes at a near-government quality and often covering much of the same “classified” evidence. More important, private-sector analysts are accustomed to writing for impact with both their technical counterparts, like chief information security officers (CISOs) and threat hunters, and nontechnical stakeholders such as boards of directors, CEOs and other persons controlling the purse strings. In this sense, unclassified, private-sector and NGO-driven cyber threat intelligence can become the lingua franca of discussions. Relying on commercial reporting generated by international teams, rather than declassified government-generated reports, both broadens the audience enough to make alliance discussions feasible and mitigates against disparities in terminology across national lines—the tendency of even closely integrated allies to describe cyber “attack,” “information operations,” and attribution findings with different implicit assumptions or implications. Long-Term Thinking In the long run, though, the U.S. and its more technologically advanced allies—such as its fellow Five Eyes (Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the U.K.), France and Japan—will have to make important policy changes in the interests of furthering alliance cooperation in cyberspace: a willingness to sometimes risk sensitive sources and methods in order to get cyber threat intelligence into the hands of other countries better positioned to take policy action, an end to classifying public information like IP addresses solely because of their acquisition via classified means, and greater transparency on their own decision-making. Government cyber leaders within the alliance should consider taking another page out of the private-sector playbook as well: running cyber-crisis exercises that involve more than the IT department. In the commercial world, the more successful practice runs involve leaders at both the CISO level and some presence from nontechnical teams that would weigh in during a crisis, such as communications and legal. The best exercises involve executives, too, who despite their busy schedules must see for themselves how their companies would survive and respond during a potentially ruinous cyberattack, and work through the minutiae of leading a response themselves. The experience and confidence is invaluable if ever called on during a real-life crisis, and the organizational introspection by involving decision-makers at all levels is irreplaceable. Military-to-military cyber training as part of cross-country force standardization and joint operational planning could pull in more senior national leadership, beyond battlefield commanders, and be coupled with increased funding for foreign affairs-led training for nontechnical leaders. The private sector could also meaningfully contribute during NATO consultations when developing Allied Joint Publications to make sure that definitions and requirements for threat intelligence incorporate the best practices of NATO member countries’ private sectors. If a U.S. diplomat reaches out to his or her counterpart in an allied country to ask for assistance responding to malware that’s damaging critical infrastructure, and that counterpart has to ask what malware is, the response isn’t going to happen. \*\*\* NATO’s essential and enduring purpose is to safeguard the freedom and security of all its members by political and military means. Tolerating cyberattacks, especially those deliberately targeting civilians and the political legitimacy of governments—without the alliance having the capability to jointly discuss attribution and have the confidence to act and assist one another—undermines this core purpose of the alliance. Likewise, pursuing only deterrence and response without an active role for the alliance in reaching peaceful diplomatic agreements with potential adversaries abrogates member responsibilities to their citizens but is impossible without a common language and operational picture to discuss enforcement of such agreements. The U.S. is stronger with allies, and with attention to these issues its cybersecurity can be too.

### L —Turf War (NSA)

#### Offensive cyber action sparks turf wars – the plan guarantees backlash from non-DoD agencies and committees

**Chalfant 18** – White House reporter for The Hill (Morgan, “Federal ‘turf war’ complicates cybersecurity efforts,” The Hill, 4-29-18, <https://thehill.com/policy/cybersecurity/385272-federal-turf-war-complicates-cybersecurity-efforts/>) //sg

Lawmakers are concerned that bureaucratic turf wars are complicating the federal response to cyber threats. The issue took center stage this week, as senators on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee fretted that they had been unable to pass key cyber legislation requested by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) because of a disagreement with the Senate Intelligence Committee. {mosads}“The reality of the situation is there is conflict here,” said Chairman Ron Johnson (R-Wis.) at a hearing Wednesday. “This threat is too significant to allow turf wars to get in the way of as efficient an operation as possible in terms of dealing with a very complex and serious problem.” The dust-up illuminates the broader issue of turf wars over cybersecurity in the federal government. The executive branchhas **no one single agency assigned to handle cyber**. Instead, authorities are spread out over various agencies, including the Justice Department, which investigates and prosecutes cyber crime, and the Pentagon and broader intelligence community, both of which handle what is considered “offensive” cyber activity. While Homeland Security is broadly recognized as the main agency defending federal networks and critical national assets from cyberattacks, individual agencies also play a major role in guarding their own networks and personnel from malicious cyber actors. The set-up means that **virtually every congressional committee** has a say in the federal government’s cybersecurity efforts.

## Aff

### Plan Popular

#### Cyber gains momentum in Congress (acting now is key).

Politico ’22 (Maggie Miller, Politico Magazine, “Cyber Bills Gain Ground on Capital Hill,” 05/23/22, https://www.politico.com/newsletters/weekly-cybersecurity/2022/05/23/cyber-bills-gain-ground-on-capitol-hill-00034321)

CYBER BILLS ON CAPITOL HILL: The passage of a flurry of standalone cybersecurity bills in the House in recent weeks is highlighting how interest in cybersecurity has sharpened on Capitol Hill after a difficult year of attacks. — Action on cyber: President Joe Biden [signed into law](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/legislation/2022/05/05/bills-signed-s-233-and-s-2629/) the Better Cybercrime Metrics Act and the National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium Act [earlier this month](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/legislation/2022/05/12/bills-signed-s-497-and-s-658/), and the House passed around half a dozen cyber-related bills in the last two weeks including measures to providing cyber funding to state and local governments and to strengthen the federal cyber workforce. The pace is no accident, following a series of incidents including the ransomware attack on Colonial Pipeline and the fallout from the SolarWinds hack. Prior to these attacks, the vast majority of cybersecurity bills were included in larger pieces of legislation, such as defense and appropriations packages. But after the chaos in 2021, cyber bills have been pushed into the spotlight for independent votes. “We are having a bit of a spurt of independent bills independently passed in the House and Senate,” said Mark Montgomery, the director of CSC 2.0 and a senior fellow at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies. “This is fantastic, this is the congressional process maturing to handle cybersecurity provisions alone, and I think overall it’s a very good thing.” Montgomery noted that “good governance” bills are more likely to get standalone votes, particularly if there is not an obvious larger legislative effort to attach them to. “I think there will be some cybersecurity in the fiscal year NDAA, and then there will be a handful more independent cybersecurity bills…any bills that are broader sweeping will probably be in the NDAA,” he predicted. — Coming soon: Several of the bills approved by the House were previously passed by the Senate, and await Biden’s signature, including the State and Local Government Cybersecurity Act, which would help increase cybersecurity coordination between all levels of government.

# NATO General

## Neg

### 2NC – L – NATO

#### Republicans don’t support NATO – Finland and Sweden prove

Schnell 7/18 – staff writer for The Hill. (Mychael, “House approves resolution supporting Finland, Sweden joining NATO; 18 Republicans vote ‘no’,” The Hill, 7-18-2022, https://thehill.com/homenews/house/3564989-house-approves-resolution-supporting-finland-sweden-joining-nato-18-republicans-vote-no/)// STC

The House approved a resolution on Monday that expressed support for Finland and Sweden joining NATO, exactly two months after the Nordic countries submitted applications to become part of the military alliance amid Russia’s invasion of Ukraine.

The resolution cleared the House in a 394-18 vote, with only Republicans voting in opposition. Two Democrats and 17 Republicans did not vote.

The GOP lawmakers who voted “no” were Reps. Andy Biggs (Ariz.), Dan Bishop (N.C.), Lauren Boebert (Colo.), Madison Cawthorn (N.C.), Ben Cline (Va.), Michael Cloud (Texas), Warren Davidson (Ohio), Matt Gaetz (Fla.), Bob Good (Va.), Marjorie Taylor Greene (Ga.), Morgan Griffith (Va.), Thomas Massie (Ky.), Tom McClintock (Calif.), Mary Miller (Ill.), Ralph Norman (S.C.), Matt Rosendale (Mont.), Chip Roy (Texas) and Jefferson Van Drew (N.J.).

The measure, which has bipartisan sponsorship, expresses support for Finland and Sweden’s “historic decision” to apply to NATO and calls on member states to formally support them joining the military alliance.

It also opposes any efforts by the Russian Federation to adversely respond to Finland and Sweden’s decision to join the alliance and urges NATO members to satisfy the two percent defense spending pledge that countries signed on to at the 2014 Wales Summit. That declaration said that NATO allies currently spending at least 2 percent of their gross domestic product on defense would try to continue to do so.

#### 63 Republicans despise NATO – reverting to past support is wishful thinking

Singer 7/21 -- political reporter based in New York. (Emily, “63 House Republicans vote against resolution affirming support for NATO,“ American Independent, 7-21-2022, https://americanindependent.com/house-republicans-nato-resolution-russia-ukraine/)// STC

Nearly one-third of the House Republican Caucus on Tuesday night voted against a resolution that vowed support for both democratic values and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization — the alliance of countries that seeks to keep peace and prevent threats from illiberal countries.

The resolution passed by a vote of 362 - 63, with all 63 "no" votes coming from Republican members — many of whom are allies of former President Donald Trump.

The resolution states that the House is voicing its "unequivocal support for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization," and tells President Biden to declare his "support for shared democratic values" and his commitment "to enhancing NATO's capacity to strengthen democratic institutions within NATO member, partner, and aspirant countries."

The 63 Republicans who voted against reaffirming support for NATO included Reps. Lauren Boebert (R-CO), Madison Cawthorn (R-NC), Matt Gaetz (R-FL), Paul Gosar (R-AZ), Marjorie Taylor Greene (R-GA), Jim Jordan (R-OH), Thomas Massie (R-KY), and Chip Roy (R-TX).

"NATO is a relic of the Cold War. Why should Americans pay for Europe's defense?" Massie tweeted in defense of his "no" vote Tuesday.

The vote came amid Russia's ongoing brutal invasion of Ukraine. The Russian government, led by President Vladimir Putin, has been working to weaken the NATO alliance in order to expand the country's power and influence in Eastern Europe.

House Democrats quickly condemned the 63 Republican lawmakers who voted against the resolution, which was sponsored by Rep. Gerry Connolly (D-VA).

"My resolution is simple — it reaffirms that democratic principles are at the heart of NATO and calls for a new NATO center dedicated to the protection of democracy worldwide," Connolly tweeted on Tuesday evening. "63 of Putin's Puppets voted against it."

"Just now 63 House Republicans — nearly one-third of the entire GOP caucus — voted against support for NATO 'as an alliance founded on democratic principles,'" Rep. Bill Pascrell (D-NJ) tweeted on Tuesday evening. "The GOP truly is Putin's Party."

Even some House Republicans expressed confusion about why their colleagues voted against the resolution. Rep. Adam Kinzinger (R-IL) chastised his fellow Republicans for "showing Putin sympathy."

"I don't even have a clue why ... I mean every no vote should be asked repeatedly by their local papers why," Kinzinger tweeted on Tuesday night.

"I hope my party can finally remember where our foundations are and actually say that we're not going to be Putin-sympathetic anymore," he added in a video posted to Twitter, adding that his hope was likely "wishful thinking."

#### **Specifically, GOP opposition helped Putin**

Saletan ’22 – writer at The Bulwark. (William, “Putin Wants to Break NATO. Republicans Want to Help Him.,“ The Bulwark, 4-12-2022, https://www.thebulwark.com/putin-wants-to-break-nato-republicans-want-to-help-him/)// STC

Vladimir Putin’s central objective in Europe isn’t to capture Kyiv, the Donbas, or any other part of Ukraine. It’s to weaken the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which protects most of the continent against him. And in that longstanding campaign, Putin scored two significant victories this week.

One was in France, where Marine Le Pen, a Putin sympathizer, finished a close second to Emmanuel Macron in Sunday’s French presidential election. Le Pen is running almost even with Macron in polls for the April 24 runoff. She has said that if she wins, she’ll withdraw France from NATO’s command structure.

The other victory was in the United States, where 63 House Republicans, nearly a third of the GOP conference, voted against a resolution of support for NATO.

The House vote, taken on April 5, is a warning sign. Putin may be losing ground in Ukraine, but he’s gaining ground in the U.S. Congress. Three years ago, 22 House Republicans voted against pro-NATO legislation. That number has nearly tripled.

The “Putin wing” of the House GOP—useful idiots such as Madison Cawthorn and Marjorie Taylor Greene, who openly spout Russian propaganda—is only a tiny fraction of the Kremlin’s target audience in Congress. They’re joined by a larger crowd of Ukraine bashers, hardcore isolationists, and right-wingers who say we shouldn’t worry about anyone else’s borders until we “secure” our own. Together, that coalition adds up to more than 20 lawmakers.

That’s a problem. But when you combine them with the NATO skeptics who voted against last week’s resolution—another 40 or so House Republicans who don’t trust alliances and who view Europeans as America’s rivals or adversaries—the problem gets a lot bigger.

The GOP’s turn against NATO is particularly worrisome because Congress has been warned, explicitly and repeatedly, about Putin’s goal of dissolving the alliance. In March 2017, after a U.S. intelligence report confirmed that Russia had interfered in the 2016 U.S. presidential election, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—which was then, like the rest of Congress, under Republican control—held a hearing on this subject. The hearing was titled, “Undermining Democratic Institutions and Splintering NATO: Russian Disinformation Aims.” Analysts and former officials explained to the committee how Russia had, in the words of one witness, persistently funded propaganda in the West to “fracture allied security, stoke public distrust against democratic institutions, and discredit the alliance structures that defend Europe.”

Over the next two years, other reports documented the same problem. The European Council on Foreign Relations noted Russia’s efforts to undermine support for NATO in Finland, the Czech Republic, and other countries. Foreign policy journals and articles in the American press noted rising alarm in Europe at President Donald Trump’s threats to withdraw U.S. troops from the continent or to abandon the American commitment to defend NATO allies.

On January 14, 2019, the New York Times reported that “several times” in 2018, Trump had “privately said he wanted to withdraw” from the alliance. The article said Trump had “told his top national security officials that he did not see the point of the military alliance, which he presented as a drain on the United States.”

A few days after the Times report, House Democrats filed and brought to the floor the NATO Support Act, which reaffirmed that the U.S. was “solemnly committed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s principle of collective defense as enumerated in Article 5.” The bill couldn’t completely bind Trump, but it expressed the sense of Congress that “the President shall not withdraw the United States from NATO” and that American policy was “to reject any efforts to withdraw the United States from NATO.” It also prohibited the use of federal funds “to take any action to withdraw the United States” from the alliance.

Every Democrat voted for the bill; 22 Republicans voted against it.

One of the 22 Republicans, Rep. Scott Perry, explained why he and other self-styled hawks had voted no. In a statement to constituents, he complained that “the bill prevented the U.S. from ever leaving NATO . . . unless Congress first voted to repeal this would-be new law.” Perry wanted Trump to be free to pull America out of NATO, on his own.

Perry also argued that Trump should be free “to negotiate better terms for the United States in NATO,” as though the alliance were a trade deal. And he warned that “an ally of ours today may not be an ally tomorrow.”

That’s how Perry and many of his colleagues viewed the world. They saw alliances as entanglements and burdens. They worried that even friendly countries couldn’t be trusted. They believed that America should hedge its commitments because our allies might screw us.

And that was all Putin needed. He didn’t need American lawmakers to love him the way Trump did. He just needed them to constrain or withhold support from NATO.

#### And, Republican distrust extends into polarization of other issues, like the plan

Bernstein ’22 – Bloomberg Opinion columnist covering politics and policy. He taught political science at the University of Texas at San Antonio and DePauw University. (Jonathan, “Are Republicans Turning Against NATO?,“ Bloomberg, 4-7-2022, https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2022-04-07/are-republicans-turning-against-nato#xj4y7vzkg)// STC

Earlier this week, an astonishing 63 House Republicans opposed a resolution supporting NATO. That’s still not a full third of the Republican conference, but it’s not exactly a tiny fringe, either. To be fair, some of those objecting claimed to oppose the non-binding, symbolic resolution because of some of its specific wording rather than because they opposed the alliance — but quite a few seem to be wary of the whole concept of an alliance of democracies against authoritarianism.

These lawmakers are only reflecting where their party appears to be heading. In two recent polls, strong minorities of Republicans — 40% of respondents in one survey — supported leaving the alliance altogether.

If a Republican committed to the old consensus wins the 2024 nomination and is elected president, I’d expect all of that to dissipate pretty rapidly. Both parties will once again be strong supporters of NATO in particular and of the general overarching direction of U.S. foreign policy since the 1940s. But if Trump is nominated, and especially if he wins the presidency, it’s hard to see the party working as hard to constrain his foreign-policy choices as it once did. And if Democrats remain in the White House for another four years (or more)? It’s easy to imagine partisan polarization extending into this area, as it has so many others, with Republicans automatically opposing whatever it is that Democratic presidents are doing — including participation in the alliances that Eisenhower, Nixon, Gerald Ford, Reagan, George H.W. Bush, and George W. Bush all strongly supported.

Preventing that result would require strong, responsible leadership from Republican politicians. I’m not optimistic that will happen.

#### Republicans’ isolationist position represents a negative shift away from NAT, causing severe domestic polarization

Ashlet Parker et al. ’22 -- White House Bureau Chief. Marianna Sotomayor is a congressional reporter covering the House of Representatives. Isaac Stanley-Becker is a national political reporter. (“Inside the Republican drift away from supporting the NATO alliance,” The Washington Post, 4-29-2022, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/04/29/nato-republicans-trump/)//> STC

In early 2019, several months after President Donald Trump threatened to upend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization during a trip to Brussels for the alliance’s annual summit, House lawmakers passed the NATO Support Act amid overwhelming bipartisan support, with only 22 Republicans voting against the measure.

But this month, when a similar bill in support of NATO during the Russian invasion of Ukraine again faced a vote in the House, the support was far more polarized, with 63 Republicans — 30 percent of the party’s conference — voting against it.

The vote underscores the Republican Party’s remarkable drift away from NATO in recent years, as positions once considered part of a libertarian fringe have become doctrine for a growing portion of the party.

The isolationist posture of some Republicans is in line with the “America First” ethos of Trump, the GOP’s de facto leader, who has long railed against NATO. Last week, speaking at a Heritage Foundation event in Florida, Trump implied that as president he had threatened not to defend NATO allies from Russian attacks as a negotiating tactic to pressure them to contribute more money toward the organization’s shared defense.

The vote also comes against the backdrop of Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, which has catapulted NATO to its most prominent role in decades. And it comes as some hawkish Republicans seek to cast themselves as stronger opponents of Russia than Democrats.

Metin Hakverdi, a German lawmaker who chairs the North America working group within the ruling Social Democratic Party, said the question that preoccupies him is, “Was Donald Trump the exception, or will Joe Biden be the exception?”

Some two dozen House GOP lawmakers who voted for the 2019 NATO Support Act voted against the similar resolution this month, which reaffirmed support for the alliance and its principles. But in interviews, several of those House Republicans said they still support the organization and simply objected to what they viewed as problematic provisions that Democrats had added to the bill for perceived political purposes.

Several who switched their votes since 2019 objected to measures they said did not specifically address strengthening NATO to help Ukraine. Rep. Barry Loudermilk (R-Ga.) found it particularly problematic that the resolution instructed NATO to be involved when a country has “internal threats from proponents on illiberalism,” which he says could be interpreted as conservatism.

“I am a huge supporter of NATO — I served in the Air Force during the Cold War, worked with NATO during that time period,” he said. “These issues should be left to those individual nations.”

Loudermilk argued that Democrats had inserted “poison pills” into the symbolic resolution, which could be used against Republicans in the 2022 midterms. “It was the Democrats trying to politicize something and add things in there that we have no business working on,” he said, explaining his vote against the bill.

Similarly, from Rep. Robert B. Aderholt (R-Ala.): “I am wholeheartedly, unequivocally, without reservation, supportive on NATO.”

But Aderholt said he worried that the resolution “had some language in that I thought went on the political side. And I don’t want to see NATO go political. I want to see NATO stand up for, you know, what’s going on in Ukraine — stand up for Ukraine against Russia.”

The two bills are not exactly the same. The legislation in 2019 reaffirmed that federal money should not be used to remove the United States from NATO — which Trump was threatening at the time — while the bill from this month called on the government to “uphold the founding democratic principles of NATO,” as well for NATO “to continue to provide unwavering support to the people of Ukraine as they fight for their sovereignty, territorial integrity, and a democratic future.”

Another sign of the party’s isolationist wing emerged Thursday, as the House passed an update to a World War II-era military bill creating a lend-lease program intended to make it easier for the United States to supply Ukraine with military aid. Only 10 lawmakers — all Republicans — voted against the measure.

In an exchange earlier in the week between Secretary of State Antony Blinken, who was testifying before Congress, and Sen. Rand Paul (R-Ky.), Paul pushed back on Blinken’s assertion that over the years Russia has shown a willingness to attack countries like Georgia that are not part of NATO, while giving wider berth to countries that are members of the alliance.

“You could also argue the countries they’ve attacked were part of Russia, or were part of the Soviet Union,” said Paul, who was one of just two senators who voted against a 2018 bill reaffirming support for a NATO, in what was at the time a pointed rebuke of Trump.

“Yes, and I firmly disagree with that proposition,” Blinken responded.

For some foreign policy experts and international allies, the mere fact that nearly one-third of the Republican conference voted against a bill that fundamentally seeks to support both NATO and Ukraine highlights a marked foreign policy evolution in the Republican Party.

“We now are really seeing the true impact of deep, deep political polarization, where it is better to harm the other side than do what’s right for the country,” said Heather Conley, president of the German Marshall Fund. “This deep domestic polarization has now crept into foreign and security policy. There has always been strong bipartisan support for NATO, but everything now has become polarized and can be weaponized against the other side, even if it supports U.S. national security interests.”

#### Times have changed – GOP “no’s” mark heavy anti-NATO sentiment

Blake ’22 – senior political reporter. (Aaron, “Why 30 percent of the House GOP voted against reaffirming NATO support,” The Washington Post, 4-6-2022, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/04/06/house-gop-nato-support/)//> STC

Times have certainly changed.

On Tuesday, 63 House Republicans voted against a symbolic resolution reaffirming support for NATO and its principles, amid Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. The “no” votes comprised more than 30 percent of the party’s conference.

As with any such symbolic resolution, it’s worth parsing exactly what it contains. Oftentimes, these resolutions are crafted to force the other party into a politically difficult vote by including smaller provisions or loaded language they might object to, then accusing them of opposing the overall (and often popular) thrust of the bill.

But even accounting for those details, this vote marks the latest shift away from what was once a bipartisan, consensus view in Congress — supporting NATO and its importance in keeping Russia in check. And the shift continues apace.

Few Republicans have commented on their reasons for opposing the resolution, but writer Will Saletan previewed the vote Tuesday by noting a number of ways in which the party has drifted in a more Russia-ambivalent and even NATO-skeptical direction. Among the emerging views he isolated: that NATO was at fault for provoking Vladimir Putin, that we should focus instead on our own Southern border, and that the United States has no business defending European allies, whether in NATO or otherwise.

Among the few Republicans to comment on their vote was one of the party’s most anti-NATO voices, Rep. Thomas Massie (R-Ky.). He called NATO “a relic of the Cold War” and asked, “Why should Americans pay for Europe’s defense?”

#### No public support for US-NATO action.

Politico ’19 (Mark Hannah, Politico Magazine, “Opinion | It’s Not Just Trump. The American People Are Skeptical of NATO, Too,” 12/05/19, https://www.politico.com/news/magazine/2019/12/03/not-just-trump-american-people-skeptical-nato-074813 )

But as the heads of NATO member countries gather this week in London, some of that popular support is in jeopardy. This is one of the conclusions of a national [survey](https://egfound.org/stories/independent-america/indispensable-no-more) that my colleagues and I at the Eurasia Group Foundation recently conducted. For a second year in a row, when faced with a hypothetical scenario in which Russia invaded Estonia, a NATO ally, Americans were roughly split on whether they wanted the United States to respond militarily. And that was after respondents were reminded of Article 5, the part of the NATO treaty that obligates the United States to respond to such aggression, and after they were told that U.S. action could be the only way to expel Russia. It’s not just President Donald Trump who is skeptical of the North Atlantic alliance, in other words. It’s the American people. To the extent that U.S. citizens think about NATO at all, they disagree about whether honoring its commitments would be worth the sacrifice. This wavering commitment likely signals a belief that American protection is no longer necessary for European security or that the United States has different priorities from when NATO was created 70 years ago. If NATO wants to earn the confidence of American citizens—who, after all, elect the American president whom NATO allies deal with—the alliance must rethink its mission for the 21st century. To be sure, most Americans still have a general sense that NATO is important to our country’s security, according to another recent [survey](https://www.thechicagocouncil.org/sites/default/files/report_ccs19_rejecting-retreat_20190909.pdf) by the Chicago Council on Global Affairs. But even that survey found the same divide on whether Americans would opt to retaliate against a Russian attack on a NATO ally. As recently as the late 1990s, nearly [70 percent](https://fas.org/man/eprint/nato_pipa.htm) of surveyed Americans supported sending U.S. troops to defend a new NATO member from a military attack.

### 2NC – L – DOD

#### DoD military expansion is shunned by Congress – narratives, funds, and fears of neo-Nazis

Williams 7/20 – staff writer for The Hill. (Jordan, “Senate defense bill signals opposition to Pentagon’s extremism efforts,” The Hill, 7-20-2022, https://thehill.com/policy/defense/3567244-senate-defense-bill-signals-opposition-to-pentagons-extremism-efforts/)// STC

The Senate Armed Services Committee signaled opposition to the Department of Defense’s efforts to counter extremism in the military in a report on its version of the fiscal 2023 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA).

The committee released the text of the bill this week, after voting 23-3 to advance the measure last month.

In the accompanying report, the committee says “the vast majority of servicemembers serve with honor and distinction, and that the narrative surrounding systemic extremism in the military besmirches the men and women in uniform.”

“The committee believes that spending additional time and resources to combat exceptionally rare instances of extremism in the military is an inappropriate use of taxpayer funds and should be discontinued by the Department of Defense immediately,” the report continues.

The language in the bill’s report was approved by a vote of 14-12, with Sen. Angus King (I-Maine), who typically caucuses with Democrats, joining all Republicans voting in favor of the language.

Republicans have been open about their opposition to the Pentagon’s efforts, essentially saying it creates problems where there aren’t any.

Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin ordered a force-wide “stand down” to address extremism in February of 2021, amid the revelation that some defendants charged in connection with the Jan. 6, 2021, attack on the U.S. Capitol had some connection to the military.

The committee’s language cited a report from the Pentagon’s Countering Extremist Activity Working Group released in December, which says that available data showed cases of prohibited extremist activity among service members was rare. However, that report also said that even a small number of cases could pose problems for the military at large.

The language in the committee report is not legally binding. Even then, it remains to be seen whether such language will be included in the final version of the defense bill that will have to be negotiated between the House and the Senate in conference committee.

Rep. Matt Gaetz (R-Fla.) offered a similar amendment to the House version of the NDAA, which would express the sense that rooting out extremism was not a “top priority” of the Pentagon. The House Armed Services Committee turned down that amendment on a party-line vote.

The Democratic-led House did include an amendment to compel government officials to prepare a report on white supremacy and neo-Nazi activity in the military and law enforcement.

## Aff

### 2AC – Thumper – Abortion

#### Abortion thumps – heated congressional battles over legislation and name-calling

Choi 7/17 – staff writer for The Hill. (Joseph, “Abortion fight comes to Senate, House floors,” The Hill, 7-17-2022, https://thehill.com/policy/healthcare/3562671-abortion-fight-comes-to-senate-house-floors/)// STC

Legislative battles over abortion access are heating up in the House and Senate as Democrats look to raise pressure on Republicans.

A round of bills aimed at protecting abortion access that were introduced by Democrats were considered on Capitol Hill last week, leading to the first instances of lawmakers butting heads over such legislation since the Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade last month.

Though the bills are unlikely to pass in the evenly divided Senate, where they would require bipartisan support to overcome the legislative filibuster, Democrats are pushing for action in the aftermath of the court’s decision and seeking to get Republican members of Congress on the record objecting to legislation on the issue in an apparent attempt to paint GOP lawmakers as going to extremes to stop abortions.

Republicans have in turn accused Democrats of fearmongering when they argue that the GOP will seek to block access to contraception and try to enact a nationwide abortion ban.

A bill that would codify protections for abortion access into federal law — the Women’s Health Protection Act — was passed by the House 219-209 almost entirely along party lines on Friday after previously being approved by the chamber in September. Democratic Rep. Henry Cuellar (Texas) voted against the measure, along with all Republican members apart from two who did not vote.

Republican lawmakers lambasted the legislation as a form of government overreach during debate over it on Friday, with several members referring to it as the “abortion on demand until birth act.” Republican Rep. Cathy McMorris Rodgers (Wash.) argued it stripped away state laws that protected women from coercion to terminate their pregnancies and claimed it would force physicians to perform abortions.

The House also on Friday passed a bill 223-205 that would protect out-of-state travel for abortion services, with three Republicans — Reps. Brian Fitzpatrick (Pa.), Adam Kinzinger (Ill.) and Fred Upton (Mich.) — joining Democrats in voting for the measure.

Democratic lawmakers slammed their GOP colleagues for opposing the bill.

“It is absolutely important to get Republicans on the record to how far they will go to restrict a woman’s right,” Rep. Judy Chu (D-Calif.) told The Hill. “Are they really saying that women should not be allowed to travel to another state to get a medical procedure?”

Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s (D-Calif.) communications director Henry Connelly tweeted shortly after the vote, “Genuinely very scary that 205 House Republicans just voted to enable states to arrest, fine or sue women for traveling to get an abortion \*even where it is still legal.\*”

GOP opposition means both bills are unlikely to pass in the evenly divided Senate, where they will need 60 votes to overcome the filibuster. The upper chamber has already failed to pass the Women’s Health Protection Act twice since September, and this week a Republican senator blocked a separate bill seeking to protect those traveling across state lines to get abortions.

Democratic senators on Tuesday unveiled legislation that would bar state legislatures from banning or restricting interstate travel to obtain abortions in states where they are still allowed. The bill was quickly brought up for a unanimous consent vote on the Senate floor just days after it was introduced, only to be blocked by Republican Sen. James Lankford (Okla.).

### 2AC – No PC – Dem Base

#### No PC – Biden is unpopular and ineffective – key young voters, the Senate, inflation, bad communication, and climate change prove

Bolton 7/18 – senior staff writer for The Hill. (Alexander, “Cracks form in Biden’s Senate Democratic base,” The Hill, 7-18-2022, https://thehill.com/homenews/senate/3561683-cracks-form-in-bidens-senate-democratic-base/)// STC

Cracks are beginning to form in President Biden’s support among Senate Democrats, who are becoming less bullish about him running for reelection in 2024 after recent polling shows that most Democratic voters want a different nominee in two years.

Senate Democrats say Biden’s unpopularity is one of their biggest challenges heading into the midterm elections and are worried about data showing that young Democratic voters, whom they need to turn out in large numbers to win, are especially unenthusiastic about the 79-year-old president.

The relatively cautious and pragmatic members of the Senate Democratic Caucus represent the top ranks of the party establishment. They have been careful not to criticize Biden during months of a disappointing stalemate over his signature legislative agenda, the Build Back Better framework focused on climate change and social spending.

Senate Majority Leader Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) has urged his colleagues to stay unified and positive throughout the negotiations and to avoid criticizing either Biden or centrist Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.), who on Thursday again delivered a blow to the measure.

But the growing disaffection among Democratic voters with the president and the direction of the country are becoming impossible to ignore.

A growing number of senators aren’t promising to back Biden in 2024 no matter what — though they don’t want to speak on the matter publicly.

One Democratic senator who requested anonymity pointed to a recent New York Times-Siena College poll showing that 94 percent of Democrats under the age of 30 would prefer another Democrat as the party’s standard-bearer in 2024.

“It shows there’s a strong reservoir of sentiment to bring in a change of administrations,” said the lawmaker, who said the midterm election results will be impacted by Biden’s low approval rating.

The senator said “I think we have a shot” to keep the Senate majority, an optimistic view shared by many Senate Democrats, but warned Biden will weigh on Democratic candidates and predicted that younger rising stars will begin to jockey for the party’s nomination starting in 2023.

“I think following the midterms we’re going to see a number of younger folks saying we want to be in that conversation, and I don’t think you’ll see a complete domination of the primary in the way you might normally see for an incumbent who’s in a strong position,” the senator said.

One of those younger rising stars is California Gov. Gavin Newsom, who made the rounds with Democratic senators on Capitol Hill Thursday, further fueling speculation about his presidential ambitions.

Newsom, 54, was careful not to criticize Biden’s age or his inability to get things done in Washington, but he identified what he sees an inability of Democratic leaders in the White House and Congress to get their message out effectively.

He said political leadership is shifting to states such as California that aren’t hampered by the Senate’s filibuster rule, which requires 60 votes to pass major legislation.

Newsom said he’s proud of the work Biden has done but added “that one of our challenges” is communicating effectively with younger voters.

“We are unable to even communicate the basics in an effective way,” he said. “There are so many things that are being done, have been done. No one believes it, no one knows it, and that’s a frustration I have fundamentally.”

“That’s one of my critiques of the Democratic Party, broadly, is our incapacity to communicate a positive alternative agenda, to set the tone and tenor of the agenda [instead] of being constantly on the defensive,” he said.

Newsom said he doesn’t think Biden’s age is the problem, despite polling data showing that 33 percent of Democratic primary voters who want a new nominee in 2024 think that Biden is too old to run for a second term.

“I’m with Bobby Kennedy. What the world needs is the qualities of youth, not a time of life,” he said. “I think we get so fixated on your date of manufacture as opposed to your quality of imagination.”

Senate Democrats have complained for months about their ineffectiveness in letting voters know about their accomplishments in the 117th Congress.

Of course, it’s not lost on them that Biden has the bully pulpit and as president is his party’s communicator in chief.

Senate Democrats don’t want to publicly question Biden’s viability as a candidate in 2024, but privately they’re holding back on endorsing another White House term until they see how the midterms play out.

“You got to ask me after 2022,” said another senator.

The senator said Biden’s numbers and high inflation are “tough” for Democratic candidates this year but argued that Republicans failed to recruit top-tier candidates in New Hampshire, Missouri and Arizona, giving Democrats a better chance of winning races in those states.

The senator said the Supreme Court’s decision in Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization, which struck down the right to an abortion, “has injected a completely different dynamic into this” by revving up Democratic voters ahead of November.

A third Democratic senator didn’t want to even touch the subject of Biden’s politically viability, telling The Hill, “I’m not going to do the politics.”

A fourth Democratic senator said Biden’s strongest attribute heading into 2024 is his track record of beating Trump in a head-to-head election. Polls showing him leading the former president in another hypothetical match-up.

The New York Times-Siena College poll that showed 64 percent of Democratic voters want someone other than Biden to be the nominee in 2024 also showed him beating Trump 44 percent to 41 percent.

Sen. Sherrod Brown (D-Ohio), whose name has been floated as a potential presidential candidate, said that if Democrats can pass prescription drug reform through the budget reconciliation process as well as legislation to improve U.S. competitiveness with China, Biden’s numbers will likely tick up.

He said “people are unhappy.”

“They don’t like Trump, they don’t like Biden, they don’t like politicians generally right now. People are in a sour mood because of a lot of things that are beyond the president’s control. Inflation is mostly about the pandemic and corporate CEOs taking advantage of it,” he said.

Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse (D-R.I.) said younger Democratic voters, whom polls show are disaffected with Biden, are understandably frustrated by the Washington’s inability to address climate change.

“I think young voters have every reason to be impatient with Congress generally and I think we have a lot more work we need to do on climate, and that includes taking a much more aggressive stance against the climate denial operation that the fossil fuel industry continues to fund and maintain,” he said.

# PGMs

## Neg

### Humanitarian L

#### Use of PGMs have been historically controversial—pushbacks from humanitarian groups prove.

**ICRC ‘01**, "Afghanistan, Operation “Enduring Freedom”," International Committee of the Red Cross, <https://casebook.icrc.org/case-study/afghanistan-operation-enduring-freedom> //brian

A. The United States uses cluster bombs

The United Nations confirmed on Thursday that nine Afghan civilians had been killed by controversial weapons. [...] The United States each day unleashes a little more of its range of weapons against the Taliban and seems to have gone one step further this week. On the twentieth day of the bombing of Afghanistan, US aircraft are said to have dropped cluster bombs on targets close to Herat in the west and on the fronts north of Kabul and near Mazar-i-Sharif. On Thursday a Pentagon official admitted anonymously that such weapons had been used. Victims in Herat According to the United Nations spokesperson in Islamabad, these missiles – which scatter hundreds of bomblets if they open before they touch the ground – have claimed the lives of nine civilians in Herat since the start of the week. For technical reasons, these sub-munitions, which are the size of a soft drink can, do not necessarily explode when they hit the ground and turn into de facto mines. One of the nine victims is said to have set off one of these sub-munitions by handling it. The UN wants explanations The United States’ use of cluster bombs, a controversial weapon which has not been formally prohibited by international treaty, has angered several humanitarian organizations. The United Nations, which is carrying out de-mining campaigns in Afghanistan, asked Washington for clarification. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) did not give an opinion. In an “official statement” issued on Wednesday, it merely expressed its increasing concern “about the impact in humanitarian terms of the war in Afghanistan”. Darcy Christen, deputy ICRC spokesman, pointed out that “the ICRC only gives an opinion about the legitimacy of military means employed as a last resort and always bases its views on its own intelligence gathered in the field”. Like the other international organizations, the ICRC has evacuated its expatriate staff from Afghanistan. An ICRC project Cluster bombs, which were last used by the United States in Kosovo in 1999, are controversial. According to a Human Rights Watch report dated January 2000, in May 1999 the US supreme command issued a secret order prohibiting their use by its armed forces. Next December in Geneva, when the United Nations Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons of 1980 is reviewed, the ICRC will propose, among other recommendations, that it be prohibited to use sub-munitions, including cluster bombs, against military targets near populous civilian areas. A bomb which splits into many others [...] Cluster bombs are tubes which each contain 200 to 300 sub-munitions. Dropped by plane or fired by the artillery, the bombs release these sub-munitions, each the size of a soft drink can, at an altitude of between 100 and 1,000 metres. These sub-munitions can cover an area of 200 metres by 400 metres, the equivalent of eight football pitches. By scattering shrapnel over a range of 76 metres, each bomblet has an explosive force capable of piercing through armour plating, wiping out troop concentrations or neutralising minefields. Cluster bombs were used during the Viet Nam war and turn into mines when their sub-munitions do not explode: according to NATO, 29,000 sub-munitions did not explode in Kosovo.

### Dems/Bipartisanship

#### Biden’s PGM sales drew Democrat backlash—it’s politically contentious.

Oliver **O'Connell**, 5-18-20**21**, Oliver O'Connell. Experienced content creator, reporter, writer, editor, event producer and conference moderator. "Democrats criticise Biden for approving $735m sale of precision-guided missiles to Israel," Independent, <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/biden-israel-weapons-sale-gaza-b1849008.html> //brian

The Biden administration has approved the sale of $735m of precision-guided weapons to Israel, raising the ire of some Democrats who question support for the government of Benjamin Netanyahu. The Washington Post reports that Congress was officially notified of the proposed sale on 5 May, citing three people familiar with the notification — a week before the current conflict with Hamas began. Rockets fired from Gaza into Israel have led to the deaths of 10 Israelis. Airstrikes on Gaza have left almost 200 Palestinians dead. The Biden administration has called for a ceasefire but also maintains that Israel has the right to defend itself. While a large majority of Congress backs this position, a growing minority of Democrats, particularly in the House of Representatives, have raised concerns about supporting Mr Netanyahu and question the timing of the sale. Some suggest using the sale as leverage to push for a ceasefire. “In the past week, the Israeli military's strikes have killed many civilians and destroyed the building that housed the Associated Press, an American company reporting on the facts in Gaza,” a Democratic lawmaker on the House Foreign Affairs Committee told the Post. “Allowing this proposed sale of smart bombs to go through without putting pressure on Israel to agree to a ceasefire will only enable further carnage.” After official notification of a weapons sale, Congress has 15 days to object by way of a non-binding resolution of disapproval. Israel maintains it uses precision-guided munitions to minimise civilian casualties, accusing Hamas of using its own people as human shields in the densely populated Gaza Strip. Given the majority support for Israel in Congress, it is unlikely that action will be taken to block the sale, but coming during the middle of the current conflict, it has highlighted a growing split in the Democrat ranks over the special treatment the ally receives. Younger lawmakers, in particular, are more open to criticising Israel’s actions, and this has opened the way for criticism from those that defend the country as the death toll in Gaza mounts. “I am deeply troubled by reports of Israeli military actions that resulted in the death of innocent civilians in Gaza as well as Israeli targeting of buildings housing international media outlets,” said Senator Robert Menendez, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in a statement over the weekend. Congressman Mark Pocan of Wisconsin tweeted: “We cannot just condemn rockets fired by Hamas and ignore Israel’s state-sanctioned police violence against Palestinians — including unlawful evictions, violent attacks on protestors & the murder of Palestinian children. US aid should not be funding this violence.” New York representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez labelled Israel an “apartheid state” on Twitter saying that it could not be considered a democracy. She also tweeted: “This is happening with the support of the United States. I don’t care how any spokesperson tries to spin this. The US vetoed the UN call for ceasefire. If the Biden admin can’t stand up to an ally, who can it stand up to? How can they credibly claim to stand for human rights?”

#### PGM sales to allies face opposition—US House rejects it.

Patricia **Zengerle**, 7-17-20**19**, Patricia Zengerle, Correspondent at Thomson Reuters. "House rejects Saudi weapons sales; Trump to veto," U.S., <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-saudi-arms-idUSKCN1UC2US> //brian

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - The U.S. House of Representatives backed resolutions on Wednesday to **block the sale of p**recision-**g**uided **m**unitions to Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, sending them to the White House, where President Donald Trump has promised a veto. Nearly a month after the Senate supported 22 resolutions disapproving of Trump’s plan for billions of dollars in weapons sales despite Congress’ objections, the House passed three of the 22, two on a vote of 238-190 and the third by a 237-190 margin, largely along party lines. The three resolutions would block the sale of Raytheon Co precision-guided munitions and related equipment to the two countries. The House’s Democratic leaders opted to take up those three before the others because the PGMs could be delivered quickly, aides said. Some lawmakers also suspect that the PGMs have been used against civilians in Yemen’s civil war Many members of Congress, including some of Trump’s fellow Republicans as well as Democrats, have been frustrated by what they see as Trump’s embrace of Saudi Arabia. The Senate’s backing of the resolutions of disapproval was one of the few times the Republican-led chamber has opposed his foreign policy. Lawmakers want Washington to push the kingdom to improve its human rights record and do more to avoid civilian casualties in the four-year-long war in Yemen, where the Saudis and UAE are leading an air campaign against Iran-backed Houthi rebels. Frustration grew after the murder at a Saudi consulate in Turkey last year of Saudi journalist and Washington Post columnist Jamal Khashoggi, a U.S. resident. “This is a strong message, I think, that our values must guide our foreign policy,” said Representative Eliot Engel, the Democratic chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, urging support for the resolutions before the vote. Trump wants to retain close ties to Riyadh, which he considers an important partner in the Middle East and counterweight to the influence of Iran. Trump also views foreign military sales as a way to generate U.S. jobs. Officials from his administration had been unhappy with Democrats in Congress who blocked the planned sales, in some cases for more than a year, over civilian casualties in Yemen. Trump announced in May that he would sidestep congressional review of the military deals, worth more than $8 billion, by declaring that the threat from Iran constituted an emergency. Tensions with Iran have decreased since then, and administration officials have acknowledged that the military equipment has not been delivered. Several Republicans joined Democrats in condemning that decision and voting for the resolutions. However, they would have to attract far more support in both the Republican-led Senate and House to garner the two-thirds majorities needed to override Trump’s vetoes. But lawmakers from both parties are not dropping the matter. Several pieces of legislation making their way through Congress include Saudi-related provisions. And the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is due to vote on two Saudi-related bills on Tuesday. One, sponsored by seven Republican and Democratic senators, includes sanctions to support a peaceful resolution of the Yemen war, address the humanitarian crisis and hold perpetrators responsible for murdering Khashoggi. The other would mandate an in-depth review of U.S.-Saudi policy and bar travel to the United States by many members of the Saudi royal family.

# Space

## Neg

### General Link

#### Congress doesn’t support funding space projects

Eric Berger, 6-22-2021, "Congress isn’t happy about SpaceX’s lunar lander and may vent this week," Ars Technica, https://arstechnica.com/science/2021/06/nasa-administrator-to-defend-lunar-budget-before-a-skeptical-congress/

NASA Administrator Bill Nelson will appear at a committee meeting of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee on Wednesday, and the meeting could be full of intrigue when the subject of NASA's Artemis Program to land humans on the Moon and SpaceX comes up. We can probably expect some happy talk as Nelson—who as a US Senator in 2011 championed the development of the Space Launch System rocket alongside Kay Bailey Hutchison—references the recent stacking of the booster's core stage with its solid rocket motors at Kennedy Space Center. After a decade and more than $20 billion in costs, NASA's large SLS rocket is indeed finally getting closer to its first test launch. But the real intrigue will involve the Human Landing System needed as part of the Moon program to take astronauts down to the lunar surface and back up to orbit. In April, due in part to a lack of funding from Congress, [NASA selected SpaceX](https://arstechnica.com/science/2021/04/nasa-selects-spacex-as-its-sole-provider-for-a-lunar-lander/) and its Starship vehicle as a sole provider for this critical component of Artemis. The space agency awarded $2.89 billion to SpaceX for the lander. Nelson was formally named NASA administrator shortly after this award was made. He has supported the contract because he knows it is the only real chance that NASA has to make a 2024 landing. But he has repeatedly asked Congress for more funding so that NASA can support a second lander contract, either [via the Biden administration's jobs and infrastructure bill](https://spacepolicyonline.com/news/nelson-sees-jobs-bill-as-solution-to-hls-and-other-funding-needs/) or as a straightforward budget addition. That latter suggestion is the route recently taken by the Senate, which authorized the addition of $10 billion to NASA's budget as part of the Endless Frontier Act passed this month. The money would principally fund development of a second lander, likely the one being designed by a Blue Origin-led team, as well as some parochial NASA projects that can [justifiably be described as pork](https://arstechnica.com/science/2021/06/legislation-requires-nasa-to-build-sls-test-article-after-initial-flights/). What makes Wednesday's hearing before the House intriguing is that key US Representatives have signaled that they will not follow the Senate's lead. As part of its version of the Endless Frontier Act, the House Science Committee skipped authorizing funds for a second lunar lander. A US Representative from Seattle, near where Jeff Bezos' Amazon and Blue Origin companies are based, offered a stinging rebuke, [telling The Wall Street Journal](https://www.wsj.com/articles/funding-for-bezos-space-company-fails-to-launch-in-house-11624008601?mod=searchresults_pos1&page=1), "If Jeff Bezos wants to explore space, that’s great, but I don’t think he needs federal dollars." So it seems clear that the House will not just throw more money at NASA for a second lunar lander. At the same time, the House is fairly hostile toward SpaceX and commercial space. The chair of the House Science Committee, Dallas Democrat Eddie Bernice Johnson, [said](https://science.house.gov/news/press-releases/chairwoman-johnson-statement-on-nasas-artemis-human-landing-system-award) she was "disappointed" after NASA selected SpaceX as its sole provider of a lunar lander in April.

#### Congress has always been divided over the highly controverseial topic of space

Jeff Foust, 7-9-2020, "House Republicans criticize NASA spending bill," SpaceNews, https://spacenews.com/house-republicans-criticize-nasa-spending-bill/

WASHINGTON — As the head of NASA emphasized what he saw as bipartisan support for the agency in Congress, several Republican members of the House criticized colleagues for a fiscal year 2021 spending bill they believe inadequately funds the agency. The commerce, justice and science (CJS) subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee favorably reported a fiscal year 2021 spending bill July 8 that includes $22.6 billion for NASA. The bill, introduced a day earlier, passed on a voice vote without any amendments. The bill rejected a proposed 12% increase in NASA’s budget, funding the agency at the same level as 2020. That request had included $3.3 billion for the Human Landing System (HLS) program to develop landers to transport astronauts to the lunar surface, but the bill provides less than $630 million for HLS. Rep. José Serrano, chairman of the CJS subcommittee, made only passing references to NASA in his opening statement about the bill. “We reject the president’s proposed cuts to climate change research programs at NASA and NOAA and instead invest in those areas,” he said. The bill increases NASA Earth science funding by more than $250 million from the request. The bill “provides robust funding for NASA, helping ensure continued American leadership in space,” said Rep. Matt Cartwright (D-Pa.), vice-chair of the subcommittee. Republican members disagreed. “The flat NASA allocation reveals a determination to rebuke America’s moon-to-Mars Artemis initiative,” said Rep. Robert Aderholt (R-Ala.), ranking member of the CJS subcommittee. “President Trump rightly wants more funding to reenergize America’s leadership in space, so much so he’s willing to pay for it within an overall austere budget request, and we should follow that lead.” Rep. Kay Granger (R-Texas), ranking member of the full appropriations committee, contrasted the flat NASA budget with the National Science Foundation, which received a $270 million increase from 2020. “There’s not a penny more for NASA,” she said, citing in particular the HLS funding. “The inadequate amount included for our landers undermines prior years’ investments in deep space exploration.” “Flat funding for NASA reveals a deliberate effort to undercut our path to renewed American space dominance,” she continued. “I think this is very shortsighted, to say the least.” That partisan criticism was not limited to appropriators. “The president’s been clear, the vice president’s been clear, we want to get boots on the moon, we want to get the first woman and the next American man back to the moon by 2024,” said Rep. Michael Waltz (R-Fla.), a member of the House Science Committee, during a session of the Future Space 2020 conference held online July 8. “There are those that don’t want to see this administration have that victory,” he claimed. “To me, that’s not a win for any administration, that’s a win for the country and a win for global freedom.” That criticism stands in contrast to comments by NASA Administrator Jim Bridenstine, who has argued that there is bipartisan support for the agency in Congress. “One of the things that I’ve done from day one is build bipartisan consensus for what we’re trying to achieve,” he said in an earlier session of the Future Space 2020 conference. “We have to make sure that NASA, as an agency, maintains bipartisan support and, I would like to say, even apolitical support.” Speaking later in the day at the NASA Exploration Science Forum meeting online, Bridenstine called the House bill the “opening salvo” in the debate about NASA’s 2021 funding. “That’s not everything that we asked for, but what it shows is there’s bipartisan support for this activity,” he said of the HLS funding in particular. “We can work with the Senate to get more resources as is necessary to achieve the 2024 landing.” Bridenstine criticized perceptions, which he recalled from his time in the House, that Republicans supported lunar exploration and human spaceflight, while Democrats backed Mars missions and science. “These are false narratives that we have to work every day to unwind, to make sure that we’re looking at our agency as a whole,” he said.