(Plan version 819 words)

We affirm.

Part 1 is preemptive theory.

Interpretation: The aff may read a plan and the neg may read a counter plan.

1. Real world. Policymakers can't implement general statements like the resolution, they can only implement specific bills that reflect general goals. That's the strongest link to education because it actually prepares us to become policymakers and gives us advocacy skills.
2. Depth. Plans promote depth of research by allowing teams to be more specific. That's key to education because thorough knowledge has lasting educational value while surface level knowledge doesn't have value once you forget most of it after the topic ends.
3. Clash. Specification of a particular plan gives the other team specific ground to attack. Without plans neg just comes up with bad examples of the resolution and shitty overly generic disads and aff comes up with good examples and they never interact. Clash is key to education because it forces rigorous contestation and testing of arguments, which is key to advocacy skills when someone contests our arguments in the real world.

Education matters because it's the lasting benefit we get from debate and it's the reason schools fund debate.

It outweighs fairness -

a. Longevity - education lasts outside the round, fairness doesn't.
b. No one gives a shit who wins this round or if this round is fair because this isn't a tournament and the topic ended a year ago - if we had just read stock you wouldn't have learned anything new.

Winning theory isn't a reason to vote for us so they can't win an RVI - it's just a reason our model of debate is better and you should let us read a plan.

Part 2 is the plan.

Plan: Through normal means of funding, The United States Federal government should fund and deploy the conventional prompt global strike (PGS) system.

Part 3 is the advantage.

PGS would revolutionize US missile capabilities, as David Sanger at the New York Times furthers in 2010 that whereas current conventional missiles take upwards of 4 hours to reach

anywhere on Earth, PGS missiles have pinpoint accuracy, can make turns in midair, and are much faster than other missiles. Elizabeth Harrington at the Washington Free Beacon quantifies in 2013 that a PGS missile could travel 20 times the speed of sound and hit anywhere the world within a few minutes. George Lewis at Cornell University explains in 2015 that PGS is fast and maneuverable enough to penetrate missile defenses.

Funding is key - James Acton at the Carnegie Endowment finds in 2013 that it would only take an additional 900 million to $2.6 billion to make a US PGS system operational. Political science PhD Corentin Brustlein furthers in 2015 that while the Pentagon wants PGS as a way to expand deterrence, low funding has prevented project success, whereas a significant investment would overcome remaining technical barriers.

The sole impact is preventing nuclear war.

Hans Kristensen at the American Federation of Scientists writes in 2009 that the world's nuclear weapons reside in 111 publicly-known locations.

We isolate 2 distinct scenarios for nuclear conflict.

1. Russia. Nickolas Roth at the Harvard Belfer Center explains in 2016 that due to increased US military exercises in Europe and Russia's ineffective early warning systems, there's currently a high risk of a civilization-ending nuclear conflict between the US and Russia starting due to miscalculation, miscommunication, or a false alarm. However, Richard Weitz at the World Politics Review explains in 2008 that PGS could be used to launch a decapitation strike that destroys Russia's nuclear weapons and communications infrastructure such that they'd be unable to strike back. Eric Zuesse at Washington's Blog furthers in 2014 that PGS launched from overseas bases could destroy the entire Russian nuclear arsenal in one minute.
2. China. Government professor Graham Allison explains in 2015 that China's status as a rising challenger to the US makes large scale war between the two powers extremely likely, and empirically, 3 of 4 rising powers went to war with the dominant power. Lily Kuo at Reuters furthers in 2016 that because of competing land claims in the South China Sea, and the growth of hardliners in China, the chance of a conflict-via-miscalculation between the US and China is currently very high. However, political science professor Taylor Fravel finds in 2015 that while PGS could completely destroy China's capability to launch a retaliatory nuclear strike, in a conventional conflict between the US, China would misinterpret normal US attacks as attacks on China's nuclear arsenal and escalate a conflict to nuclear war.

More generally, James Acton explains in 2013 that both Russia and China would perceive PGS as usable and able to threaten the survivability of their arsenal, deterring them from escalating conflicts. Trunews furthers in April that overseas bases have missile systems directed at Russia and China that could be paired with PGS to destroy both countries' nuclear arsenals while also defending against every trajectory for a strike on the US.

(Normal)

We affirm.

Our sole contention is deploying the conventional prompt global strike system, or PGS.

PGS is a missile system that launches non-nuclear missiles at high speeds to reduce the amount of time it takes for the US to hit a target without using nuclear weapons. George Lewis at Cornell University explains in 2015 that although PGS is fast and maneuverable enough to penetrate missile defenses, it hasn't been implemented anywhere. PGS would revolutionize US missile capabilities, as David Sanger at the New York Times furthers in 2010 that whereas current conventional missiles take upwards of 4 hours to reach anywhere on Earth, PGS missiles have pinpoint accuracy, can make turns in midair, and are much faster than other missiles. Elizabeth Harrington at the Washington Free Beacon quantifies in 2013 that a PGS missile could travel 20 times the speed of sound and hit anywhere the world within a few minutes.

Increased US military spending has a high probability of deploying PGS for two reasons.

1. PGS can be used to shoot down missiles. James Acton at the Carnegie Endowment explains in 2013 that PGS missiles could destroy incoming nuclear ballistic missiles within a range of 300 feet and that PGS is uniquely good for missile defense due to its speed and accuracy. This would garner PGS widespread support, as Bruce Blair at Princeton explains in 2016 that many fear that Trump's tendency to lash out will start a nuclear conflict, which has fueled Congressional Republican support for a missile defense system.
2. PGS has high political support. Professor of defense Keith Payne explains in 2012 that currently, the enabling technology for PGS exists and it has broad political support in the US. Charles Tiefer at Forbes reports in 2016 that part of Trump's plan for increased military spending includes higher funding for missile defense. However, Andrew Taylor at the Washington Post explains in May that Trump was forced to sign a 2017 spending bill that delayed increasing military spending. Increasing spending would go to PGS, as Amy Woolf at the Congressional Research Service reports in 2017 that the proposed military spending increase for 2017 more than doubled spending on PGS compared to 2016. James Acton at the Carnegie Endowment finds in 2013 that it would only take an additional 900 million to $2.6 billion to make a US PGS system operational. Political science PhD Corentin Brustlein furthers in 2015 that while the Pentagon wants PGS as a

way to expand deterrence, low funding has prevented project success, whereas a significant investment would overcome remaining technical barriers.

The sole impact is preventing nuclear war.

Hans Kristensen at the American Federation of Scientists writes in 2009 that the world's nuclear weapons reside in 111 publicly-known locations.

We isolate 2 distinct scenarios for nuclear conflict.

3. Russia. Nickolas Roth at the Harvard Belfer Center explains in 2016 that due to increased US military exercises in Europe and Russia's ineffective early warning systems, there's currently a high risk of a civilization-ending nuclear conflict between the US and Russia starting due to miscalculation, miscommunication, or a false alarm. However, Richard Weitz at the World Politics Review explains in 2008 that PGS could be used to launch a decapitation strike that destroys Russia's nuclear weapons and communications infrastructure such that they'd be unable to strike back. Eric Zuesse at Washington's Blog furthers in 2014 that PGS launched from overseas bases could destroy the entire Russian nuclear arsenal in one minute.
4. China. Government professor Graham Allison explains in 2015 that China's status as a rising challenger to the US makes large scale war between the two powers extremely likely, and empirically, 3 of 4 rising powers went to war with the dominant power. Lily Kuo at Reuters furthers in 2016 that because of competing land claims in the South China Sea, and the growth of hardliners in China, the chance of a conflict-via-miscalculation between the US and China is currently very high. However, political science professor Taylor Fravel finds in 2015 that while PGS could completely destroy China's capability to launch a retaliatory nuclear strike, in a conventional conflict between the US, China would misinterpret normal US attacks as attacks on China's nuclear arsenal and escalate a conflict to nuclear war.

More generally, James Acton explains in 2013 that both Russia and China would perceive PGS as usable and able to threaten the survivability of their arsenal, deterring them from escalating conflicts. Trunews furthers in April that overseas bases have missile systems directed at Russia and China that could be paired with PGS to destroy both countries' nuclear arsenals while also defending against every trajectory for a strike on the US.

CASE OUTWEIGHS (Stock)

1. Magnitude. Even if nuclear war doesn't directly kill everyone, Carl Shulman finds in 2013 that any nuclear conflict would result in soot entering the atmosphere, causing nuclear winter that collapses agriculture and starves all humans. AND EXTINCTION COMES FIRST, Schell 2000: although the risk of extinction may be fractional, the stake is infinite, and a fraction of infinity is still infinity.
2. Solves all conflict — even if we don't win a nuclear scenario PGS still deters all conflict, it goes 20x the speed of sound and can kill anyone, anytime, anywhere, AND it stops ALL retaliatory strikes. That creates literally infinite deterrence, Elaine Bunn at the CSR explains in 2011 that PGS would be a *stronger* deterrent than nuclear weapons because adversaries would perceive the US as more willing to use PGS than nuclear weapons.
3. Turns the whole case:
    a. Turns welfare — PGS means we save a TON of money on useless military tech that can be redirected to welfare
    b. Turns Multilat — PGS means we can threaten other nations with leadership decapitation and force them to cooperate, AND the threat of PGS makes unilat 100% effective.
    c. Turns police mil — PGS means almost all military equipment is useless so in the long term the supply of spare equipment completely drys up.
    d. Turns interventions — PGS is all we need to end the conflict by EITHER killing one side's leadership OR using the threat of PGS to force them to the negotiating table, which also means ground troop interventions never happen.

EXTRA SCENARIOS

5. North Korea nuclear war now.
    a. Due to western sanctions and low resource access, Sungtae Park at the CFR explains in 2016 that the North Korean regime could collapse at any time, causing Kim Jong Un to miscalculate US's intentions and launch nuclear weapons in a pre-emptive strike.
    b. Bruce Blair explains North Korea will soon have the nuclear capabilities to directly threaten the US, risking Trump lashing out and starting a nuclear conflict. Anna Fifield at the Washington Post furthers in 2016 that North Korea has integrated preemptive nuclear strikes into its doctrine, so small clashes combined with existing tensions could cause miscalculation resulting in nuclear conflict.

IR professor Peter Hayes finds in 2009 that a North Korean nuclear war would immediately kill hundreds of millions and cause global starvation from nuclear winter.

PGS solves both of those scenarios — George Lewis from case explains that PGS can destroy the arsenal of rogue states like North Korea before launch, and Acton says PGS can shoot down anything they successfully launch.

FRONTLINES:

AT: Arms race:

1. IT'S TRY OR DIE — Gertz says China and Russia are ALREADY developing their own PGS so the only question is whether the US has its own PGS to A, provide usable missile defense against Russia and China, and B, decapitate their nuclear capabilities so escalation is impossible.
2. We can kill their nukes but they can't kill ours — Trunews says we'd use PGS from forward bases — we'd have unbreakable missile defense, but other countries can't use PGS to defend their arsenals because we could launch PGS *so close* that they would have literally zero time to respond.
3. No link — James Acton finds that there's no historical correlation between the US developing PGS and rivals developing high speed precision weapons.
4. Just PGS their PGS scientists.

AT: Miscalc→ nuclear war

1. IT DOESN'T MATTER — the second we launch PGS we literally eliminate the entire arsenal, communications infrastructure, and leadership of Russia and China and we could do the same to NoKo — there's no conflict for it to escalate to cuz we killed them.
2. EVEN IF WE MISS SOME OF THE NUKES, PGS still lets us shoot other nukes out of the sky.
3. No link — Acton explains that the cost of escalation if the US has PGS is too high for rivals to miscalculate, the deterrent of being able to kill LITERALLY ANYONE ANY TIME is just too strong.

AT: They'll develop BMD

1. Lewis says PGS gets through all defense — it's too fast to be stopped. Supercharged by the fact that we're launching from overseas bases that are super close.
2. Just PGS their missile defense

AT: They'll strike back

1. They can't — Acton says PGS is missile defense, it has a spread shot that hits anything within 300 feet, and Sanger says PGS can turn around so even if we miss the first time it's fast enough to keep trying
2. They won't want to strike back if they know we can PGS their leadership

AT: Not "significant" increase

1. Yes it is — Brustlein says it would take significantly higher spending to develop PGS — Prefer, none of their EV uses the word significant or is specific to PGS.

AT: Too expensive to develop

1. No — Acton says it would only take a few billion more dollars to be operational, plus extra spending from producing multiple missiles

AT: We don't know where nukes are/some will be left over

1. Kristansen says we know where everyone's nukes are.
2. Irrelevant — even if we miss some, retaliation is still impossible because Acton says we can just shoot down the nukes once our enemies launch them.

AT: Tech doesn't exist

1. Payne says the tech already exists — Acton says it's just a question of funding.
2. Brustlestein says it takes significant investment to make the tech successful

AT: China impact d

1. No — SCS border disputes and internal hardliners mean tensions with China are super high in the squo and risk of miscalc is significant — any conflict goes nuclear because China perceives it as an attack on their arsenal.
2. Your evidence doesn't assume long term change — almost every rising power goes to war with the hegemon because there's an incentive to strike first and take the competitor out to gain total control, so the risk of war in the long term is high
3. Yes escalation — Fravel says second strike doesn't check because China would act more aggressively and try to level the playing field with the US by lowering the threshold for nuclear use AND it thinks every attack is an attempt to take out its SECOND STRIKE so it's still use or lose.
4. Even if their impact d is mostly true, there's still always a nonzero risk that nuclear weapons could be used absent PGS whereas with PGS we can truly turn the risk to zero so if we win Schell we still win

AT: Russia impact d

1. No — high tensions from US troops in Europe make miscalc likely AND Russia's nuclear early warning satellites are fucked and could send a false alarm at ANY TIME which immediately escalates to nuclear war.
2. Tensions aren't low now — Trump might seem friendly with Putin but he also launched an airstrike at Assad.
3. Yes escalation, deterrence doesn't check — if Russia's satellites tell them the US is launching nukes at them, they HAVE to launch nukes back and once there are *actual* nukes in the air, the US has to respond in kind.
4. Even if their impact d is mostly true, there's still always a nonzero risk that nuclear weapons could be used absent PGS whereas with PGS we can truly turn the risk to zero so if we win Schell we still win