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#### CR will pass, BUT it’s tight---failure ensures shutdown.

Mia McCarthy 9/19, Reporter for POLITICO, “Capitol agenda: CRs hit the floor,” POLITICO, 9/19/25, https://www.politico.com/live-updates/2025/09/19/congress/shutdown-deadline-continuing-resolution-funding-emmer-00572645

IN THE HOUSE — The House will vote this morning on the GOP-led continuing resolution funding the government through Nov. 21. Expect nearly every Democrat to vote against it, though Reps. Jared Golden (D-Maine) and Marie Gluesenkamp Perez (D-Wash.) have stayed quiet about their plans. (Golden was the sole House Democrat to break from his party in the March shutdown fight.)

In an extended interview with POLITICO on Thursday, Whip Tom Emmer said he’s confident Republicans can muscle their CR through the House — though he declined to say whether leaders will need to call in President Donald Trump for backup.

“I talk to the White House, I keep them advised as to where we are,” the Minnesota Republican said, when asked if they’re prepared to get Trump on the phone Friday if needed. “We’re going to pass this.”

While the hard-liners appear on board, a few rank-and-file Republicans could cause headaches for GOP leaders. Rep. Warren Davidson (R-Ohio) told POLITICO he’s “disappointed” there is no plan past the CR but declined to say how he’ll vote Friday. Rep. Thomas Massie (R-Ky.) is a likely “no.” Republicans can lose only two of their members with full attendance for party-line passage.

If the funding patch passes, House GOP leaders are considering not coming back into session until after Oct. 1 — jamming Senate Democrats and daring them to vote against the CR right before the deadline.

IN THE SENATE — The Senate will vote Friday on competing CRs, one led by Republicans and one led by Democrats. Both are expected to fail, raising the chances of a shutdown in less than two weeks.

Majority Leader John Thune said Thursday it’s “unlikely” the Senate will come back next week. That means the next vote on the GOP’s stopgap bill would be the evening of Monday, Sept. 29 — less than 48 hours before a potential shutdown.

“I do not believe that Chuck Schumer and the Democrats are actually going to shut the government down,” Emmer told POLITICO. “That would be one of the most foolish things you can do.”

#### Congressional Republicans oppose the plan---they want to rewrite the civil service

Eleanor Holmes Norton 2025, Congresswoman D-DC, “Norton Highlights Federal Employees in Remarks During Oversight Committee Reconciliation Markup”, April 30, https://norton.house.gov/media/press-releases/norton-highlights-federal-employees-remarks-during-oversight-committee, accessed 8-21-25, HMc

The Trump administration and Congress have launched unprecedented attacks on federal employees, federal contract workers, federal agencies, federal programs, the rule of law and the Constitution, among other things. Most recently, the administration stripped federal employees of their collective bargaining rights.

The administration and Republicans in Congress are trying to dismantle much of the federal government, gut the federal workforce and fill federal jobs with political loyalists, in violation of the Constitution, statutes and regulations. Federal employees, who provide invaluable services to the American people, deserve praise—not derision, cruelty, fear, chaos and illegal firings. These actions would – and have – deprived the federal government of expertise and experience. This harms the services the federal government provides to all Americans.

#### Shutdown destroys aviation safety.

Oriana Pawlyk 25, POLITICO's aviation reporter, covering everything from drones to airlines to the uncharted territory of commercial space, “Government shutdown a 'hit' air traffic controllers can’t take, union president warns”, https://subscriber.politicopro.com/article/2025/03/government-shutdown-a-hit-air-traffic-controllers-cant-take-union-president-warns-00210516, \*language edited

The head of the union for air traffic controllers warned lawmakers Tuesday that a government shutdown would be a [damaging] ~~crippling~~ blow to the controller workforce, which is already strained by persistent staffing shortages and amid the aftermath of a midair disaster in January that killed 67 people.

“The air traffic controllers cannot take another hit right now,” said Nick Daniels, president of the National Air Traffic Controllers Association.

Daniels said not only do controllers have to work without pay during a shutdown, the FAA Academy that trains new crops of controllers would close its doors, disrupting classes. Daniels said even a one-day shutdown "puts us months behind."

“That's what a government shutdown is — not only is it impacting modernization, but it will shut down the Oklahoma City Academy that we are relying on, to bring in these new air traffic controllers so we can train them,” Daniels said.

Without a deal, the government is set to shut down on March 14.

And many controllers may simply quit if the government shuts down again, because they don't want to deal with the disruptions anymore, Daniels said.

"Many of them don't come back, because they certainly do not want to work in that type of career field, or go with $0 paychecks — or not even a paycheck,” Daniels said.

The controller workforce is short of roughly 3,600 certified controllers, and it’s impossible to just fast-track that number, especially during a shutdown, he said. The shutdown that began in December 2018 and lasted for just over a month impacted 25 percent of the trainees coming through the system.

Daniels added it takes between two to three years from the time a controller is hired to get into their official role from when they pass initial qualifications.

Last week, DOT Secretary Sean Duffy announced a new plan that would seek to shorten the hiring process, though how that's being streamlined is murky. Lawmakers have also proposed the idea of raising the threshold of the maximum amount of people allowed to be trained at the academy, and the potential of opening a second academy.

Findings from an independent panel of experts released in 2023 said that the shutdown politics injects risk into the system, and found that a spike of near collisions at airports that year were directly linked to congressional dysfunction.

#### Another crash wrecks the aerospace industry broadly.

GTF 25, Global Tourism Forum, an international collaboration platform focused on addressing the challenges for the travel industry that combines the joint efforts of government agencies, industry stakeholders and academia, “Why Airline Crashes Shake Global Economies: Stock, Insurance, and Infrastructure Losses Explained Introduction”, https://live.worldtourismforum.net/opinion/why-airline-crashes-shake-global-economies-stock-insurance-and-infrastructure-losses-explained-introduction

Aviation is one of the world’s most economically sensitive sectors. When a plane crash occurs, the effects are immediate and far-reaching—impacting not only the airline involved but also airports, insurers, stock markets, and even a nation’s economic output. The ripple effects can disrupt supply chains, freeze tourism flows, spike insurance premiums, and dent investor confidence.

This article examines how commercial airline crashes shake global economies—through market reactions, insurance liabilities, and infrastructure losses. Drawing from real-world incidents, it explains why aviation disasters cost billions, not just in lives but also in lost productivity, trade, and trust.

1.⁠ ⁠Stock Market Shockwaves: A Fall in Investor Confidence

Plane crashes often trigger sudden and sharp declines in the stock value of the affected airline and, in some cases, the broader aviation sector.

Examples:  
• Boeing 737 MAX (2018–2019):  
Following two fatal crashes, Boeing’s stock plunged by nearly 25%, wiping out over $60 billion in market capitalization. The MAX program was halted, and hundreds of aircraft were grounded globally, resulting in canceled orders and legal backlash.  
• Lufthansa & Germanwings (2015):  
After a Germanwings co-pilot deliberately crashed Flight 9525, Lufthansa’s stock dropped by approximately 3–4% intraday. Although it recovered quickly, the brand’s credibility took a temporary hit.  
• Malaysia Airlines (2014):  
After MH370 and MH17, Malaysia Airlines’ share price fell 13%, and the airline suffered its largest quarterly losses ever.

Why This Matters:

Investors flee airline stocks after a crash due to fears of operational grounding, compensation payouts, and reputational damage. If the crash involves a manufacturing defect, aircraft makers like Boeing or Airbus may see even greater losses.

2.⁠ ⁠Insurance Payouts and Long-Term Premium Hikes

A commercial airline crash initiates enormous liability for the airline, aircraft manufacturer, and even the country of origin.

Typical Costs Include:  
• Passenger compensation (under the Montreal Convention): ~$175,000 per victim minimum  
• Hull loss (value of the aircraft): often $100–200 million  
• Third-party damages and environmental remediation  
• Legal settlements and fines

Case Study: Boeing’s 737 MAX Liability  
• Boeing paid over $2.5 billion in fines and compensation.  
• Airlines were compensated for lost revenue due to grounded aircraft.  
• Insurance firms faced claims in the billions, triggering reevaluations of risk and policy premiums.

Aftermath:

These payouts contribute to higher aviation insurance premiums globally, especially for carriers in developing countries or those with safety concerns.

#### Aerospace dominance avoids the only scenario for nuclear war.

Dr. Robert Zubrin 19, Masters in Aeronautics and Astronautics and Ph.D. in Nuclear Engineering from the University of Washington, President of Pioneer Energy, Founder and President of the Mars Society, Senior Fellow with the Center for Security Policy, The Case for Space: How the Revolution in Spaceflight Opens Up a Future of Limitless Possibility, p. Google Books

Eastern and Central Europe is now so weakly defended as to virtually invite invasion. The United States is not about to go to nuclear war to defend any foreign country. So deterrence is dead, and, with the German army cut from 12 divisions to three, the British gone from the continent, and American forces down to a 30,000-troop tankless remnant, the only serious and committed ground force that stands between Russia and the Rhine is the Polish army. It’s not enough. Meanwhile, in Asia, the powerful growth of the Chinese economy promises that nation eventual overwhelming numerical force superiority in the region.

How can we restore the balance, creating a sufficiently powerful conventional force to deter aggression? It won’t be by matching potential adversaries tank for tank, division for division, replacement for replacement. Rather, the United States must seek to totally outgun them by obtaining a radical technological advantage. This can be done by achieving space supremacy.

To grasp the importance of space power, some historical perspective is required. Wars are fought for control of territory. Yet for thousands of years, victory on land has frequently been determined by dominance at sea. In the 20th century, victory on both land and sea almost invariably went to the power that controlled the air. In the 21st century, victory on land, sea or in the air will go to the power that controls space.

The critical military importance of space has been obscured by the fact that in the period since the United States has had space assets, all of our wars have been fought against minor powers that we could have defeated without them. Desert Storm has been called the first space war, because the allied forces made extensive use of GPS navigation satellites. However, if they had no such technology at their disposal, the end result would have been just the same. This has given some the impression that space forces are just a frill to real military power — a useful and convenient frill perhaps, but a frill nevertheless.

But consider how history might have changed had the Axis of World War II possessed reconnaissance satellites — merely one of many of today’s space-based assets — without the Allies having a matching capability. In that case, the Battle of the Atlantic would have gone to the U-boats, as they would have had infallible intelligence on the location of every convoy. Cut off from oil and other supplies, Britain would have fallen. On the Eastern front, every Soviet tank concentration would have been spotted in advance and wiped out by German air power, as would any surviving British ships or tanks in the Mediterranean and North Africa. In the Pacific, the battle of Midway would have gone very much the other way, as the Japanese would not have wasted their first deadly airstrike on the unsinkable island, but sunk the American carriers instead. With these gone, the remaining cruisers and destroyers in Adm. Frank Jack Fletcher’s fleet would have lacked air cover, and every one of them would have been hunted down and sunk by unopposed and omniscient Japanese air power. With the same certain fate awaiting any American ships that dared venture forth from the West Coast, Hawaii, Australia and New Zealand would then have fallen, and eventually China and India as well. With a monopoly of just one element of space power, the Axis would have won the war.

But modern space power involves far more than just reconnaissance satellites. The use of space-based GPS can endow munitions with 100 times greater accuracy, while space-based communications provide an unmatched capability of command and control of forces. Knock out the enemy’s reconnaissance satellites and he is effectively blind. Knock out his comsats and he is deaf. Knock out his navsats and he loses his aim. In any serious future conventional conflict, even between opponents as mismatched as Japan was against the United States — or Poland (with 1,000 tanks) is currently against Russia (with 12,000) — it is space power that will prove decisive.

Not only Europe, but the defense of the entire free world hangs upon this matter. For the past 70 years, U.S. Navy carrier task forces have controlled the world’s oceans, first making and then keeping the Pax Americana, which has done so much to secure and advance the human condition over the postwar period. But should there ever be another major conflict, an adversary possessing the ability to locate and target those carriers from space would be able to wipe them out with the push of a button. For this reason, it is imperative that the United States possess space capabilities that are so robust as to not only assure our own ability to operate in and through space, but also be able to comprehensively deny it to others.

*Space superiority* means having better space assets than an opponent. Space supremacy means being able to assert a complete monopoly of such capabilities. The latter is what we must have. If the United States can gain space supremacy, then the capability of any American ally can be multiplied by orders of magnitude, and with the support of the similarly multiplied striking power of our own land- and sea-based air and missile forces be made so formidable as to render any conventional attack unthinkable. On the other hand, should we fail to do so, we will remain so vulnerable as to increasingly invite aggression by ever-more-emboldened revanchist powers.

### Impact---Timeframe---1NR

#### Each scenario detonates into nuclear World War III.

Dr. Robert Farley 15, Senior Lecturer at the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce at the University of Kentucky, “How World War III Starts: 5 'Sparks' That Could Set the World Ablaze”, The National Interest, 11/21/2015, https://nationalinterest.org/feature/how-world-war-iii-starts-5-sparks-could-set-the-world-ablaze-14406

Every global war needs a spark. A conflict somewhere ignites the interest of more than one great power. World War I had the assassination of Franz Ferdinand; the Seven Years War had desultory fighting between the French and British along the Mississippi River. The combatants do not always appreciate that the sparks can lead to conflagrations.

But at some point things escalate. Other major nations become involved, and the initial cause of war becomes subsumed under great power competition. The goal of fighting becomes the establishment of a new global order, and with the increase in stakes comes an increase in the resources committed by the combatants, and the sacrifices that their people make.

“World War III” would, in effect, be the fifth World War in the history of the modern state system. What might spark such a war, and how would it escalate into a global conflict? Here are five potential scenarios, none likely, but all possible:

Syria

The Spark:

At the moment, ISIS has drawn the attention of most of the world’s most powerful countries, including France, the United States, and Russia. But the explosion of attention (not to mention air traffic) could complicate the next step in the war. On the one hand, an accidental confrontation between NATO and Russia aircraft could lead to bad tactical decisions, with one or more planes shot out of the air. On the other, a dramatic shift on the ground in Syria could force the hand of one of the supporters of the proxy combatants.

Escalation:

Even if the emerging anti-ISIS coalition prevails, conflict between major power could ensue. This could get ugly, as France, Russia, and the United States have very different views about how the future of Syria should look. If any of the three decide to intervene in favor of their preferred factions, the situation could very quickly come to resemble a game of chicken, with airstrikes, no fly zones, and secure enclaves providing the points of conflict. Serious fighting between external powers in Syria could quickly draw in Turkey, Iran, and Saudi Arabia, and potentially spread to other parts of the globe.

India and Pakistan

Spark:

India and Pakistan could go to war again for any number of reasons. If a Pakistani-sponsored terrorist group makes another attack similar to that in Mumbai, India’s patience could wear very thin. Either state could engage in some adventurism in Afghanistan, perhaps in response to the activity of non-state actors.

Debate over the conventional balance along the border between India and Pakistan has raged for years. But if Pakistan suffered a serious conventional defeat, the use of tactical nuclear weapons might seem like the only way out. If that happens, all bets are off.

Escalation:

The United States has grown closer to India over the past few years, even as it continues to send weapons and cash to Pakistan. Conversely, China has intensified the relationship with one of its only client states. The 1971 Indo-Pakistani War nearly drew in both the United States and China; in that conflict, both would have intervened on the Pakistani side. It is unclear, at this point, how the United States would respond if China felt that it needed to intercede on Pakistan’s behalf in a war with India.

East China Sea

Spark:

Over the past two years China and Japan have played a dangerous game around the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands. Both countries claim the islands, and each has deployed military forces in their vicinity. A naval or air incident could create an upsurge of nationalist hostility in both countries, making it difficult for either Tokyo or Beijing to back down. Moreover, both countries have struggled to control the activities of nationalist groups, leading to additional potential flashpoints.

Escalation:

The United States is bound by treaty to defend Japan. If a conflict between China and Japan erupts, the United States may find it difficult to avoid entanglement. In context of any kind of sustained combat between Japanese and Chinese forces (not to mention an aggressive Chinese effort to land on the islands), the United States would almost certainly become involved. Given the likelihood that such intervention would prove decisive, China might feel compelled to pre-empt U.S. intervention by an attack on American military installations across the region. This would trigger a broader U.S. response, and throw the entire Asia-Pacific into chaos.

South China Sea

Spark:

The United States has already had a number of uncomfortable confrontations with Chinese naval and air units in the South China Sea. If an operator lost his or her cool, dreadful consequences could ensue. Similarly, as the United States steps up its involvement with Vietnam and the Philippines, it could become entangled in Chinese military operations against either country.

Escalation:

A U.S.-China war would be bad enough, but depending on the context and course of the conflict, both Japan and India might feel the need to intervene in some fashion. Russia would likely stay out, except insofar as it used its defense-industry to keep the Chinese military operating. War would result in a clash between the U.S. Air Force and U.S. Navy on one side, and the PLA’s anti-access, area denial systems on the other. Nuclear escalation could happen either accidentally (one side misinterprets a missile launch or targeting decision), or on purpose (China feels the need to staunch the bleeding if its Great Wall at Sea crumbles).

Ukraine

Spark:

Russia continues to view the political allegiance of the Kiev government as a critical national security interest. If it cannot command that allegiance, then Moscow can take steps to destabilize and weaken the country. Thus far, the United States and NATO have limited their exposure, supporting the right of the Kiev government to resist Russia, but not providing it much in the way of means to do so. The situation is rife with opportunities for miscalculation, and a mistake on either side could produce a militarized confrontation.

Escalation:

Much depends on how NATO countries decide to respond to Russian moves in Ukraine. If Russia became sufficiently certain of NATO intervention, then it could take steps to pre-empt NATO mobilization. Any attack, or serious threat of attack, against a NATO country could then trigger a NATO response, which could involve attacks into Russian territory. The Kaliningrad enclave could provide a key flashpoint for escalation, as military forces within the enclave are simultaneously threatening and vulnerable. And if Russia believes that it cannot prevail with conventional force (a possibility), Moscow could consider the use of tactical nuclear weapons.

#### It's the most likely scenario---space dominance is key.

The Economist 24, “War in Space is No Longer Science Fiction”, 1-31-24, <https://www.economist.com/international/2024/01/31/america-china-and-russia-are-locked-in-a-new-struggle-over-space>, DOA: 1-15-25, JA

The first shot of the next war between the world’s big powers, it is often said, will be fired in space. As conflict spreads on Earth, ill omens are emerging in the firmament. As countries race to develop new capabilities in space, some are also building the forces and weapons to fight beyond the atmosphere. On January 28th Iran said it had launched three satellites; Western countries fear they could be used in its ballistic-missile programme. Russia’s invasion of Ukraine has opened a new chapter in space war. But America’s biggest dread is China, which seeks to match if not surpass America’s primacy in the heavens. Admiral Christopher Grady, vice-chairman of America’s joint chiefs of staff, explains it bluntly: “Space has emerged as our most essential warfighting domain.”

American generals scrutinise the cosmos from Space Command’s headquarters in Colorado Springs. “Guardians”, as America’s new breed of space warriors call themselves, monitor about 15 daily missile launches, from Ukraine to Iraq and North Korea, at the Joint Operations Centre (joc). They also watch the fast-growing deployment of satellites, heaps of orbiting junk and the re-entry of objects into the atmosphere. Above all, they look for danger.

Among the most closely observed objects are two recently launched robotic space planes, smaller versions of the space shuttle. America’s x37-b lifted off from Cape Canaveral on December 28th (pictured). China’s Shenlong, or Divine Dragon, was lofted a fortnight earlier. Both missions are largely secret. Space planes’ ability to undertake long missions, deliver and capture payloads, change orbit and return to Earth to refuel make them potentially important weapons. Russia launched Cosmos 2570 in October, the latest “nesting doll” in orbit: it released a second satellite, which then let out a third. To American commanders, such things look like a test of a “kill vehicle”, in other words a projectile for destroying satellites.

A foretaste of space hostilities came on the evening of November 14th 2021, Colorado Springs time, when two electronic bells warned the joc of a missile fired from Russia’s Plesetsk cosmodrome. Early-warning satellites detected the fireball, ground radars tracked the missile and computers soon projected its unusual trajectory: neither a ballistic-missile nor a satellite launch, but a Nudol anti-satellite weapon aimed at a defunct Soviet spy satellite.

Some in the joc thought Russia would aim close to the target. Others reckoned, correctly, it would blast the bird. This may well have been a Russian warning to America: stay out of the impending war in Ukraine or risk conflict that will stretch into space. Never mind the 1,800 bits of debris that forced astronauts in the International Space Station (including two Russians) to shelter in their escape craft.

Put your helmet on

Russia’s second shot was unambiguous: shortly before its tanks assaulted Ukraine on February 24th 2022 malware spread through part of the ka-sat network owned by Viasat, an American firm, and operated by a partner. It disabled the satellite-internet modems of some 50,000 European users, among them many Ukrainian military units. Within weeks, however, Ukrainian forces were back online thanks to the vast constellation of smaller Starlink broadband satellites launched by SpaceX, another private company. Russian attempts at hacking and jamming satellite signals persist, and the country has warned that commercial systems “can become a legitimate target for retaliation”.

All this shows that space is not just a place for peaceful exploration, but an arena for future combat. Control of space has become as important as dominance on land, sea and air. Space technology makes military forces in all other domains more powerful. Lose primacy in space and you risk losing wars on Earth. In any future conflict between America and China, for instance, satellites would be essential to finding and destroying targets across the vast distances of the Pacific Ocean (see China section). Much about warfare in space remains hidden, and most of what is known comes from America. What is clear, though, is that America is intensifying its effort to preserve its edge in space.

General John Shaw, a former deputy head of Space Command, argues that the world has entered “the third space age”. The first, in the cold war, was dominated by superpowers with large national-security satellites. Intelligence-gathering, early-warning and communications spacecraft were bound with nuclear deterrence. In the second stage, private firms became more prominent as they delivered communications, television and other services from space. Satellites such as the Global Positioning System (gps) revolutionised conventional warfare, starting with the war in Iraq in 1991. Later on, especially in Iraq and Afghanistan, they made possible precision bombing and long-distance drone operations. Space itself, though, was regarded as a sanctuary.

Not so in the third age. Space services are woven ever more tightly into civilian life—gps enables everything from financial transactions to mapping apps. Commercial firms such as SpaceX have reduced the cost of launches and satellites. Above all, the era features threats and potential conflict in space, says General Shaw.

Countries are beefing up military space branches. America’s Space Force, the youngest military service, seemed to be a whim of the then president, Donald Trump, when it was launched in 2019. In fact the germ of the idea had been around since at least 2001, when a bipartisan commission warned of a potential “space Pearl Harbour”. Carved out of the air force, and administratively tied to it, Space Force is by far the smallest American military service, but is growing fast. It counts just 8,600 active personnel, compared with 322,000 for the air force, but is likely to expand by 9% this year. Its budget of $26bn last year, compared with $180bn for the air force, is set to grow by 15%. Some worry about unnecessary duplication. Others question how far it has succeeded in overcoming a legacy of slow and costly procurement.

Like the air force, navy and other branches, Space Force is placing specialist units within America’s combatant commands, the headquarters responsible for military operations in the Indo-Pacific, Europe and other regions. Abutting them all is Space Command, also newish, which oversees the “astrographic” domain from 100km above sea level to, in theory, infinity. Among other things, it defends against long-distance missiles and manages satellite services for other commands.

But forget Star Wars, hyperspace-faring spaceships and zapping ray guns. War in space is part of earthly strife. It is also in its infancy. Like hot-air balloons and dirigibles in early aviation, satellites are invaluable platforms for observation but are usually easy to spot, hard to manoeuvre and largely defenceless.

In space offence has the advantage over defence, argues Space Force’s chief, General Chance Saltzman; the side that delivers the first blow can quickly gain the upper hand. “There’s nothing to hide behind in space,” he explains. Satellites move in predictable orbits, and lines of communication with them are exposed.

America, China and India have all tested Earth-based anti-satellite (asat) missiles like Russia’s Nudol (see chart). Other threats include ground-based “directed energy” weapons: lasers, high-power microwaves and radio-frequency jammers. All this can be done in orbit, too, which is why “rendez-vous and proximity operation” satellites, which get close to other ones, cause particular jitters. A nuclear blast in space is another worry. America says its satellites are regularly dazzled, jammed and probed remotely.

America’s intelligence agencies say China has fielded ground-based lasers and asat missiles “intended to disrupt, damage and destroy target satellites.” Orbital weapons are under development, too. Chinese documents speak of using “surprise, swift, limited-scale, overawing strikes” in space—not as part of war, but to deter one or to force early capitulation. China has the second-largest number of satellites and the country has stepped up the pace of its launches in recent years.

The Outer Space Treaty of 1967 bans territorial claims on celestial bodies and the stationing of nuclear weapons in space, but it is silent on conventional weapons. It has not prevented echoes of the cold war and earlier imperial land-grabs as America and China seek to establish lunar bases. Some have compared celestial bodies to contested islands in the Pacific.

Space “is increasingly congested, contested and competitive”, says recent military space doctrine from America’s joint chiefs of staff; America should preserve “space superiority”, not least through “offensive and defensive space operations”. Only a few guardians have direct experience of their domain. Some compare themselves to submariners, who must rely on sensors in order to fight shadowy, lurking foes. There is much about space that seems counterintuitive.

On Earth objects need propulsion to keep moving. In space they keep moving because friction is negligible, their orbits determined by gravity. A destroyed plane falls to the ground; a sunken ship goes to the bottom of the sea. The remains of a satellite struck by a missile stay in orbit for years or decades, endangering everything in their path. With enough junk, a collision could start a chain reaction of impacts, known as the “Kessler syndrome”, rendering some orbits all but unusable.

Instead of rivers and communications nodes, ”key terrain” in space consists of orbital regions (see diagram on the next page). Low-Earth orbit (leo), up to a height of 2,000km, is where most functioning satellites operate. They pass overhead only briefly, so large constellations are needed to ensure continuous coverage. Starlink has more than 5,000 in leo, with plans to grow to perhaps 12,000. Meanwhile China is creating rival mega-constellations.

Geostationary orbit (geo), about 36,000km away, is a vital but increasingly crowded band. Satellites circle the equator once a day, so appear fixed in the sky, which favours broadcasting, missile-warning and more. In-between, medium-earth orbit (meo) is used for gps. The poles are best served by highly elliptical orbits (heo), looping out to about 40,000km. Beyond, in “cis-lunar” space, lie Lagrange points where the gravitational interplay of the Earth and Moon allows satellites to keep stable positions with little fuel.

Even at orbital speeds—7.8km per second in leo—actions in space can still seem rather painfully slow. An asat missile takes about ten minutes to strike in leo, and hours to reach geo. Co-orbital weapons may take days to approach their targets. Friend and foe, private and military users, are intermingled.

Space Command’s mission is to ensure there is “never a day without space”. That requires it to do three things: detect threats, deter attacks and defeat enemies. Begin with detection. Just understanding what is happening beyond the atmosphere—space domain awareness—is demanding, slow and imperfect. Space Command tracks and publicises the movement of 45,000-odd objects ten centimetres in diameter and wider, of which only 9,400 are active satellites. Radars do not continuously watch all objects in leo; telescopes monitoring geo often cannot see in daylight or through clouds or when objects pass in the Earth’s shadow; and there are few telescopes in space. Such observation gaps afford foes a chance to act unseen.

The stars look very different today

Surveillance involves predicting the orbit of each object, and confirming it when it passes a sensor. If one goes missing, it must be found and “custody” restored. The more eyes the better. America’s main space-monitoring systems have long been concentrated in the northern hemisphere, a legacy of the cold war. But Space Command draws data from any radar it can, eg, those on warships. It is placing more sensors in Australia to cover the southern half of the globe, and is working with allies to share data. America, moreover, operates five satellites called gssap that wander in geo to monitor objects. Guardians have enlisted commercial space-monitoring firms, too. What they lack in high-end sensors they make up for in numbers, global distribution and automation.

One company, LeoLabs, with six radar sites to monitor leo, gave notice in December of Russia’s latest “nesting doll” test. Another, ExoAnalytic Solutions, which specialises in watching geo with hundreds of telescopes, recounted a striking Chinese satellite-removal manoeuvre in 2022. The sj-21 satellite, seemingly equipped with a grappling arm and a net, captured a satellite tumbling in geo and towed it to a graveyard orbit before returning. The manoeuvre was so abrupt that it was lost for some hours. “Like a magician’s sleight of hand,” in the words of one expert. Another trick is “zombie” objects: supposedly dead rocket motors and satellites that unexpectedly come back to life.

All this causes nervousness about what lurks in the vastness. A clean-up technique in peacetime could quickly turn into a crippling attack. “Deep space” beyond geo, where it is harder to spot things, is a particular worry. Ultimately, though, any object able to manoeuvre can be steered into the path of another one to destroy it.

All of which emphasises the importance of deterrence. A vital step is to lower the benefit of an attack through greater resilience. A long-standing priority has been to shift jobs done by a few “big, fat, juicy” satellites in geo to myriad smaller satellites in leo, akin to Starlink. The loss or jamming of any one makes little difference, and satellites can be replaced faster than asat missiles.

What if a set of orbits is rendered unusable? The answer is to have satellites in different orbits. America’s new sensors to detect and track missiles, including hypersonic ones, will rely on constellations in leo, meo and heo, supplementing older systems in geo.

It helps if lost capabilities can be replaced quickly. On this front America enjoys an advantage. SpaceX alone conducted more launches in the past year than all other operators—private and state-run—combined. But such dominance also raises worries about America’s dependence on a single provider, especially one run by an unpredictable ceo, Elon Musk.

Meanwhile, an exercise called Victus Nox in September showed that Space Force could mount and launch a new satellite within about a day, down from a typical 6-12 months. Guardians say they are trying to develop a “tactically responsive” mindset that involves making do and improvising with what is available, and fielding new systems rapidly by tapping into commercial technology. In times of need, they will also look to private firms and allies to provide back-up capabilities.

Space warriors are most cagey about the “defeat” aspect of their mission (a new Pentagon policy on declassifying space and other systems is itself classified). Projectiles are the most visible means to destroy spacecraft. But this may be self-defeating if debris makes parts of space unusable. “It’s almost like saying, how do you win a nuclear war?” argues General Saltzman. “There’s really just no winner when you go into a destructive on-orbit conflict.”

The quest is to develop nimbler defences and surgical strikes. “Dynamic space operations”—the ability to manoeuvre—will require spacecraft to carry more fuel, or have the ability to be repaired and refuelled in orbit. “Directed-energy weapons are likely to be the primary weapon of choice in space in the future,” reckons General Shaw. Such weapons act at the speed of light. If based in space, they are unencumbered by land obstacles or the atmosphere. Satellites will need better protection, too. Some talk of “bodyguard” satellites to detect and counter foes. In time, General Shaw adds, satellites will feature artificial intelligence to act on their own.

Satellites are only one part of a space system, and may be the hardest part to attack, notes Craig Miller of Viasat. Going after ground stations or communications links may be more effective. Indeed, commanders speak of a triad of military tactics involving space weapons, special forces and, especially, cyberattacks.

Without the experience of real war, guardians must learn from exercises and simulations. The Pentagon’s wargames are classified. A recent one explored requirements for dynamic space operations. Henry Sokolski of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Centre, a think-tank in Washington, dc, notes several lessons for America from unclassified games he has run. One envisaged North Korea detonating a nuclear bomb in space, highlighting the need to harden commercial satellites against electromagnetic pulses. Another imagined Pakistani terrorists using commercial satellite imagery and communications to hit India with drones, showing that muddy regulations could play a part in drawing America and China inadvertently into a conflict in space. “The frontline of strategic deterrence is gravitating away from the surface of the Earth and into space,” Mr Sokolski says.

If war does break out between America and China, the world will have to worry about much more than the fate of satellites. Perhaps the biggest near-term danger is miscalculation. The contest in space is novel and ambiguous. Nobody is certain what space weapons exist, not least because many civilian technologies have military uses. Rules of the road are ill defined or non-existent, with little prospect for arms control. “Grey-zone” attack, short of war, might thus be tempting. Like cyberattacks, disabling satellites does not usually kill people directly. But were an American early-warning satellite over the Pacific to be attacked, warns Brian Weeden of the Secure World Foundation, an American group that compiles public information on space weapons, perilous escalation might follow. “Washington would freak out and might think it was part of a nuclear attack. The understanding we had with the Soviets in the cold war is that interference with warning satellites would be interpreted as a sign of an impending nuclear attack.”

### Impact---Turns Case---1NR

#### Turns Case---Shutdown allows Trump to decide agency enforcement---turning case.

Jonathan Bogage 9/23, Reporter for The Washington Post; Riley Beggin is a Reporter for The Washington Post, “A Shutdown would give Trump More Power over Federal Spending,” The Washington Post, 9/23/25, https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2025/09/23/government-shutdown-federal-spending/

The Trump administration would have broad authority to make decisions about spending if the government shuts down next week — and it would also have broad authority to make those decisions if the government stays open under a long-term funding extension.

Congress has operated under such an extension for months and is trying to pass another short-term extension, known as a continuing resolution, or CR, before federal funding laws expire. Without action, a shutdown would start just after midnight on Oct. 1.

Under an extension of funding, the administration has far greater leeway to decide how to spend federal money than it does under normal operations. If the government does shut down, Trump and the White House Office of Management and Budget would have the power to decide which agencies and offices stay open and which would go offline until the deadlock is resolved.

#### Turns case---Shutdown crushes the administrative state---federal employees either get furloughed or quit.

McGregor McCance 25, Executive Editor at the University of Virginia Darden School of Business, former Executive Director of Strategic Communications, Office of the EVP and Chief Operating Officer at Darden, “Hidden Costs: More Than Jobs Are Lost in a Government Shutdown”, https://news.darden.virginia.edu/2025/03/11/hidden-costs-more-than-jobs-are-lost-in-a-government-shutdown/

Another potential government shutdown looms as Congress struggles to fund operations. (A vote in the House is possible Tuesday.) Without a solution this week, thousands of federal workers face furloughs and citizens will suffer from diminished or lost services in the near future. For government employees, a shutdown would add insult to injury. Thousands already have lost their jobs due to cuts to agency payrolls from Elon Musk’s Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE), while all have faced uncertainty about their status, and aggressive demands to justify their contributions.

The potential damage to the federal workforce and the services it provides extends beyond lost wages due to furloughs or individual worries about continuing employment, according to University of Virginia Darden School of Business Assistant Professor Christoph Herpfer. The government suffers, too. Research by Herpfer and colleagues in 2023 found that employees affected by government shutdown experience a 31% increase in voluntary turnover after a furlough.

### Link---AT: Courts Shield---1NR

#### Obviously, if the plan is controversial, it’ll result in fights.

Dr. Paul M. Collins Jr 22, PhD in Political Science from Binghamton, Professor of Legal Studies and Political Science, UMass Amherst; Dr. Matthew Eshbaugh-Soha has a PhD in Political Science from Binghamton, Professor of Political Science at University of North Texas, “The Supreme Court, the President, and Congress,” Journal of Law and Courts, Fall 2022, UK Libraries, AG, accessed 5/20/25

A variety of factors shape Supreme Court decision-making, including the justices’ ideological preferences, legal precedent, and public opinion (e.g., Epstein and Knight 1998; Friedman 2009). Evidence suggests that the executive and legislative branches of government also influence the justices’ decisions (e.g., Epstein and Jacobi 2010). According to the separation-of-powers model, the justices anticipate actions of the executive and legislative branches, and they alter their decisions based on external preferences ( Johnson 2004) or to avoid retaliation (e.g., Epstein and Knight 1998). This work contributes to our understanding of this perspective on the separation of powers in three ways. First, it shows that, even if the justices issue decisions to avoid retaliation by the president and Congress, there are nonetheless many instances in which their decisions generate such retaliation. Second, it helps us comprehend what motivates the president and Congress to take both negative and positive action in response to the Court’s decisions. Third, it speaks to a specific way in which presidents go public to address the actions of Congress and the Supreme Court.

We argue that presidential and congressional responses to Supreme Court decisions are motivated by a similar set of interrelated goals: the pursuit of good public policy, reelection, and protecting the power and authority of their respective institutions. It is well known that these goals motivate the president’s interaction with Congress (Edwards 1989; Bond and Fleisher 1990; Light 1999) and the public (Canes-Wrone 2006), as well as congressional behavior (e.g., Mayhew 1974; Arnold 1990; Meernik and Ignagni 1997; Cox and McCubbins 2007). We believe they also help to explain why presidents call on Congress to implement or override Supreme Court decisions, as well as congressional reactions to those calls. Because the bulk of the president’s relationship with Congress since at least the 1970s centers on a public relationship that affords the president enormous opportunity to lead Congress even in the face of divided government and gridlock (Kernell 1997), we focus on the president’s public calls on Congress, not on private communications with Congress

### Link---AT: Courts Shield---Floortime---1NR

#### The plan knocks the CR off the docket.

Dr. Valerie Heitshusen 19, PhD, Analyst, Congress & Legislative Process, Congressional Research Service, "The Legislative Process on the Senate Floor: An Introduction," Library of Congress, 07/22/2019, https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/96-548.

The legislative process is laborious and time-consuming, and the time available for Senate floor action each year is limited. Every day devoted to one bill is a day denied for consideration of other legislation, and there are not enough days to act on all the bills that Senators and Senate committees wish to see enacted. Naturally, the time pressures become even greater with the approach of deadlines such as the date for adjournment and the end of the fiscal year. So, for all but the most important bills, even the threat of a filibuster can provide significant leverage to Senators. Before a bill reaches the floor or while it is being debated, its supporters often seek ways to accommodate the concerns of opponents, preferring an amended bill that can be passed without protracted debate to the time, effort, and risks involved in confronting a filibuster or the threat of one.

### Link---AT: Courts Shield---Craig Indict---1NR

#### It’s main citation is from 1893 AS well as a bunch of other old data-points, get out of here. Inserting.

McKinzie Craig & Joseph Daniel Ura 25. Assistant director at the Louisiana State University Paul M. Herbert Law Center, Ph.D. in political science and government from Texas A&M University. Professor of political science at Clemson University, Ph.D. in political science from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. "Policy, Position-Taking, and Congressional Voting under Judicial Review." *American Politics Research*, 0.0, 2.

Scholars have also identified a number of deeper, more subtle ways that institution of judicial review influences congressional behavior. Thayer (1893), for example, argues that judicial review insures against unpalatable policy outcomes, creating a moral hazard for members of Congress. He writes, “No doubt our doctrine of constitutional law has had a tendency to drive out questions justice and right, and to fill the mind of legislators with thoughts of mere legality…‘if we are wrong,’ they say, ‘the courts will correct it’” (1893, pp. 155- 156). Rogers (2001) similarly argues that legislators’ knowing courts will ultimately review their decisions induces them to enact riskier laws than they would have in the absence of subsequent judicial scrutiny. Fox and Stephenson (2011) likewise claim judicial review creates incentives for legislators to “posture by taking some bold, dramatic action in order to appear competent to voters” even if the legislature is “insufficiently confident that such dramatic action is warranted” (p. 398). Graber’s (1993) also describes how Congress effectively delegates some politically fraught policy choices to the judiciary so its members can avoid taking controversial or unpopular political positions (see also Whittington, 2005).1

This latter set of studies broadly shares Thayer’s (1893) perspective that judicial review acts as a kind of safety net or backstop for difficult political choices in legislatures. Congress makes law knowing the Supreme Court may rescue it and the country from decisions to enact risky, unreasonably bold, or otherwise imprudent policy choices.2 At least in some cases, the possibility courts may cushion the blow of bad policy may lead Congress to make different decisions than it would have in the absence of judicial review.

## Civil Service ADV

### Civil Service ADV---No Return---1NC

#### The damage has been done---nobody wants to go back

Mimi Montgomery 2025, Axios, “Agencies scramble to rehire federal workers after DOGE layoffs”, June 10, https://www.axios.com/local/washington-dc/2025/06/10/federal-workers-rehired-doge-layoffs, accessed 8-23-25, HMc

The intrigue: Some of the workers who've peaced out don't want to return, so the administration is trying to get around this by asking existing employees to work overtime, take on new roles, or volunteer to fill the empty spots.

What they're saying: The move is heightening wariness among federal employees already sapped from DOGE's whirlwind house cleaning.

"They wanted to show they were gutting the government, but there was no thought about what parts might be worth keeping," an FDA staffer told the Post. "Now it feels like it was all just a game to them."

### Civil Service ADV---No Return---2NC

#### Firings caused irreparable harm

William Roberts 2025, International Bar Association US Correspondent, “Trump 2.0 and the destruction of the state”, June 2, https://www.ibanet.org/Trump-2.0-and-the-destruction-of-the-state, accessed 8-23-25, HMc

The abrupt dismissal of nearly 20 per cent of the FDA’s workforce – which the administration says will reduce ‘bureaucratic sprawl’ – triggered paralysis at the agency. Key functions critical to the US food, pharmaceutical and medical industries all but shut down. ‘Lots of people were let go, almost haphazardly and cruelly in a way that made no sense,’ says Anne Walsh, Co-Chair of the IBA Healthcare and Life Sciences Law Committee.

Senior FDA leadership, anticipating the upheaval, began resigning en masse. ‘A lot of folks at high levels of leadership saw the writing on the wall and resigned. As it currently stands, there’s a loss of talent at the top,’ adds Walsh, who’s also a director at Hyman, Phelps & McNamara in Washington, DC.

As with many US agencies affected by the Trump administration’s layoffs, the FDA is today still suffering from staffing gaps and operational failures. Emails to FDA staff bounce back as undeliverable, while phone calls go unanswered. ‘The total silence at times is really hard to stomach, especially for publicly traded companies who require disclosure of information and timing. So, it’s really still a tough situation for the FDA,’ Walsh says.

Some former employees have now been brought back in a staffing ‘boomerang’. But it’ll probably be months or even years before key positions are filled and a sense of ‘normalcy’ returns to the FDA.

‘We are deeply concerned about the current state of the agency and its future,’ the non-profit group No Patient Left Behind says in a letter signed by more than 400 biotech executives who fear the loss of institutional knowledge at the FDA – a result of the reduction in the agency’s workforce and the wave of retirements – will jeopardise new financing deals.

The dismissals and chaos at the FDA reflect a pattern seen across other US agencies. President Trump is waging a campaign to dismantle the US administrative state by fundamentally altering the structure and function of federal agencies. His second-term agenda goes far beyond regulatory rollbacks into a wholesale remaking of the federal government.

Battling the ‘bureaucracy’ in Washington has long been a conservative cause. But what Trump is doing represents a radical restructuring that circumvents Congress and expands his presidential power in unprecedented, and potentially unconstitutional, ways.

Commentators warn the long-term impact may not necessarily be as good for business as President Trump claims to intend. By undermining institutions, circumventing procedures and sowing unpredictability, the Trump administration is introducing a new kind of structural volatility into the US regulatory regime.

Enter DOGE

The newly formed Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE), until recently led by President Trump’s billionaire backer Elon Musk, is asserting unprecedented authority to overhaul or eliminate government operations. Early personnel purges directed by Musk’s team shocked the Washington establishment.

The Trump administration shut down the US Agency for International Development (USAID) and is folding its functions into the State Department as it seeks to curtail the US’s overseas spending. The administration is attempting to close the Department of Education, expressing a desire to ‘return education authority to the states.’ Both agencies are authorised by Congress in statutes that President Trump is seeking to override by executive fiat.

The Defense Department alone is planning to slash up to 60,000 civilian roles. The Department of Health and Human Services is eliminating 20,000 jobs, including at the FDA, the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The Commerce, Labor, Interior, Housing and Urban Development departments and the Social Security Administration are all planning similar cuts.

Indeed, announced and planned job cuts by DOGE amount to a staggering 275,000 positions across 27 US agencies, according to data collected as of April by recruitment company Challenger, Gray & Christmas, as the Trump administration seeks to produce ‘efficiencies’.

Operating on President Trump’s word alone and without legislative authority from Congress, the actions of Musk and DOGE have led to a raft of federal lawsuits. These cases test the balance between the authority of Congress to mandate regulatory regimes and the president’s authority to revise or undo the work of agencies. The lawsuits are in various stages of argument and appeal. They will probably land before the Supreme Court.

In February, President Trump issued an executive order instructing all federal agency heads ‘in coordination with their DOGE Team Leads’ and the White House’s Office of Management and Budget to review all regulations and identify whole classes for elimination. ‘Ending Federal overreach and restoring the constitutional separation of powers is a priority of my Administration,’ Trump’s order says.

But the president’s approach is not just about deregulation. It’s a deconstruction of the administrative state. It’s about undermining the statutory mandates of federal agencies. More than simply repealing rules, the Trump administration’s actions will predictably disable enforcement and oversight by removing personnel and the functional machinery of government, commentators say.

### Civil Service ADV---Won’t Listen---1NC

#### No civil servants’ impact---Trump won’t listen. This independently takes out every other impact.

Selena Simmons-Duffin 8/8, Health Policy Correspondent at NPR; Domenico Montanaro is Senior Political Editor/Correspondent at NPR, “How a Distrust of Experts is Shaping Government Policy Under Trump,” NPR, 8/8/25, https://www.npr.org/2025/08/08/nx-s1-5494569/how-a-distrust-of-experts-is-shaping-government-policy-under-trump

President Trump and members of his administration have often expressed a distrust of science and experts. That distrust is now helping to shape policies in several areas of government, from vaccines and health care to trade and the economy.

MARY LOUISE KELLY, HOST: Last week, the Trump administration canceled approximately $500 million in contracts to develop mRNA vaccines that protect the nation against future viral threats. The move alarmed public health experts. That was big news. But disregarding the advice of experts is nothing new for this administration, whether it's about health policy or other areas of government work like, say, the economy or foreign aid, just to name two. We want to hear more about the broader implications of that distrust of science and expertise, so for the next few minutes, we're going to turn the microphone over to two NPR reporters who have been following this closely - health policy correspondent Selena Simmons-Duffin and senior political editor and correspondent Domenico Montanaro.

DOMENICO MONTANARO, BYLINE: This decision at HHS canceling all this money for mRNA vaccines is kind of wild to me because it feels like a reversal from Trump's first term. He pushed to develop these vaccines in the first place.

SELENA SIMMONS-DUFFIN, BYLINE: Yeah, you know, it is, in some ways, a dramatic U-turn from the first Trump administration, which was in place when the COVID-19 pandemic began. So under Trump, the National Institutes for Health and private pharmaceutical companies collaborated to create vaccines incredibly fast. And you remember that effort was called Operation Warp Speed. And the speed was possible because the vaccines were built using this relatively new mRNA platform. The vaccines weren't perfect. There were a lot of breakthrough infections, but they are credited with saving many, many lives and preventing hospitalizations. And since that success, many scientists have been excited to figure out what else mRNA technology can do.

However, mRNA vaccines have also been a longtime target of Robert F. Kennedy Jr., who is now the U.S. health secretary. He built his reputation and fortune by disparaging vaccines and suing drugmakers and regulators. He once tweeted that the COVID vaccines were, quote, "a crime against humanity." And even though he reassured senators during his confirmation hearing he wasn't going to bring his anti-vaccine activism to this new, very powerful role, that's exactly what he has done, and this is the latest example of that. And President Trump seems to be happy with this development, even though he used to call Operation Warp Speed and the vaccines it produced a miracle.

MONTANARO: Yeah. I mean, he's not going to put his neck out there, you know, to stand up for them anymore as a miracle, as he did describe them. But, you know, the fact is COVID was a huge political problem for Trump. He was trying to find anything that would help solve the problem and help him politically. But his handling overall of that is arguably why he lost in 2020. You know, many in his base turned on the vaccines. So Trump had to wind up walking this very fine line.

There was a huge overlap with RFK Jr.'s base of people who'd long, you know, been seen as on the fringe, and Trump needed them in 2024. But Trump really doesn't have very strongly held beliefs on this topic. You know, remember, he's also expressed his own skepticism about vaccines, so now Trump's allowing RFK Jr. the room to run, regardless of the best science because his movement and that of so many right-wing populist movements around the world, by the way, are dependent on this distrust of expertise.

SIMMONS-DUFFIN: Yeah. And, you know, Secretary Kennedy has really disparaged the Department of Health and Human Services, which he now oversees. He's laid the blame for American population - the American population's relatively poor health on rank-and-file HHS employees. He says they failed to improve America's health for decades. He's pointed to that as justification for abruptly firing approximately 10,000 workers, shutting down federal labs, canceling billions in funding for public health departments and researchers. And he doesn't just say these experts are ineffective. He told Lara Trump on Fox News that they're deliberately manipulating the truth.

(SOUNDBITE OF ARCHIVED RECORDING) ROBERT F KENNEDY JR:

ROBERT F KENNEDY JR: There's all kinds of biases, and we need to have a system in place that will account for those biases and that will produce the best gold-standard science for Americans and evidence-based medicine.

SIMMONS-DUFFIN: Kennedy talks about gold-standard science constantly, but he doesn't really define what he means. He said in his confirmation hearings this isn't just a label he uses for research whose results fit with his preconceived beliefs. He says it's more objective than that. But gold-standard science is not a term that's used among scientists, and he seems to be using it as a filter for what research gets funding and credibility and what can be brushed aside.

MONTANARO: Yeah. And Kennedy isn't the only member of this administration with a deep distrust of experts. You know, there's this anti-elitism, anti-intellectualism, this distrust in the experts. It's really something that's fueled Trump's politics. That was made explicit in the October vice presidential debate. Listen to now-Vice President JD Vance then strongly disagreeing with the idea that it's important to listen to the experts - in this case - about health.

## Presidency ADV

### Presidency ADV---Trump D---1NC

#### Trump errs towards restraint.

Andrew Byers and Randall L. Schweller 24, Nonresident Fellow at Texas A&M University’s Albritton Center for Grand Strategy; Professor of Political Science and Director of the Program for the Study of Realist Foreign Policy at Ohio State University, “Trump the Realist”, Foreign Affairs, 7/1/24, accessed 9/2/24, https://archive.is/sUiIu#selection-1221.0-1224.0

In his first term, Trump’s realist instincts were frequently thwarted by his senior national security advisers. But the former president’s inclination for restraint nonetheless shaped his policies. Trump avoided new military entanglements, began extricating the United States from its 20-year occupation of Afghanistan, and engaged adversarial states such as China, North Korea, and Russia in ways that lessened the possibility of conflict. He shifted the burden of paying for mutual defense to allies and away from American taxpayers. He talked tough as a means of pressuring other leaders and appeasing his domestic base. But he never acted like a neoconservative primacist. Even when it came to Iran, the country toward which he was most belligerent, Trump always pulled back from the brink of using significant military force.