

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Fall 2023)

Topic: Arctic Militarization

| | |
|--|----------|
| PROS AND CONS OF ARCTIC MILITARIZATION (REBUTTALS) | 2 |
| REBUTTAL-01 (PRO): vs. Harming Security | 2 |
| 1.) First... Countering Russian Military Expansion | 2 |
| S: According to... Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022 | 2 |
| 2.) Also... Counter-Balancing is not a Threat | 2 |
| S: According to... the Brookings Institution, May 2021 | 2 |
| 3.) Furthermore... .. | 2 |
| 4.) Finally... .. | 2 |
| REBUTTAL-02 (PRO): vs. Harming the Environment | 3 |
| 1.) First... Responsible Operation w/o Harming Environment | 3 |
| S: According to... the United States Navy [Website], Last Accessed: October 2023 | 3 |
| 2.) Also... Military Increasing Focus on Climate Change | 3 |
| S: According to... the Department of Defense, 2022 | 3 |
| 3.) Furthermore... .. | 3 |
| 4.) Finally... .. | 3 |
| REBUTTAL-03 (PRO): vs. Wasting Money | 4 |
| 1.) First... Access to Trillions in Resources | 4 |
| S: According to... Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022 | 4 |
| 2.) Also... Opening New Trade Routes | 4 |
| S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023 | 4 |
| 3.) Furthermore... Bioprospecting Leads to New Medicines | 4 |
| S: According to... University of East Anglia, Oct 18, 2022 | 4 |
| 4.) Finally... .. | 4 |
| REBUTTAL-01 (CON): vs. Improving Security | 5 |
| 1.) First... Military Buildup Seen as Provocation | 5 |
| S: According to... Responsible Statecraft, August 29, 2022..... | 5 |
| 2.) Also... Significantly Increasing Risk of War (ex. Miscalculations)..... | 5 |
| S: According to... CBC News, February 18, 2018..... | 5 |
| 3.) Furthermore... .. | 5 |
| 4.) Finally... .. | 5 |
| REBUTTAL-02 (CON): vs. Helping the Economy | 6 |
| 1.) First... Militarization is Incredibly Costly (& Costs Threaten Security)..... | 6 |
| S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023 | 6 |
| 2.) Also... Resource Exploitation is Too Costly! | 6 |
| S: According to... The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023 | 6 |
| 3.) Furthermore... Wasting Precious Resources (Other Higher Priorities: Climate Change)..... | 6 |
| S: According to... Responsible Statecraft, August 29, 2022..... | 6 |
| 4.) Finally... .. | 6 |
| REBUTTAL-03 (CON): vs. Helping Science | 7 |
| 1.) First... Cooperation is Vital to Pursuing Science (in the Arctic) | 7 |
| S: According to... The Arctic Institute, March 14, 2023 | 7 |
| 2.) Also... Restoring Cooperation is Critical to Addressing Climate Emergencies | 7 |
| S: According to... The Arctic Institute, March 28, 2023 | 7 |
| 3.) Furthermore... .. | 7 |
| 4.) Finally... .. | 7 |

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Fall 2023)

Topic: Arctic Militarization

PROS AND CONS OF ARCTIC MILITARIZATION (REBUTTALS)

REBUTTAL-01 (PRO): vs. Harming Security

They said... increasing our military presence in the arctic will harm security.

We say... this will NOT harm security.

Because...

1.) First... Countering Russian Military Expansion

S: According to... Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022

<https://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/2022/11/11/combating-the-gray-zone-enhancing-americas-arctic-force-posture/>

F: It states... Recently, the Russian military reopened 50 military installations and invested in a growing array of Arctic capabilities, including hypersonic cruise missiles and nuclear-powered undersea drones.

C: This means... by increasing our military presence in the Arctic, we can counterbalance Russian military expansion and deter potential aggression, this enhances global security and protects millions of lives.

2.) Also... Counter-Balancing is not a Threat

S: According to... the Brookings Institution, May 2021

https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/FP_20210520_arctic_defense.pdf

F: *It states...* As access to the arctic increases so will extracting resources, commerce, and tourism. Many countries such as Russia and China are developing critical infrastructure and a greater military presence. The US and its allies must do the same.

C: *This means...* since Russia and even China have already increased their military presence, when we do the same it is not likely to be seen as a hostile act, but an act of balancing – so, this will not increase conflict nor cause a war.

3.) Furthermore...

4.) Finally...

Therefore... increasing our military presence in the arctic will not harm security.

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Fall 2023)

Topic: Arctic Militarization

REBUTTAL-02 (PRO): vs. Harming the Environment

They said... increasing our military presence in the arctic will harm the environment.

We say... this will NOT harm security.

Because...

1.) First... Responsible Operation w/o Harming Environment

S: According to... the United States Navy [Website], Last Accessed: October 2023

<https://www.navsea.navy.mil/Home/SUPSALV/Environmental/>

F: *It states...* The Navy is committed to operating in an environmentally responsible manner on land and at sea. Prevention is the Navy's first line of defense, with the goal of reducing the number of spills that occur.

C: *This means...* increasing the military in the arctic will not cause pollution from the ships as the Navy is working hard to prevent the kinds of spills that would cause serious damage.

2.) Also... Military Increasing Focus on Climate Change

S: According to... the Department of Defense, 2022

<https://media.defense.gov/2022/Oct/06/2003092213/-1/-1/0/2022-DOD-CAP-PROGRESS-REPORT.PDF>

F: *It states...* The government has established the Arctic and Global Resilience to support the integration of global climate change considerations into strategies, policies, plans, and programs, as well as working closely with Allies and partners to build resilience to climate change.

C: *This means...* Increased military in the arctic will not worsen climate change nor will it significantly add to any pollution.

3.) Furthermore...

4.) Finally...

Therefore... increasing our military presence in the arctic will not harm the environment.

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Fall 2023)

Topic: Arctic Militarization

REBUTTAL-03 (PRO): vs. Wasting Money

They said... increasing our military presence in the arctic will waste money.

We say... this will NOT waste money.

Because...

1.) **First... Access to Trillions in Resources**

S: According to... *Georgetown Security Studies Review, November 11, 2022*

<https://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/2022/11/11/combating-the-gray-zone-enhancing-americas-arctic-force-posture/>

F: It states... In addition to vast reserves of hydrocarbons, the Arctic could potentially possess up to \$1 trillion worth of rare earth metals and abundant fisheries. Access to natural resources.

C: This means... we must increase our military presence in the Arctic, so we can improve the lives of hundreds of millions of people by gaining access to trillions of dollars in Arctic resources.

2.) **Also... Opening New Trade Routes**

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

F: It states... the Arctic ice is melting and that this environmental change is opening up potential trade routes and making natural resources more available for exploration and extraction.

C: This means... if we increase our military in the arctic, we can protect billions in trade and gain access to trillions of dollars in resources. This alone makes it worth the cost of providing security.

3.) **Furthermore... Bioprospecting Leads to New Medicines**

S: According to... *University of East Anglia, Oct 18, 2022*

<https://www.labmanager.com/new-dataset-reveals-biological-treasure-trove-of-arctic-ocean-29033>

F: It states... a center for polar and marine research supports bioprospecting to tackle the shortage of antibiotics and antiviral medication, as well as reveal evidence that might influence our understanding of the evolution of life on Earth.

C: This means... by providing greater security and safety for scientists we can get access to new life-saving discoveries improving the lives of millions of people. These new medicines can also help us fight against viruses like covid.

4.) **Finally...**

Therefore... increasing our military in the arctic will not waste money nor cause harm to the economy.

Concluding Statement:

So, for all these reasons we ask you to vote for the PRO. Thank you.

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Fall 2023)

Topic: Arctic Militarization

PROS AND CONS OF ARCTIC MILITARIZATION (REBUTTALS): Continued...

REBUTTAL-01 (CON): vs. Improving Security

They said... increasing our military presence in the arctic will improve security.

We say... this will NOT improve security.

Because...

1.) First... Military Buildup Seen as Provocation

S: According to... *Responsible Statecraft*, August 29, 2022

<https://responsiblestatecraft.org/2022/08/29/arctic-military-build-up-poses-new-geopolitical-and-climate-risks/>

F: It states... A U.S. build-up could fuel military competition with Russia. "There are certainly real consequences for the U.S.'s greater military presence in the Arctic," and may "very well be treated as a military provocation by Russia and may result in increased Russian military exercises."

C: This means... by increasing U.S. military presence in the Arctic, we risk escalating tensions with Russia, thereby potentially destabilizing the region and putting millions of lives at risk.

2.) Also... Significantly Increasing Risk of War (ex. Miscalculations)

S: According to... *CBC News*, February 18, 2018

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/world/war-risk-blunder-1.4540790>

F: It states... Miscalculations, accidents, and human error combined with rising global instability led experts to believe accidents and missteps are more likely and far more dangerous than they were in the past.

C: This means... when we increase tension in the arctic, we are also increasing the risk of the kind of miscalculation that could trigger a war.

3.) Furthermore...

4.) Finally...

Therefore... increasing our military presence in the arctic will not improve security.

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Fall 2023)

Topic: Arctic Militarization

REBUTTAL-02 (CON): vs. Helping the Economy

They said... increasing our military presence in the arctic will help the economy.

We say... this will NOT help the economy.

Because...

1.) First... Militarization is Incredibly Costly (& Costs Threaten Security)

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

F: *It states...* the costs of controlling the arctic will be significant and will weaken our ability to secure other areas of national interest. Working 'collectively' with allies would provide security without consuming resources needed in other areas.

C: *This means...* a substantial increase in military presence could waste billions of dollars and threaten the security of millions of people by weakening our defenses in other more vital areas around the world.

2.) Also... Resource Exploitation is Too Costly!

S: According to... *The Center for International Maritime Security, April 13, 2023*

<https://cimsec.org/why-the-us-is-losing-the-race-for-the-arctic-and-what-to-do-about-it/>

F: *It states...* The high costs of extracting resources and transporting them from the arctic, companies are still not going to pursue arctic resources unless something changes dramatically, which is unlikely.

C: *This means...* increasing our military presence in the arctic will not lead to greater economic resources for the economy and it will not be worth the hundreds of billions each year that we spend doing it.

3.) Furthermore... Wasting Precious Resources (Other Higher Priorities: Climate Change)

S: According to... *Responsible Statecraft, August 29, 2022*

<https://responsiblestatecraft.org/2022/08/29/arctic-military-build-up-poses-new-geopolitical-and-climate-risks/>

F: *It states...* Dr. Neta Crawford, of Brown University, sees the military's view towards competition and build-up in the Arctic as a poor use of resources. "We have a certain catastrophe on its way," Crawford said. The resources we put toward reducing emissions and adaptation are much better spent, in terms of saving lives.

C: *This means...* by increasing our military presence in the Arctic, we divert resources away from the greater threat of climate change, thereby failing to address imminent threats that could impact billions of lives!

4.) Finally...

Therefore... increasing our military presence in the arctic will not help the economy.

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Fall 2023)

Topic: Arctic Militarization

REBUTTAL-03 (CON): vs. Helping Science

They said... increasing our military presence in the arctic will help science.

We say... this will NOT help science.

Because...

1.) First... Cooperation is Vital to Pursuing Science (in the Arctic)

S: According to... The Arctic Institute, March 14, 2023

<https://www.thearcticinstitute.org/conflict-collaboration-role-non-arctic-states-arctic-science-diplomacy/>

F: *It states...* Cooperation with Russia has become difficult due to the war in Ukraine, and science diplomacy may yet be an effective means of restoring constructive relationships within the region.

C: *This means...* when we significantly militarize the arctic, we are provoking Russia, a key player, whose cooperation we need in science and science diplomacy.

2.) Also... Restoring Cooperation is Critical to Addressing Climate Emergencies

S: According to... The Arctic Institute, March 28, 2023

<https://www.thearcticinstitute.org/can-arctic-cooperation-restored/>

F: *It states...* there is limited room to restore cooperation, which is absolutely necessary to dealing with the climate emergency that threatens the whole world, cooperation in research to understand the changes unfolding in the region, in environmental protection, and in joint climate change adaptation and mitigation efforts remain an imperative.

C: *This means...* when we use our military in a way that Russia will see as provoking them, we are closing the door on ways that we can gain vital cooperation with them.

3.) Furthermore...

4.) Finally...

Therefore... increasing our military presence in the arctic will not help science.

Concluding Statement:

"So, for all these reasons we ask you to vote for the CON. Thank you."