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### 1-Can’t Spec Employer

A. If the aff defends a living wage policy, they must defend all workers eligible for living wage-not a specific group of people.

B. They defend living wage for \_\_\_\_\_.

C. prefer:

1. Limits. There are an infinite number of collections of people-having to be prepared to debate each one forces debaters to prep hundreds of case negs that may never be run. Key to fairness since I can’t engage in your aff if I can’t predict it-means you’ll always have the structural prep advantage-turns back education since your interp incentivizes debaters to find the most shock value interps farthest from the core of the lit which kills in depth discussion.

2. Ground. Specifying a group lets the aff pick the most desirable slice of the resolution-they can pick a group with a tangential link to the topic which excludes all stock neg offense. For example none of my generic turns to your aff apply since you have hyper specific group with very specific studies. Ground is key to fairness since I need arguments to win.

D. Vote on fairness, debate’s a competitive activity-no debater ought to have a structural advantage. Vote on education-it’s why schools fund debate and provides portable skills for the real world. This outweighs theory. If the aff advocacy is not fair there is no ground on which to issue their theory claim – neg abuse is justified on the basis of a not fair aff.

Drop the debater 1. To rectify time lost running theory and 2. To deter future abuse—empirically proven by shells like a prioris bad. 3. Drop the arg skews my strat since debaters will read lots of unfair args in the AC and force me to waste time with lots of theory killing substantive education.

Competing interps since 1. Any brightline is arbitrary and bites judge intervention 2. Reasonability causes a race to the bottom to see who can be the most abusive under the given brightline 3. Competing interps forces a race to the top-an offense defense paradigm fosters good norms for the activity.

No RVIs. 1. Illogical. Just because you are fair doesn’t mean you should win. If that were true, both debaters would win rounds without theory, which would be irresolvable, and resolvability comes first since every debate needs a winner. 2. Chilling effect. Either I read theory and you beat me with your 4 minute prep out or I don’t read theory and abusive practices prevail-both kill fairness. 3. Topical clash. RVIs kill substantive debate. Once theory is initiated we can never go back to substance, because it’s unnecessary so nobody will engage in the topic. 4. Norm setting. I can’t concede that the counter-interp is better even if I come to that realization in the middle of the round, so the RVI forces debaters to argue for bad debate practices, which is inimical to the most fair and educational interps in the long run.

### 2-Competitiveness DA

Global economy is growing but we’re still recovering from the recession-US is key.

Davidson 14 Paul “IMF: World economy stronger; recovery uneven” USA Today April 8, 2014 http://www.usatoday.com/story/money/business/2014/04/08/imf-global-forecast/7441869/

The International Monetary Fund said Tuesday the global recovery will gain strength this year, but it trimmed its growth forecast amid a sharp rise in Japan's sales tax and a slowdown in emerging markets. An accelerating U.S. recovery will help the world economy grow 3.6% this year, the IMF said, up from 3% in 2013 but down slightly from its 3.7% projection in January. Growth will pick up to a 3.9% pace in 2015, the fund said in advance of the spring meetings of the IMF and World Bank in Washington this week. "A recovery which was starting to take hold in October is becoming stronger but also broader," IMF chief economist Olivier Blanchard said at a press briefing Tuesday. But, he added, "the recovery remains uneven." The IMF's 2014 growth forecast for the U.S. was unchanged at 2.8%. That is the highest among advanced economies, which the IMF said are driving the global expansion. "A major impulse to global growth has come from the United States," the IMF said in its World Economic Outlook, adding that U.S. growth will pick up to 3% next year. The IMF cited more modest federal government spending cuts this year, higher household wealth, the recovering housing market and banks that are more willing to lend.

US airline competitiveness increasing.

Blakey 14 Marion C. Blakey (President and Chief Executive Officer of AIA, the nation’s largest trade association representing aerospace and defense manufacturers) “THE U.S. AVIATION INDUSTRY AND JOBS: KEEPING AMERICAN MANUFACTURING COMPETITIVE” March 13th 2014 <http://www.aia-aerospace.org/news/the_us_aviation_industry_and_jobs_keeping_american_manufacturing_competitiv/> JW 3/23/15

U. S. aircraft manufacturers continue to hold strong positions in the world market due to the dedication and hard work of American workers, the wisdom of executives leading those companies, and the pursuit of technological advances that drive world markets. In fact, the aerospace industry continues to be the United States' leading exporter of manufactured goods. By value, our industry exported $72.1 billion more than we imported last year. This figure was up 10% over the previous year, even as the overall U. S. economy improved in fits and starts.

Living wage for airports specifically causes inflation that kills competitiveness and collapses economy. This card is sick.

Opdyke 14 Jeff D. Opdyke (Editor, Profit Seeker) “Americans Are Expensive” June 24th 2014 The Sovereign Investor Daily <http://thesovereigninvestor.com/economic-collapse-2/americans-are-expensive/> JW

Politicians, economists and random rabble-rousers are determined to fix this “problem” of questionable significance by way of minimum-wage increases — never stopping to consider that the problem isn’t the minimum wage in America … it’s the wages the rest of the world earns in a globalized economy, mixed with the policies of a paternal American government that buys its power through costly give-away programs that are draining the nation’s productive capacity. The prescription being offered to cure the earnings gap will do more to reduce America’s competitiveness and throw her into economic collapse than it will improve the lot of our middle class. And for us, investors, that fact says a lot about where we should have our money at work … and where we should scale back. The latest organization to weigh in on the “raise the wage” debate is the International Monetary Fund. The IMF last week said the U.S. minimum wage is too low by historical and global standards, and that raising the minimum would, duh!, raise the incomes for millions of working-poor Americans. On a nominal basis, that’s true. But on a real basis, meaning adjusted for the inflation that wage hikes necessarily engender, it’s pure pabulum — lip-service designed to play to the masses who feel the system is rigged against them, and, oh, improve the IMF’s image. The early events already taking place in Seattle, where the city now mandates a $15 minimum wage, tell you exactly why these “living wage” arguments are bogus and why, ultimately, they will do very little to improve the financial standing of America’s middle class. Small-businesses in Seattle are already realizing the true impact of this legislation isn’t just a raise for minimum-wage earners … it’s an across-the-board wage hike for just about everyone below the corporate/ownership level, and it’s a cost hike — i.e. inflation — for everyone in Seattle. Restaurants serve as a great example. They employ workers earning at or just above minimum wage, which in Washington state is already $9.32 an hour. Managers who oversee those workers earn in the $15 range currently. You can clearly see the dots that are connecting. America’s Achilles Heel If minimum-wage Jack is suddenly earning $15 an hour, then manager Jill certainly is not going to cotton to earning the same salary for taking on more responsibility. She will rightly demand a wage commensurate with the wage gap she once enjoyed … which, of course, means Jill’s manager is going to demand a raise, too, for having to manage all the Jills in the organization. At least one Subway franchisee has calculated the real cost on his restaurant and has determined that he will have to raise costs by $0.75 per sandwich. Doesn’t sound like much, but it represents an inflation rate for sandwiches of as much as 15%. But, more important, that’s just one price rise in the many price rises consumers will face for all sorts of products — the definition of broad-based inflation. It’s trickle up economics and it is fundamentally the kind of maneuver that leads toward economic collapse. America’s Achilles Heel is its overpriced labor force. The rest of the world can make much of what we make here at home, only it can do it at cheaper prices and with equal or better quality. Now, they certainly can’t make and import a Subway sandwich; some things must be made locally. However, when a sandwich jockey earns $15 an hour for slapping some turkey on wheat bread, then the line worker building airplanes for Boeing in Seattle is, ultimately, going to demand a higher wage, too, at some point because he’s having to compete for goods with the sandwich maker who now has more money to spend … and that begins to trickle up the labor pool at Boeing and other manufacturers that are competing globally. Yet, when American manufacturers like Boeing face bloated labor costs, they must either cut corners on quality (which helped bring General Motors to the brink of death), reduce research and development that would give them a competitive edge, or reduce their workforce for fear of losing contract opportunities. So, tell me: How does raising the minimum wage help the American middle class if it reduces the quality of American-made goods, leads to a reduction in job opportunities (at the very moment technology is making so many no-, low- and medium-skilled jobs redundant) and increases the cost of living that hurts the very workers the higher wage is supposed to help? Investing in Profit-Friendly Markets In the end, raising the minimum wage just makes America increasingly less competitive. In a closed economy, that wouldn’t necessarily matter. But in a global economy, where labor is abundant, cheap and fungible (who cares where my iPhone is made, so long as it’s affordable to the masses) America’s “raise the wage” debate is anachronistic and blind to the reality of global labor markets. For investors, that tells you that you don’t want your portfolio concentrated in U.S. markets. The economy faces the headwinds of rising labor costs that will crimp corporate profits, which pushes stock prices down … or inflationary pressures, which, also, pushes stock prices down. You want your money in markets where labor is more conducive to corporate profitability — and that tends to be Asia. That’s where the real opportunities are today. And that’s where you should begin putting some of your wealth to work.

Airline industry drives US competitiveness. Statistics.

Kelly 8 Gary Kelly (Chief Executive Officer of Southwest Airlines) “CEOpinion: Airline Industry Very Fuel-Efficient” Corporate Responsibility Magazine 2008 http://www.thecro.com/node/620

The problem of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and the resulting climate change is one that faces all of us—as individuals, but also as corporations. The backbone of the aviation industry is helping individuals go, see and do in a time-effective manner. If we don’t address the problem of GHG emissions, there will not be natural places to go, a world to see or things to do. We, as an industry, are highly motivated to preserve the natural world around us. Southwest Airlines and the entire airline industry have a great story to tell about improving fuel efficiency and reducing GHG emissions. Compared to other industries, and even other modes of transportation, the airline industry is incredibly fuel-efficient and continues to improve efficiency with investments in new technology and by adopting new operational procedures. We are driven to be as fuel efficient as possible because, not only is it the right thing to do, frankly, it’s good business. Fuel accounts for an incredibly large portion of any airline’s operating costs. And thus, we have every reason in the world to be as fuel (and carbon) efficient as possible. We are constantly searching for ways to reduce our fuel costs. When we reduce our fuel consumption, we help both the environment and our bottom line. Any government solution to climate change should leverage this economic reality. According to a recent study, “Commercial Aviation and the American Economy,” the airline industry, which includes both passenger and cargo carriers, is a major driver of economic activity, especially in the United States, where the airline industry is directly responsible for 5.8 percent of gross economic output and 8.8 percent of national employment. Despite our role in being a major generator of economic activity, airlines account for only about 2 percent of GHG emissions in the United States and 3 percent worldwide. Again, the airline industry delivers more value to the economy while maintaining a low carbon footprint because we are constantly improving our fuel efficiency. The industry has already contributed to the reduction of emissions through technology and efficiency. The industry has improved its fuel efficiency—and hence GHG efficiency—by 103 percent between 1978 and 2006.

Regression analysis proves economic competitiveness solves global peace.

Hubbard 10 Jesse Hubbard, Program Assistant at Open Society Foundations Washington, District Of Columbia International Affairs Previous National Democratic Institute (NDI), National Defense University, Office of Congressman Jim Himes Education PPE at University of Oxford, Hegemonic Stability Theory: An Empirical Analysis, 2010

Research into the theoretical underpinnings of this topic revealed that there are two main subfields within the literature on hegemonic stability. One line of study, an avenue pursued by prominent theorists such as Kindleberger, Keohane, and Ikenberry focuses primarily on questions of related to the economic system. The other avenue, pursued by theorists such as Gilpin, looks at the role of hegemonic governance in reducing violent conflict. In my research, I focus on this aspect of hegemonic stability – its implications for military conflict in the international system. To research this question, I undertook a broad quantitative study that examined data from both the American and British hegemonic epochs, focusing on the years of 1815-1939 in the case of British hegemony, and 1945 to 1999 in the case of American hegemony. I hypothesized that hegemonic strength was inversely correlated with levels of armed conflict in the international system. Using the data from the Correlates of War Project, I was able to perform a number of statistical analyses on my hypothesis. To measure hegemonic strength, I used the Composite Index of National Capability, a metric that averages together six different dimensions of relative power as a share of total power in the international system. **I** then **matched this data with data cataloging all conflicts** in the international system **since 1815**. I organized this data into five-year increments, in order to make statistical analysis more feasible. **Regression** analysis of the data **revealed** that there was **a statistically significant negative correlation between** relative **heg**emonic power **and conflict** levels in the international system. However, further statistical tests added complications to the picture of hegemonic governance that was emerging. Regression analysis of military actions engaged in by the hegemon versus total conflict in the system revealed a highly positive correlation for both American and British hegemony. Further **analysis revealed** that in both cases, **military power was a less accurate predictor of** military **conflict than economic power**. There are several possible explanations for these findings. It is likely that economic stability has an effect on international security. In addition, **weaker hegemons are more likely to be challenged militarily** than stronger hegemons. Thus, the hegemon will engage in more conflicts during times of international insecurity, because such times are also when the hegemon is weakest. Perhaps the **most important** implication of this research **is that hegemons may well be more effective in promoting peace through economic power** than through the exercise of military force. II. Research Question In examining hegemonic stability theory, there are several important questions to consider. First of all, an acceptable definition of what constitutes a hegemon must be established. Secondly, a good measure of what constitutes stability in the international system must be determined. Certainly, the frequency and severity of interstate conflict is an important measure of stability in the international system. However, other measures of stability should also be taken into account. Conflict in the international system takes on a wide range of forms. While military conflict is perhaps the most violent and severe dimension, it is only one of many forms that conflict can take. Conflict need not be confined to wars between traditional states. Terrorism, piracy, and guerilla warfare are also types of conflict that are endemic to the international system. Economic conflict, exemplified by trade wars, hostile actions such as sanctions, or outright trade embargos, is also an important form of conflict in the international system. States can also engage in a range of less severe actions that might be deemed political conflict, by recalling an ambassador or withdrawing from international bodies, for example. Clearly, “stability” as it pertains to the international system is a vast and amorphous concept. Because of these complexities, a comprehensive assessment of the theory is beyond the purview of this research. However, completing a more focused analysis is a realistic endeavor. Focusing on international armed conflicts in two select periods will serve to increase the feasibility the research. I will focus on the period of British hegemony lasting from the end of the Napoleonic wars to 1939 and the period of American hegemony beginning after the Second World War and continuing until 1999, the last year for which reliable data is available. The proposed hypothesis is that in these periods, the **heg**emon **acted as a stabilizing force** by reducing the frequency and severity of international armed conflict. The dependent variable in this case is the frequency and severity of conflict. The primary independent variable is the power level of the hegemon. This hypothesis is probabilistic since it posits that the hegemon tended to reduce conflict, not that it did so in every single possible instance. One way to test this hypothesis would be through a case-study method that examined the role of Britain and the United States in several different conflicts. This method would have the advantage of approaching the problem from a very feasible, limited perspective. While it would not reveal much about hegemony on a broader theoretical level, it would help provide practical grounding for what is a highly theoretical area of stuffy in international relations. Another method would be to do a broader quantitative comparison of international conflict by finding and comparing data on conflict and hegemonic strength for the entire time covered by British and American hegemony. The hypothesis is falsifiable, because it could be shown that the hegemon did not act as a stabilizing force during the years of study. **It** also **avoids** some of **the pitfalls** associated **with the case study method, such as selection bias and** the inherently **subjective** nature of **qualitative analysis.**

Absent heg, these conflicts will escalate to nuke war.

Kagan 7 Robert Kagan (Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution). “End of Dreams: Return of History.” Foreign Policy. 2007.

The jostling for status and influence among these ambitious nations and would-be nations is a second defining feature of the new post-Cold War international system. **Nationalism** in all its forms **is back**, if it ever went away, **and so is international competition for power**, influence, honor, and status. **American predominance prevents these rivalries from intensifying** — its regional as well as its global predominance. **Were the U**nited **S**tates **to diminish its influence** in the regions where it is currently the strongest power, the **other nations would settle disputes** as great and lesser powers have done in the past: sometimes through diplomacy and accommodation but often **through confrontation and wars** of varying scope, intensity, and destructiveness. One novel aspect of such a multipolar world is that **most of these powers would possess nuclear weapons.** **That could make wars** between them less likely, or it could simply make them more **catastrophic.**

### 3-Util Negates

Consequentialism means you negate. The resolution questions what just governments ought to do so if consequentialism is incapable of requiring something or fails to guide action, then a just government ought not require employers pay a living wage.

Universe is flat and infinite.

NASA 14 National Aeronautics and Space Administration. “Will the Universe expand forever?” 24 January 2014. <http://map.gsfc.nasa.gov/universe/uni_shape.html>

The fate of the universe is determined by a struggle between the momentum of expansion and the pull of gravity. The rate of expansion is expressed by the Hubble Constant, Ho, while the strength of gravity depends on the density and pressure of the matter in the universe. If the pressure of the matter is low, as is the case with most forms of matter of which we know, then the fate of the universe is governed by the density. If the density of the universe is less than the "critical density", which is proportional to the square of the Hubble constant, then the universe will expand forever. If the density of the universe is greater than the "critical density", then gravity will eventually win and the universe will collapse back on itself, the so called "Big Crunch". However, the results of the WMAP mission and observations of distant supernova have suggested that the expansion of the universe is actually accelerating, which implies the existence of a form of matter with a strong negative pressure, such as the cosmological constant. This strange form of matter is also sometimes referred to as "dark energy". If dark energy in fact plays a significant role in the evolution of the universe, then in all likelihood the universe will continue to expand forever. INFINITE UNIVERSE? Possible space curvatures of the universe: Closed, Flat, Open The density of the universe also determines its geometry. If the density of the universe exceeds the critical density, then the geometry of space is closed and positively curved like the surface of a sphere. This implies that initially parallel photon paths converge slowly, eventually cross, and return back to their starting point (if the universe lasts long enough). If the density of the universe is less than the critical density, then the geometry of space is open (infinite), and negatively curved like the surface of a saddle. If the density of the universe exactly equals the critical density, then the geometry of the universe is flat like a sheet of paper, and infinite in extent. The simplest version of the inflationary theory, an extension of the Big Bang theory, predicts that the density of the universe is very close to the critical density, and that the geometry of the universe is flat, like a sheet of paper. MEASUREMENTS FROM WMAP The WMAP spacecraft can measure the basic parameters of the Big Bang theory including the geometry of the universe. If the universe were flat, the brightest microwave background fluctuations (or "spots") would be about one degree across. If the universe were open, the spots would be less than one degree across. If the universe were closed, the brightest spots would be greater than one degree across. Recent measurements (c. 2001) by a number of ground-based and balloon-based experiments, including MAT/TOCO, Boomerang, Maxima, and DASI, have shown that the brightest spots are about 1 degree across. Thus the universe was known to be flat to within about 15% accuracy prior to the WMAP results. WMAP has confirmed this result with very high accuracy and precision. We now know (as of 2013) that the universe is flat with only a 0.4% margin of error. This suggests that the Universe is infinite in extent; however, since the Universe has a finite age, we can only observe a finite volume of the Universe. All we can truly conclude is that the Universe is much larger than the volume we can directly observe.

The universe has a flat topology which undermines util calculation. All actions would have equal and infinite value.

Bostrom Nick “Are Cosmological Theories Compatible with All Possible Evidence: A Missing Methodological Link” 2002

In the standard Big Bang model, assuming the simplest topology (i.e., that space is singly connected), there are three basic possibilities: the universe can be open, flat, or closed. Current data suggests a flat or open universe, although the final verdict is pending. If the universe is either open or flat, then it is spatially infinite at every point in time and the model entails that it contains an infinite number of galaxies, stars, and planets. There exists a common misconception which confuses the universe with the (finite) ‘observable universe’. But the observable part—the part that could causally affect us—would be just an infinitesimal fraction of the whole. Statements about the “mass of the universe” or the “number of protons in the universe” generally refer to the content of this observable part; see e.g. [1]. Many cosmologists believe that our universe is just one in an infinite ensemble of universes (a multiverse), and this adds to the probability that the world is canonically infinite; for a popular review, see [2].” Recent cosmological evidence suggests that the world is probably infinite. Moreover, if the totality of physical existence is indeed infinite, in the kind of way that modern cosmology suggests it is, then it contains an infinite number of galaxies, stars, and planets. If there are an infinite number of planets then **there is, with probability one, an infinite number of people.** Infinitely many of these people are happy, infinitely many are unhappy. Likewise for other local properties that are plausible candidates for having value, pertaining to person‐states, lives, or entire societies, ecosystems, or civilizations—there are infinitely many democratic states, and infinitely many that are ruled by despots, etc.  Suppose the world contains an infinite number of people and a corresponding infinity of joys and sorrows, preference satisfactions and frustrations, instances of virtue and depravation, and other such local phenomena at least some of which have positive or negative value. More precisely, suppose that there is some finite value ε such that there exists an infinite number of local phenomena (this could be a subset of e.g. persons, experiences, characters, virtuous acts, lives, relationships, civilizations, or ecosystems) each of which has a value ≥ ε and also an infinite number of local phenomena each of which has a value ≤ (‒ ε). Call such a world canonically infinite. Ethical theories that hold that value is aggregative imply that a canonically infinite world contains an infinite quantity of positive value and an infinite quantity of negative value. This gives rise to a peculiar predicament. We can do only a finite amount of good or bad. Yet in cardinal arithmetic, **adding** or subtracting **a finite quantity does not change an infinite quantity.** Every possible act of ours therefore has the same net effect on the total amount of good and bad in a canonically infinite world: none whatsoever. Aggregative consequentialist theories threatened by infinitarian paralysis: they seem to imply that if the world is canonically infinite then it is **always** ethically **indifferent what we do.**

## Case

### Solvency

The increase in security that the plan provides is marginal-consensus of lit.

Harris 02 Douglas H. Harris (chairman and principal scientist of Anacapa Sciences, Inc., specialized in improving human performance on inspection, investigation, and intelligence tasks and has served on the National Research Council’s Committee on Commercial Aviation Security and Panel on Airline Passenger Security Screening) “How to Really Improve Airport Security” Ergonomics in Design Winter 2002 <https://www.hfes.org/web/Newsroom/Improve_Airport_Security.pdf> JW 3/23

The low wages paid to screeners are frequently cited as a principal contributor to poor operator performance. It is argued that higher wages would attract “better” people to these jobs and, in turn, lead to better performance. However, increased pay alone is not likely to increase operator performance directly. A substantial body of evidence suggests that any linkage between pay and performance is tenuous at best and is probably insignificant in the face of much more powerful determinants of operator performance, such as job design, performance measurement and feedback, and the match between operator aptitudes and tasks (for example, see Filipczak, 1996; Guzzo, 1988; Guzzo, Jette, & Katzell, 1985; Hertzberg, 1968; Lawler, 1971, 1981).

No internal link to advantages. A. Your evidence says they will target airports, not necessarily airplanes. That means they don’t need to get past security. B. You can’t screen people for deadly diseases means that they can still get away with Ebola if they want to.

If people are super set on bombing the US, even decreasing security threats by 50% won’t do anything. They’ll keep coming back and eventually they will get through.

### Bioterror

Bioterror is empirically denied. The worst case scenario happened… four times.

**Dove 12** <Alan Dove, PhD in Microbiology, science journalist and former Adjunct Professor at New York University, “Who’s Afraid of the Big, Bad Bioterrorist?” Jan 24 2012, http://alandove.com/content/2012/01/whos-afraid-of-the-big-bad-bioterrorist/>

The second problem is much more serious. Eliminating the toxins, we’re left with a list of infectious **bacteria and viruses**. With a single exception, these organisms **are** probably near-**useless as weapons, and history proves it**. There have been at least three well-documented military-style deployments of infectious agents from the list, plus one deployment of an agent that’s not on the list. I’m focusing entirely on the modern era, by the way. There are historical reports of armies catapulting plague-ridden corpses over city walls and conquistadors trying to inoculate blankets with Variola (smallpox), but it’s not clear those “attacks” were effective. Those diseases tended to spread like, well, plagues, so there’s no telling whether the targets really caught the diseases from the bodies and blankets, or simply picked them up through casual contact with their enemies. **Of** the **four modern biowarfare incidents, two have been fatal**. The first was the **1979** Sverdlovsk **anthrax incident**, which **killed** an estimated **100 people**. In that case, a Soviet-built biological weapons lab accidentally released a large plume of weaponized Bacillus anthracis (anthrax) over a major city. Soviet authorities tried to blame the resulting fatalities on “bad meat,” but in the 1990s Western investigators were finally able to piece together the real story. The **second fatal incident also involved anthrax from a government-run lab**: the 2001 “Amerithrax” attacks. That time, a rogue employee (or perhaps employees) of the government’s main bioweapons lab sent weaponized, powdered anthrax through the US postal service. **Five** people **died. That gives us** a grand total of around **105 deaths, entirely from agents** that were grown and **weaponized in officially-sanctioned and funded bioweapons** research **labs**. Remember that. **Terrorist groups have** also **deployed** **bio**logical **weapons twice**, and these cases are very instructive. The first was the 1984 Rajneeshee bioterror attack, in which members of **a cult in Oregon inoculated** restaurant **salad bars with Salmonella** bacteria (an agent that’s not on the “select” list). 751 people got sick, but **nobody died**. Public health authorities handled it as a conventional foodborne Salmonella outbreak, identified the sources and contained them. Nobody even would have known it was a deliberate attack if a member of the cult hadn’t come forward afterward with a confession. Lesson: our **existing public health infrastructure was** entirely **adequate** to respond to a major bioterrorist attack. The **second** genuine bioterrorist **attack** took place in 1993. Members of the **Aum Shinrikyo** cult successfully isolated and **grew** a large stock of **anthrax** bacteria, **then sprayed it** as an aerosol from the roof of a building **in downtown Tokyo**. **The cult was well-financed,** **and had** many **highly educated members, so this** release over the world’s largest city really **represented a worst-case scenario**. **Nobody got sick** or died. From the cult’s perspective, it was a complete and utter failure. Again, the only reason we even found out about it was a post-hoc confession. Aum members later demonstrated their lab skills by producing Sarin nerve gas, with far deadlier results. Lesson: one of the top “select agents” is extremely hard to grow and deploy even for relatively skilled non-state groups. It’s a really crappy bioterrorist weapon. Taken together, these events point to an uncomfortable but inevitable conclusion: our biodefense industry is a far greater threat to us than any actual bioterrorists.

### Retaliation

Nuclear response is impossible because no terror group has a defined location we could target. We can’t just nuke the whole Middle East. We wouldn’t anyway after how badly Iraq went. At worst the impact is a single US nuke because no country could or would retaliate.

Zero chance of a lashout.

Bremmer 4 (Ian, President of Eurasia Group and Senior Fellow at the World Policy Institute, http://www.newstatesman.com/200409130005, AD: 7/7/10) jl

**What would happen if there were a new terrorist attack inside the U**nited **S**tates on 11 September 2004? How would it affect the presidential election campaign? The conventional wisdom is that Americans - their patriotic defiance aroused - would rally to President George W Bush and make him an all but certain winner in November. But consider the differences between the context of the original 9/11 and that of any attack which might occur this autumn. In 2001, the public reaction was one of disbelief and incomprehension. Many Americans realised for the first time that large-scale terrorist attacks on US soil were not only conceivable; they were, perhaps, inevitable. A majority focused for the first time on the threat from al-Qaeda, on the Taliban and on the extent to which Saudis were involved in terrorism. This time, the public response would move much more quickly from shock to anger; debate over how America should respond would begin immediately. Yet **it is difficult to imagine how the Bush administration could focus its response on an external enemy**. Should the US send 50,000 troops to the Afghan-Pakistani border to intensify the hunt for Osama Bin Laden and "step up" efforts to attack the heart of al-Qaeda? Many would wonder if that wasn't what the administration pledged to do after the attacks three years ago. **The president would face intensified criticism from those who have argued all along that Iraq was a distraction** from "the real war on terror".And what if a significant number of the terrorists responsible for the pre-election attack were again Saudis? **The Bush administration could hardly take military action against the Saudi government** at a time when crude-oil prices are already more than $45 a barrel and global supply is stretched to the limit. While the Saudi royal family might support a co-ordinated attack against terrorist camps, real or imagined, near the Yemeni border - where recent searches for al-Qaeda have concentrated - that would seem like a trivial, insufficient retaliation for an attack on the US mainland. Remember how the Republicans criticised Bill Clinton's administration for ineffectually "bouncing the rubble" in Afghanistan after the al-Qaeda attacks on the US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in the 1990s. So what kind of response might be credible? Washington's concerns about Iran are rising. The 9/11 commission report noted evidence of co-operation between Iran and al-Qaeda operatives, if not direct Iranian advance knowledge of the 9/11 hijacking plot. Over the past few weeks, US officials have been more explicit, too, in declaring Iran's nuclear programme "unacceptable". However, **in the absence of an official** Iranian **claim of responsibility for this hypothetical terrorist attack, the domestic opposition to such a war and the international outcry it would provoke would make quick action** against Iran **unthinkable.**In short, **a decisive response from Bush could not be external. It would have to be domestic**. Instead of Donald Rumsfeld, the defence secretary, leading a war effort abroad, Tom Ridge, the homeland security secretary, and John Ashcroft, the attorney general, would pursue an anti-terror campaign at home. Forced to use legal tools more controversial than those provided by the Patriot Act, Americans would experience stepped-up domestic surveillance and border controls, much tighter security in public places and the detention of a large number of suspects. Many Americans would undoubtedly support such moves. But **concern for civil liberties and personal freedom would ensure that the government would have nowhere near the public support it enjoyed for the invasion of Afghanistan**.

#### No disease impact. Empirics and evolution

Posner 5 Senior Lecturer, U Chicago Law. Judge on the US Court of Appeals 7th Circuit. AB from Yale and LLB from Harvard. (Richard, Catastrophe, <http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi_0199-4150331/Catastrophe-the-dozen-most-significant.html>)

Yet the fact that Homo sapiens has managed to survive every disease to assail it in the 200,000 years or so of its existence is a source of genuine comfort, at least if the focus is on extinction events. There have been enormously destructive plagues, such as the Black Death, smallpox, and now AIDS, but none has come close to destroying the entire human race. There is a biological reason. Natural selection favors germs of limited lethality; they are fitter in an evolutionary sense because their genes are more likely to be spread if the germs do not kill their hosts too quickly. The AIDS virus is an example of a lethal virus, wholly natural, that by lying dormant yet infectious in its host for years maximizes its spread. Yet there is no danger that AIDS will destroy the entire human race. The likelihood of a natural pandemic that would cause the extinction of the human race is probably even less today than in the past (except in prehistoric times, when people lived in small, scattered bands, which would have limited the spread of disease), despite wider human contacts that make it more difficult to localize an infectious disease.

#### Empirically denied. Extinction should have happened in the 4,000 years before we had public hygiene, hospitals, and modern medicine.

# 2NR

### A2 Permissibility & Prohibition Theory

Counter interp: debaters may read one reason why consequentialism generates no obligation and is prohibitory if a) it is disclosed on the NDCA LD wiki b) the aff specified a specific group of employers, and c) they only read one reason consequentialism generates no obligation. I meet. Prefer:

1. only way to garner turns to aff given that you read a hyper specific aff with no good offense-T shell abuse is proven

2. textually my ground-ought implies obligation so anything not obligation is neg ground

Maintaining textuality as a rule best achieves fairness and education.

Nebel 4 Jake Nebel (debate coach his students have won the TOC, NDCA, Glenbrooks, Bronx, Emory, TFA State, and the Harvard Round Robin. As a debater, he won six octos-bid championships and was top speaker at the TOC and ten other major tournaments) “The Priority of Resolutional Semantics by Jake Nebel” VBriefly February 20th 2015 <http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/> JW 2/20/15

One way admits that such pragmatic considerations are relevant—i.e., they are reasons to change the topic—but holds that they are outweighed by the reasons for the topicality rule. It would be better if everyone debated the resolution as worded, whatever it is, than if everyone debated whatever subtle variation on the resolution they favored. Affirmatives would unfairly abuse (and have already abused) the entitlement to choose their own unpredictable adventure, and negatives would respond (and have already responded) with strategies that are designed to avoid clash—including an essentially vigilantist approach to topicality in which debaters enforce their own pet resolutions on an arbitrary, round-by-round basis. Think here of the utilitarian case for internalizing rules against lying, murder, and other intuitively wrong acts. As the great utilitarian Henry Sidgwick argued, wellbeing is maximized not by everyone doing what they think maximizes wellbeing, but rather (in general) by people sticking to the rules of common sense morality. Otherwise, people are more likely to act on mistaken utility calculations and engage in self-serving violations of useful rules, thereby undermining social practices that promote wellbeing in the long run. That is exactly what happens if we reject the topicality rule in favor of direct appeals to pragmatic considerations. Sticking to a rule that applies regardless of the topic, of the debaters’ preferred variations on the topic, and of debaters’ familiarity with the national circuit’s flavor of the week, avoids these problems.