## FW

#### The Value is morality because of the phrase ought in the resolutions

#### Since public colleges are the actors of the resolution their actions should be based on how governments ought to act. Governments must be practical and have consent among the ruled

Rhonheimer 05 [MARTIN RHONHEIMER 5 [Prof Of Philosophy at The Pontifical University of the Holy Cross in Rome. “THE POLITICAL ETHOS OF CONSTITUTIONAL DEMOCRACY AND THE PLACE OF NATURAL LAW IN PUBLIC REASON: RAWLS’S “POLITICAL LIBERALISM” REVISITED” The American Journal of Jurisprudence vol. 50 (2005), pp. 1-70]

It is a fundamental feature of political philosophy to be part of practical philosophy. ¶ Political philosophy belongs to ethics, which is practical, for it both reflects on practical ¶ knowledge and aims at action. Therefore, it is **not only** normative, but must consider the concrete conditions of realization. The rationale of political institutions **and action** must be understood as embedded in concrete **cultural and, therefore, historical** contexts **and** as meeting with problems that only in these contexts are understandable. A normative political philosophy which would abstract from the [ignore] conditions of realizability would be ¶ trying to establish norms for realizing the “idea of the good” or of “the just” (as Plato, in ¶ fact, tried to do in his Republic). Such a purely metaphysical view, however, [and is] is doomed to failure. As a theory of political praxis, political philosophy must include in its reflection the concrete historical context, historical experiences and the corresponding knowledge of the proper logic of the political.¶ 14¶ Briefly: political philosophy is not metaphysics, which contemplates the necessary order of being, but practical philosophy, which ¶ deals with partly contingent matters and aims at action. ¶ Moreover, unlike moral norms in general—natural law included,—which rule the ¶ actions of a person—“my acting” and pursuing the good—, the logic of the political is ¶ characterized [shown] by acts like framing institutions and establishing legal rules by which not only personal actions but the actions of a multitude **of** persons are regulated by the coercive force of state power, and by which a part of citizens exercises power over others. ¶ Political actions are, thus, both actions of the whole of the body politic and referring to ¶ the whole of the community of citizens.¶ 15¶ Unless we wish to espouse a platonic view according to which some persons are by ¶ nature rulers while others are by nature subjects, we will stick to the Aristotelian differentiation between the “domestic” and the “political” kind of rule¶ 16¶ : unlike domestic rule, ¶ which is over people with a common interest and harmoniously striving after the same ¶ good [despotism] and, therefore, according to Aristotle is essentially “despotic,” political rule is exercised over free persons who represent a plurality of [have many] interests and pursue, in the common context of the polis, different goods. The exercise of such political rule, therefore, needs justification and is continuously in search of [searches for] consent among those who are [the] ruled, but who potentially at the same time are also the rulers.

#### And, the only way policymakers can justify their decisions to the citizenry is to follow a utilitarian calculus.

Woller 97 [Woller, Gary BYU Prof., “An Overview by Gary Woller”, A Forum on the Role of Environmental Ethics, June 1997, pg. 10]

Moreover, virtually all public policies entail some redistribution of economic or political resources, such that one group's gains must come at another group's ex- pense. Consequently, public policies in a democracy must be justified to the public, and especially to those who pay the costs of those policies. Such justification cannot simply be assumed a priori by invoking some higher-order moral principle. Appeals toa priori moral principles, such as environmental preservation, also oftenfail to acknowledge that public policiesinevitably entail trade-offs among competing values. Thus since policymakers cannot justify inherent value conflicts to the public in any philosophical sense, and since public policiesinherently imply winners and losers, the policymakers' duty [is]to the public interest requires **them** to demonstrate thatthe redistributive effects and value trade-offs implied by their polices are **somehow** to theoverall advantage of society.At the same time, deontologically based ethical systems have severe practical limitations as a basis for public policy. At best, a priorimoral principles provide only general guidance to ethical dilemmas in public affairs and do **not themselves suggest appropriate public policies, and at worst, they** create a regimen of regulatory unreasonableness while failing to adequatelyaddress the problem[.] or actually making it worse. For example, a moral obligation to preserve the environment by no means implies the best way, or any way for that matter, to do so, just as there is no a priori reason to believe that any policy that claims to preserve the environment will actually do so. Any number of policies might work, and others, although seemingly consistent with the moral principle, will fail utterly. That deontological principles are an inadequate basis for environmental policy is evident in the rather significant irony that most forms of deontologically based environmental laws and regulations tend to be implemented in a very utilitarian manner by street-level enforcement officials. Moreover, ignoring the relevant costs and benefits of environmental policy and their attendant incentive structures can, as alluded to above, actually work at cross purposes to environmental preservation. (There exists an extensive literature on this aspect of regulatory enforcement and the often perverse outcomes of regulatory policy. See, for example, Ackerman, 1981; Bartrip and Fenn, 1983; Hawkins, 1983, 1984; Hawkins and Thomas, 1984.) Even the most die-hard preservationist/deontologist would, I believe, be troubled by this outcome. The above points are perhaps best expressed by Richard Flathman, The number of values typically involved in public policy decisions, the broad categories which must be employed and above all, the scope and complexity of the consequences to be anticipated militate against reasoning so conclusively that they generate an imperative to institute a specific policy.It is seldom the case that only one policy will meet the criteria of the public interest (1958, p. 12). It therefore follows thatin a democracy, policymakers have an ethical duty to establish a plausible link between policy alternatives and the problems they address,and the public must be reasonably assured that a policy will actually do something about an existing problem; this requires the means-end language and methodology of utilitarian ethics. Good intentions, lofty rhetoric, and moral piety are an insufficient though perhaps at times a necessary, basis for public policy in a democracy.

#### AND, Utilitarianism is the only theory relevant to morality because consequences are the only form of value we can experience

Harris 10 [Sam Harris CEO of Project reason “The Moral Landscape: How Science Can Determine Human Values” 2010]

Here is my (consequentialist) starting point: all questions of value (right and wrong, good and evil, etc.) depend upon the possibility of experiencing such value. Without potential consequences at the level of experience—happiness, suffering, joy, despair, etc.—all talk of value is empty. Therefore, to say that an act is morally necessary, or evil, or blameless, is to make (tacit) claims about its consequences in the lives of conscious creatures (whether actual or potential). I am unaware of any interesting exception to this rule. Needless to say, [For example,] if one is worried about pleasing God or His angels, this assumes that such invisible entities are conscious (in some sense) and cognizant of human behavior. It also generally assumes [and] that it is possible to suffer their [his] wrath or enjoy their approval, either in this world or the world to come. Even within religion, therefore, consequences and conscious states remain the foundation of all values.

#### Thus the standard is maximizing net benefits.

Extinction comes first

Uncertainty means we should default to preventing extinction to ensure the future has the possibility of more value. Indicts to the framework mandates it since we need as many perspectives as possible to resolve and act in accordance with the coherent ethical view. Framework contestation concedes the desire to escape uncertainty.

1. Risk analysis means preventing existential risk comes first. Bostrom 05

Bostrom, Nick. [Professor of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School, Director of Future of Humanity Institute Director of Programme on the Impacts of Future Technology, Professor of University of Oxford] "Transcript of "A Philosophical Quest for Our Biggest Problems"" TED. TED Conferences, July 2005. Web. 27 Dec. 2014. PH

Now, if we think about what just reducing the probability of human extinction by just one percentage point -- not very much -- so that's equivalent to 60 million lives saved, if we just count the currently living people, the current generation. Now one percent of six billion people is equivalent to 60 million. So that's a large number. If we were to take into account future generations that will never come into existence if we blow ourselves up, then the figure becomes astronomical. If we could eventually colonize a chunk of the universe -- the Virgo supercluster -- maybe it will take us 100 million years to get there, but if we go extinct we never will. Then, even a one percentage point reduction in the extinction risk could be equivalent to this astronomical number -- 10 to the power of 32. So if you take into account future generations as much as our own, every other moral imperative of philanthropic cost just becomes irrelevant. The only thing you should focus on would be to reduce existential risk because even the tiniest decrease in existential risk would just overwhelm any other benefit you could hope to achieve. And even if you just look at the current people, and ignore the potential that would be lost if we went extinct, it should still have a high priority. Now, let me spend the rest of my time on the third big problem, because it's more subtle and perhaps difficult to grasp. Think about some time in your life -- some people might never have experienced it -- but some people, there are just those moments that you have experienced where life was fantastic.

This means if there were a 1% chance of consequentialism being true, existential risk would be bad for the purpose of decision-making.

## Advantages

### Advantage 1 is Democracy

#### Speech restrictions for professors spillover and create students who don’t believe in the 1st amendment this is empirically proven. Lukianoff:

Greg Lukianoff (attorney and president of Foundation for Individual Rights in Education). “Speech Codes: Alive and Well, 10 years later.” Huffington Post. 10/15/13. JY.

In my 2012 book, Unlearning Liberty: Campus Censorship and the End of American Debate, I argue that **campus censorship is contributing to** an atmosphere of **stifled discourse**. I cite a 2010 study **by the Association of American Colleges and Universities** that **found only 16.7% of professors strongly agree** with the statement **that it is “safe to hold unpopular positions on campus.”** Students report similar beliefs, with **only 30.3% of college seniors strongly agree**ing. More recent data gives me even more cause for concern: This summer, the First Amendment Center unveiled its annual survey of attitudes about free speech and found that a startling **47% of young people believe that the First Amendment “goes too far.”** While I hope that this is an anomalous fluctuation, **it seems almost inevitable that if campuses show** at best impatience with, and at worst outright **hostility to, free speech, it would** eventually **produce students who take free speech for granted and** even **show support for “enlightened” censors**. Censorship, of any stripe, is incompatible with academic freedom and the entire teaching-and-learning enterprise. Colleges and universities continue on this trajectory at their ultimate peril.

#### The students of today are the leaders of tomorrow so speech restrictions on campuses raise a generation of American leaders who won’t hesitate to restrict speech when they see fit.

#### Finally, freedom of speech guards against tyranny and must be protected in every instance. Pinker:

Steven Pinker (professor of psychology at Harvard). “Why free speech is fundamental.” Boston Globe. 1/27/15. JY.

A third reason that free speech is foundational to human flourishing is that it is essential to democracy and a bulwark against tyranny. How did the monstrous regimes of the 20th century gain and hold power? The answer is that groups of armed fanatics silenced their critics and adversaries. (The 1933 election that gave the Nazis a plurality was preceded by years of intimidation, murder, and violent mayhem.) And once in power, the totalitarians criminalized any criticism of the regime. This is also true of the less genocidal but still brutal regimes of today, such as those in China, Russia, African strongman states, and much of the Islamic world. Why do dictators brook no dissent? One can imagine autocrats who feathered their nests and jailed or killed only those who directly attempted to usurp their privileges, while allowing their powerless subjects to complain all they want. There’s a good reason dictatorships don’t work that way. The immiserated subjects of a tyrannical regime are not deluded that they are happy, and if tens of millions of disaffected citizens act together, no regime has the brute force to resist them. The reason that citizens don’t resist their overlords en masse is that they lack *common knowledge* — the awareness that everyone shares their knowledge and knows they share it. People will expose themselves to the risk of reprisal by a despotic regime only if they know that others are exposing themselves to that risk at the same time. Common knowledge is created by public information, such as a broadcasted statement. The story of “The Emperor’s New Clothes’’ illustrates the logic. When the little boy shouted that the emperor was naked, he was not telling them anything they didn’t already know, anything they couldn’t see with their own eyes. But he was changing their knowledge nonetheless, because now everyone knew that everyone else knew that the emperor was naked. And that common knowledge emboldened them to challenge the emperor’s authority with their laughter. The story reminds us why humor is no laughing matter — why satire and ridicule, even when puerile and tasteless, are terrifying to autocrats and protected by democracies. Satire can stealthily challenge assumptions that are second nature to an audience by forcing them to see that those assumptions lead to consequences that everyone recognizes are absurd. That’s why humor so often serves as an accelerant to social progress. Eighteenth-century wiseguys like Voltaire, Swift, and Johnson ridiculed the wars, oppressions, and cruel practices of their day. In the 1960s, comedians and artists portrayed racists as thick-witted Neanderthals and Vietnam hawks and nuclear cold warriors as amoral psychopaths. The Soviet Union and its satellites had a rich underground current of satire, as in the common definition of the two Cold War ideologies: “Capitalism is the exploitation of man by man; Communism is the exact opposite.” We use barbed speech to undermine not just political dictators but the petty oppressors of everyday life: the tyrannical boss, the sanctimonious preacher, the blowhard at the bar, the neighborhood enforcer of stifling norms. It’s true that free speech has limits. We carve out exceptions for fraud, libel, extortion, divulging military secrets, and incitement to imminent lawless action. But these exceptions must be strictly delineated and individually justified; they are not an excuse to treat speech as one fungible good among many. Despots in so-called “democratic republics” routinely jail their opponents on charges of treason, libel, and inciting lawlessness. Britain’s lax libel laws have been used to silence critics of political figures, business oligarchs, Holocaust deniers, and medical quacks. Even Oliver Wendell Holmes’s famous exception to free speech — falsely shouting “Fire!” in a crowded theater — is easily abused, not least by Holmes himself. He coined the meme in a 1919 Supreme Court case that upheld the conviction of a man who distributed leaflets encouraging men to resist the draft during World War I, a clear expression of opinion in a democracy.

#### American commitment to free speech sets an example to the world. Pinker:

Steven Pinker (professor of psychology at Harvard). “Why free speech is fundamental.” Boston Globe. 1/27/15. JY.

**It may seem outlandish to link American campus freedom** — which by historical and global standards is still admirably high — **to the world’s brutal regimes**. But I’m here to tell you that the connection is not that far-fetched. This morning I woke up in Oslo, after having addressed the Oslo Freedom Forum, a kind of TED for political dissidents. **I met people who escaped from North Korea by walking across the Gobi desert in winter; [but for] people who were jailed for a single tweet;** people whose families were thrown in prison because of their own political activity. These stories put the relatively minor restrictions on campus speech in perspective. But the **American commitment to unfettered speech**, unrivaled even by our democratic allies in Europe, **stands as a beacon of inspiration to the world’s dissidents**, one of the few features of the American brand that still commands global admiration**. At least one speaker** at the Forum **singled out speech codes** and other restrictions on expression **in the United States as a worrisome development**.

#### Democracy decreases international war

Lynn-Jones 98, Sean M [Editor, International Security; Series Editor, Belfer Center Studies in International Security]. "Why the United States Should Spread Democracy." Discussion Paper 98-07, Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard University, March 1998.

* blue

B. Democracy is Good for the International System In addition to improving the lives of individual citizens in new democracies, the spread of democracy will benefit the international system by reducing the likelihood of war. Democracies do not wage war on other democracies. This absence-or near absence, depending on the definitions of "war" and "democracy" used-has been called "one of the strongest nontrivial and nontautological generalizations that can be made about international relations."51 One scholar argues that "the absence of war between democracies comes as close as anything we have to an empirical law in international relations."52 If the number of democracies in the international system continues to grow, the number of potential conflicts that might escalate to war will diminish. Although wars between democracies and nondemocracies would persist in the short run, in the long run an international system composed of democracies would be a peaceful world. At the very least, adding to the number of democracies would gradually enlarge the democratic "zone of peace."

#### Democracy is better than all other systems-multiple warrants.

Fukuyama and McFaul 7 – Francis Fukuyama [Bernard L. Schwartz Professor of International Political Economy at the School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS) of Johns Hopkins University and director of SAIS’ International Development program]. Michael McFaul [the Peter and Helen Bing Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution, where he codirects the Iran Democracy Project. He is also the director of the Center on Democracy, Development, and Rule of Law at the Freeman Spogli Institute and professor of political science at Stanford University. He is also a nonresident senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.] “Should Democracy Be Promoted or Demoted?” The Stanley Foundation. June 2007. <http://www.stanleyfoundation.org/publications/other/fukuymcfaul07.pdf>

* No alt to democracy
* Holds rulers accountable – reduces abusive rule
* Drives better governance
* Reduces bad rulers, complacency, corruption
* Avoids genocide and famine
* Better economic growth
* AT: imperialism Ks – universal appeal and people want democracy

First and foremost, democracy is the best system of government. Winston Churchill was right: democracy is a terrible system of government, but still better than all of the others that have been tried. Democracy provides the best institutional form for holding rulers accountable to their people. If leaders must compete for popular support to obtain and retain power, then they will be more responsive to the preferences of the people, in contrast to rulers who do not govern on the basis of popular support. The institutions of democracy also prevent abusive rule, constrain bad rule, and provide a mechanism for removing corrupt or ineffective rule. Furthermore, democracy provides the setting for political competition, which in turn is a driver for better governance. Like markets, political competition between contending leaders, ideas, and organizations produces better leaders, ideas, and organizations (which is the premise of the Bridging the Foreign Policy Divide project). At a minimum, democracy provides a mechanism for removing bad rulers in a way that autocracy does not. The absence of political competition in autocracies produces complacency, corruption, and has no mechanism for producing new leaders. Second, democracies provide more, and more stable, welfare for their people than do autocracies. Democracies avoid the worst threats to personal well-being, such as genocide and famine. Over the last several decades, democracies around the world have not produced higher economic growth rates than autocracies: “the net effect of more political freedom on growth is theoretically ambiguous.”4 Instead, compared to democracies, autocracies produce both much higher and much lower rates of growth. For every China there is an Angola. Democracies tend to produce slower rates of growth than the best autocratic performers, but also steadier rates of economic development. The old conventional wisdom that dictators are better at economic modernization than the democratic counterparts is not supported by data. Third, the demand for and appeal of democracy as a system of government are widespread, if not universal. Public opinion surveys of people throughout the world, including the wider Middle East, show that majorities in most countries support democracy.5 Ideological challengers remain, such as the modernizing autocrat or Osama bin Ladenism. But compared to earlier historical periods, these opponents of democracy have never been weaker.

#### Additionally, democracy empirically avoids internal mass killings.

**Rummel ’91** (Ph.D. in political science from Northwestern University, BA and MA from the University of Hawaii, frequently nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize, “The Democratic Peace: A New Idea?”, 1991 <https://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/POLSYS.ART.HTM#1> )

The organizers of this conference asked me write a taxonomic paper on the question: "Can the relative bellicosity of states be measured and predicted as a function of their internal political system?" The answer of most current empirical research is decidedly yes. Indeed, the empirical relationship is even more profound and comprehensive than the question implies. In theory and fact, the more democratic the political systems of two states, the less violence between them; and if they are both democratic, violence is precluded altogether. That is, democratic states do not make war on each other. Moreover, **the** **more democratic a political system, the less foreign and domestic** collective **violence; the more totalitarian, the more likely such violence**. Perhaps the most surprising finding is that **the less democratic a government, the more likely it will kill its own citizens in cold blood, independent of any foreign or domestic war.** Now, war is not the most deadly form of violence. Indeed, while 36 million people have been killed in battle in all foreign and domestic wars in our century, **at least 119 million** more **have been killed by government genocide, massacres, and other mass killing. And about 115 million of these were killed by totalitarian governments** (as many as 95 million by communist ones). **There is no case of democracies killing en masse their own citizens**. The inverse relationship between democracy and foreign violence, collective domestic violence, or government genocide is **[This is] not simply a correlation, but a cause and effect.** In a nutshell, **democratic freedom promotes nonviolence**. These results are worthy of the greatest attention and analysis, for if true, which I am now convinced they are, then peace research has in fact defined a policy for minimizing collective violence and eliminating war: enhance and foster democratic institutions--civil liberties and political rights--here and abroad. Impact: **Democracies are inherently stable. the decrease in democracy is directly responsible for increased risk of international conflict, which can turn deadly.**

### Advantage 2 is Educational Competition

#### Academic freedom is in danger and harms the legitimacy of research by discouraging rigorous peer review Wildavsky et. Al 2

[Wildavsky, Rachel, and Erin O'Connor. "Free to Teach, Free to Learn: Understanding and Maintaining Academic Freedom in Higher Education." American Council of Trustees and Alumni (2013). Erin O’Connor is an Associate Professor of Sociology in the Department of Politics and Human Rights at Marymount Manhattan College]

Academic freedom is in danger on many fronts. Campus speech codes and double standards have produced an environment where professors and students are punished for expressing unorthodox views, and where robust debate among multiple viewpoints is discouraged. Post-tenure review is ineffective and peer review is compromised: Studies show that cheating among faculty and students is widespread, that training in professional ethics is almost nonexistent, and that policies on conflict of interest, plagiarism, and research misconduct are erratically and weakly enforced. Shared governance is a cornerstone of academic life and a primary component of academic freedom—and yet, in the wake of the U.S. Supreme Court’s 2006 ruling in Garcetti v. Ceballos, lower courts are finding that professors may be disciplined and even fired for speaking out on governance matters.

#### Professors need to be able to express themselves fully for any education to be gained Wildavsky et. al

[Wildavsky, Rachel, and Erin O'Connor. "Free to Teach, Free to Learn: Understanding and Maintaining Academic Freedom in Higher Education." American Council of Trustees and Alumni (2013). Erin O’Connor is an Associate Professor of Sociology in the Department of Politics and Human Rights at Marymount Manhattan College]

The second function—which for a long time was the only function—of the American college or university is to provide instruction for students. It is scarcely open to question that freedom of utterance is as important to the teacher as it is to the investigator. No [person] man can be a successful teacher unless [t]he[y] enjoys the respect of his students, and their confidence in his [their] intellectual integrity. It is clear, however, that this confidence will be impaired if there is suspicion on the part of the student that the teacher is not expressing himself [themselves] fully or frankly, or that college and university teachers in general are a repressed and intimidated class who dare not speak with that candor and courage which youth always demands in those whom it is to esteem. The average student is a discerning observer, who soon takes the measure of his instructor. It is not only the character of the instruction but also the character of the instructor that counts; and if the student has reason to believe that the instructor is not true to [them self] himself, the virtue of the instruction as an educative force is incalculably diminished. There must be in the mind of the teacher no mental reservation. He must give the student the best of what he has and what he is.

#### Due to this college academic performance is declining- kills international competitiveness. Jaschik 15

Jaschik, Scott. "Report Finds U.S. Millennial Generation Faring Poorly Educationally Compared to Those of OECD Nations | InsideHigherEd." Mediocre Millennials. Marymount University, 17 Feb. 2015. Web. 20 Apr. 2015. PH

Comparisons of the educational levels of Americans with those of other industrialized nations rarely reassure[s] those in the United States. And a new analysis released today by the Educational Testing Service is likely to be unsettling to many. The new study makes use of data collected by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development through a project called the Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (or PIAAC). The[y] data look at the capabilities of all adults (and of groups of adults) rather than comparing those at certain grade levels, as is the case with many international comparisons. In theory, an all-adult focus might benefit Americans, since much of the rest of the world has only more recently sought to provide a higher education (or higher levels of secondary education) to broad cross sections of their populations. But the results show the United States lagging most O.E.C.D. nations. The PIAAC focuses on three areas: literacy, numeracy and problem solving. The ETS study focuses on millennials (those 16 to 34), noting that they will be in the American workforce for many decades to come and reflect the current state of the American educational system. Here are some of the highlights: In literacy, millennials in the U.S. were better only than Spain and Italy among the 22 participating O.E.C.D. countries. In numeracy, millennials in the U.S. were tied for last with Italy and Spain. In problem solving, millennials in the U.S. again ranked last, this time tied with the Slovak Republic, Ireland and Poland. Countries that ranked high for millennial score levels (in order, across fields): Finland, Japan, Sweden, Netherlands and Norway. The U.S. millennial population of course includes both those with and without a college education. And the data show that a college degree is no guarantee of comparing well internationally. U.S. millennials with a four-year bachelor’s degree scored higher in numeracy than their counterparts in only two countries in the study: Poland and Spain. Further, the best-educated millennials -- those who have a master's or a research-oriented degree -- only outperformed across all fields their counterparts in Ireland, Poland and Spain. The ETS study also looked at various demographic groupings. For instance, the study found a strong correlation between the millennial skill levels and parental levels of educational attainment. But there was no country that scored lower than the United States across all levels of parental educational attainment. Another interesting finding relates to immigrant populations. In most of the countries studied, native-born millennials outperformed immigrant millennials, not surprising since the latter would have been uprooted at some point, perhaps interrupting their education. When the researchers isolated the scores of native-born U.S. millennials and compared them to those of other countries, the Americans did not perform higher than those in any other country.

#### Better education ensures future competitiveness in the global economy- teachers are uniquely key. Hanushek 11

Hanushek, Eric A. "Valuing Teachers: How Much Is a Good Teacher Worth?" Valuing Teachers: How Much Is a Good Teacher Worth? Education Next, Summer 2011. Web. 24 Apr. 2015. PH

For some time, we have recognized that the academic achievement of schoolchildren in this country threatens, to borrow President Barack Obama’s words, “the U.S.’s role as an engine of scientific discovery” and ultimately its success in the global economy. The low achievement of American students, as reflected in the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) (see “Teaching Math to the Talented,” features, Winter 2011), will prevent them from accessing good, high-paying jobs. And, as demonstrated in another article in Education Next (see “Education and Economic Growth,” research, Spring 2008), lower achievement means slower growth in the economy. From studying the historical relationship, we can estimate that closing just half of the performance gap with Finland, one of the top international performers in terms of student achievement, could add more than $50 trillion to our gross domestic product between 2010 and 2090. By way of comparison, the drop in economic output over the course of the last recession is believed to be less than $3 trillion. Thus the achievement gap between the U.S. and the world’s top-performing countries can be said to be causing the equivalent of a permanent recession. According to the president in this year’s State of the Union address, this is “our generation’s Sputnik moment,” the time when we realize the urgent need to step up the performance of our education system. Only today, unlike in the 1950s, we have a clear idea of what it takes to improve achievement. The quality of the teachers in our schools is paramount: no other measured aspect of schools is nearly as important in determining student achievement. The initiatives we have emphasized in policy discussions—class-size reduction, curriculum revamping, reorganization of school schedule, investment in technology—all fall far short of the impact that good teachers can have in the classroom. Moreover, many of these interventions can be very costly. Indeed, the magnitude of variation in the quality of teachers, even within each school, is startling. Teachers who work in a given school, and therefore teach students with similar demographic characteristics, can be responsible for increases in math and reading levels that range from a low of one-half year to a high of one and a half years of learning each academic year. But while most parents are able to distinguish a good teacher from a bad one, few have any idea what difference it makes in the lives of their children. And researchers do not help, tending to talk in terms of standard deviations of achievement and effect sizes, phrases that simply have no meaning outside of the rarefied world of research. Here, I translate the researchers’ shorthand into concepts that might be more readily understood: the impact of teachers on the earnings of individuals and on the future of the economy as a whole.

#### Competitiveness prevents great power nuclear war. Khalilzad ‘11

Khalilzad, Zalmay. "The Economy and National Security." National Review Online. National Review, 8 Feb. 2011. Web. 26 Apr. 2015. PH

We face this domestic challenge while other major powers are experiencing rapid economic growth. Even though countries such as China, India, and Brazil have profound political, social, demographic, and economic problems, their economies are growing faster than ours, and this could alter the global distribution of power. These trends could in the long term produce a multi-polar world. If U.S. policymakers fail to act and other powers continue to grow, it is not a question of whether but when a new international order will emerge. The closing of the gap between the United States and its rivals could intensify geopolitical competition among major powers, increase incentives for local powers to play major powers against one another, and undercut our will to preclude or respond to international crises because of the higher risk of escalation. The stakes are high. In modern history, the longest period of peace among the great powers has been the era of U.S. leadership. By contrast, multi-polar systems have been unstable, with their competitive dynamics resulting in frequent crises and major wars among the great powers. Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both world wars. American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of arms races, miscalculation, or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions. As rival powers rise, Asia in particular is likely to emerge as a zone of great-power competition. Beijing’s economic rise has enabled a dramatic military buildup focused on acquisitions of naval, cruise, and ballistic missiles, long-range stealth aircraft, and anti-satellite capabilities. China’s strategic modernization is aimed, ultimately, at denying the United States access to the seas around China. Even as cooperative economic ties in the region have grown, China’s expansive territorial claims — and provocative statements and actions following crises in Korea and incidents at sea — have roiled its relations with South Korea, Japan, India, and Southeast Asian states. Still, the United States is the most significant barrier facing Chinese hegemony and aggression. Given the risks, the United States must focus on restoring its economic and fiscal condition while checking and managing the rise of potential adversarial regional powers such as China. While we face significant challenges, the U.S. economy still accounts for over 20 percent of the world’s GDP. American institutions — particularly those providing enforceable rule of law — set it apart from all the rising powers. Social cohesion underwrites political stability. U.S. demographic trends are healthier than those of any other developed country. A culture of innovation, excellent institutions of higher education, and a vital sector of small and medium-sized enterprises propel the U.S. economy in ways difficult to quantify. Historically, Americans have responded pragmatically, and sometimes through trial and error, to work our way through the kind of crisis that we face today.

#### War also causes species extinction. Robock and Slanina 09

Robock and Slanina 9 – Prof Climatology @ Rutgers, Alan, Head of Environmental Research @ Netherlands Energy Research Foundation, Sjaak, "Nuclear winter." In: Encyclopedia of Earth. Eds. Cutler J. Cleveland http://www.eoearth.org/article/Nuclear\_winter

Nuclear winter is a term that describes the climatic effects of nuclear war. In the 1980's, work conducted jointly by Western and Soviet scientists showed that for a full-scale nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union the climatic consequences, and indirect effects of the collapse of society, would be so severe that the ensuing nuclear winter would produce famine for billions of people far from the target zones. There are several wrong impressions that people have about nuclear winter. One is that there was a flaw in the theory and that the large climatic effects were disproven. Another is that the problem, even if it existed, has been solved by the end of the nuclear arms race. But these are both wrong. Furthermore, new nuclear states threaten global climate change even with arsenals that are much less than 1% of the current global arsenal. What's New Based on new work published in 2007 and 2008 by some of the pioneers of nuclear winter research who worked on the original studies, we now can say several things about this topic. New Science: \* A minor nuclear war (such as between India and Pakistan or in the Middle East), with each country using 50 Hiroshima-sized atom bombs as airbursts on urban areas, could produce climate change unprecedented in recorded human history. This is only 0.03% of the explosive power of the current global arsenal. \* This same scenario would produce global ozone depletion, because the heating of the stratosphere would enhance the chemical reactions that destroy ozone. \* A nuclear war between the United States and Russia today could produce nuclear winter, with temperatures plunging below freezing in the summer in major agricultural regions, threatening the food supply for most of the planet. \* The climatic effects of the smoke from burning cities and industrial areas would last for several years, much longer than we previously thought. New climate model simulations, that have the capability of including the entire atmosphere and oceans, show that the smoke would be lofted by solar heating to the upper stratosphere, where it would remain for years. New Policy Implications: The only way to eliminate the possibility of this climatic catastrophe is to eliminate the nuclear weapons. If they exist, they can be used. \* The spread of nuclear weapons to new emerging states threatens not only the people of those countries, but the entire planet.\* Rapid reduction of the American and Russian nuclear arsenals will set an example for the rest of the world that nuclear weapons cannot be used and are not needed. How Does Nuclear Winter Work? A nuclear explosion is like bringing a piece of the Sun to the Earth's surface for a fraction of a second. Like a giant match, it causes cities and industrial areas to burn. Megacities have developed in India and Pakistan and other developing countries, providing tremendous amounts of fuel for potential fires. The direct effects of the nuclear weapons, blast, radioactivity, fires, and extensive pollution, would kill millions of people, but only those near the targets. However, the fires would have another effect. The massive amounts of dark smoke from the fires would be lofted into the upper troposphere, 10-15 kilometers (6-9 miles) above the Earth's surface, and then absorption of sunlight would further heat the smoke, lifting it into the stratosphere, a layer where the smoke would persist for years, with no rain to wash it out. The climatic effects of smoke from fires started by nuclear war depend on the amount of smoke. Our new calculations show that for 50 nuclear weapons dropped on two countries, on the targets that would produce the maximum amount of smoke, about 5 megatons (Tg) of black smoke would be produced, accounting for the amount emitted from the fires and the amount immediately washed out in rain. As the smoke is lofted into the stratosphere, it would be transported around the world by the prevailing winds. We also did calculations for two scenarios of war between the two superpowers who still maintain large nuclear arsenals, the United States and Russia. In one scenario, 50 Tg of black smoke would be produced and in another, 150 Tg of black smoke would be produced. How many nuclear weapons would be required to produce this much smoke? It depends on the targets, but there are enough weapons in the current arsenals to produce either amount. In fact, there are only so many targets. Once they are all hit by weapons, additional weapons would not produce much more smoke at all. Even after the current nuclear weapons reduction treaty between these superpowers is played out in 2012, with each having about 2,000 weapons, 150 Tg of smoke could still be produced. Here are movies of the smoke transport from three different scenarios: These new results were made possible by the use of a state-of-the-art general circulation model of the climate. For the first time a complete calculation of not only atmospheric but also oceanic circulation was conducted, including the entire atmosphere from the surface up through the troposphere, stratosphere, and mesosphere, to an elevation of 80 kilometers (50 miles). Previous calculations had not been run for the 10 year simulations here, and had not allowed the smoke to be lofted into the upper stratosphere, where it would persist for many years. We calculated the climate response to the three scenarios illustrated above. Compared to the global warming observed for the past century, all three scenarios show massive cooling. Compared to the climate change for the Northern Hemisphere for the past 1,000 years, the famous hockey stick diagram, the climate change from any of these scenarios is unprecedented. Compared to climate change for the past millenium, even the 5 Tg case (a war between India and Pakistan) would plunge the planet into temperatures colder than the Little Ice Age (approximately 1600-1850). This would be essentially instantly, and agriculture would be severely threatened. Larger amounts of smoke would produce larger climate changes, and for the 150 Tg case produce a true nuclear winter, making agriculture impossible for years. In both cases, new climate model simulations show that the effects would last for more than a decade. Analogs Support the Theory Nuclear winter is a theory based on computer model calculations. Normally, scientists test theories by doing experiments, but we never want to do this experiment in the real world. Thus we look for analogs that can inform us of parts of the theory. And there are many such analogs that convince us that the theory is correct: \* Cities burning. Unfortunately, we have several examples of cities burning, firestorms created by the intense release of energy, and smoke being pumped into the upper atmosphere. These include San Francisco as a result of the earthquake in 1906, and cities bombed in World War II, including Tokyo, Dresden, Hamburg, Darmstadt, Hiroshima, and Nagasaki. \* The seasonal cycle. In the winter, the climate is cooler, because the days are shorter and sunlight is less intense. Again, this helps us quantify the effects of reduction of solar radiation. \* The diurnal cycle. At night the Sun sets and it gets cold at the surface. If the Sun did not rise tomorrow, we already have an intuitive feel for how much cooling would take place and how fast it would cool. \* Volcanic eruptions. Explosive volcanic eruptions, such as those of Tambora in 1815, Krakatau in 1883 and Pinatubo in 1991, provide several lessons. The resulting sulfate aerosol cloud in the stratosphere is transported around the world by winds, thus supporting the results from the animations above. The surface temperature plummets after each large eruption, in proportion to the thickness of the stratospheric cloud. In fact 1816, following Tambora, is known as the "Year Without a Summer," with global cooling and famine. Following the Pinatubo eruption, global precipitation, river flow, and soil moisture all reduced, since cooling the planet by blocking sunlight has a strong effect on reducing evaporation and weakening the hydrologic cycle. This is also what the nuclear winter simulations show. \* Forest fires. Smoke from large forest fires sometimes is injected into the lower stratosphere. And the smoke is transported around the world, also producing cooling under the smoke. \* Dust storms on Mars. Occasionally, dust storms start in one region of Mars, but the dust is heated by the Sun, lofted into the upper atmosphere, and transported around the planet to completely enshroud it in a dust blanket. This process takes a couple weeks, just like our computer simulations for the nuclear winter smoke. \* Extinction of the dinosaurs. 65,000,000 years ago an asteroid or comet smashed into the Earth in southern Mexico. The resulting dust cloud, mixed with smoke from fires, blocked out the Sun, killing the dinosaurs, and starting the age of mammals. This Cretaceous-Tertiary (K-T) extinction may have been exacerbated by massive volcanism in India at the same time. This teaches us that large amounts of aerosols in Earth's atmosphere have caused massive climate change and extinction of species. The difference with nuclear winter is that the K-T extinction could not have been prevented. Policy Implications The work on nuclear winter in the 1980's, and the realization that both direct and indirect effects of nuclear war would be a global catastrophe, led to the end of arms race and the end of the Cold War. In response to the comment "In the 1980s, you warned about the unprecedented dangers of nuclear weapons and took very daring steps to reverse the arms race," in an interview in 2000, Mikhail Gorbachev said "Models made by Russian and American scientists showed that a nuclear war would result in a nuclear winter that would be extremely destructive to all life on Earth; the knowledge of that was a great stimulus to us, to people of honor and morality, to act in that situation."[1] Since the 1980's, the number of nuclear weapons in the world has decreased to 1/3 of the peak number of more than 70,000. The consequences of regional-scale nuclear conflicts are unexpectedly large, with the potential to become global catastrophes. The combination of nuclear proliferation, political instability, and urban demographics may constitute one of the greatest dangers to the stability of society since the dawn of humans. The current and projected American and Russian nuclear arsenals can still produce nuclear winter. Only nuclear disarmament will prevent the possibility of a nuclear environmental catastrophe.

### Advantage 3 is Bio-Medical Innovation

#### **Limits on academic freedom deter innovative bio-medical research. Even with increased funding professors don’t know how to use the money in ways that meet regulations.**

Leone and Anrig 03 [Richard C., and Greg. The war on our freedoms: Civil liberties in an age of terrorism. PublicAffairs, 2003.]

**In popular culture, images of scientists range from the saintly Dr. Schweitzer to the evil genius of Dr. Frankenstein. Judging by the responses of George W. Bush's administration to recommendations from scientific experts, the White House view tilts toward the mad scientist end of the spectrum.** When elite scientific panels endorsed stem-cell research and nonreproductive cloning as keys to biomedical progress, for example, the administration aligned itself with conservative religious opponents of those technologies. Despite ample evidence that condoms reduce the risk of HIV transmission and a dearth of proof that abortion leads to breast cancer, the administration insisted in each case that the opposite was true. **Given that religious ideology has repeatedly trumped scientific consensus, the administration's recent excursions into life-science research should come as no surprise**. Suspicions about biologists are woven into the broad legislative agenda that the administration began developing before the ruins of the World Trade Center stopped smoking. **Starting with the USA Patriot Act, Congress has passed a series of laws imposing restrictions on academic researchers studying organisms with weapons potential. Although national security is the rationale for these unprecedented incursions into university and medical school laboratories, many experts believe that these new rules will have the paradoxical effect of slowing research needed to fend off or combat future biological attacks. The stakes for the public are high. When the government imposes tight controls on nuclear weapons research "you may lose some defense capability, but you're not losing lives**," Atlas said. In fact, slowing the development of nuclear weapons could clearly save lives. "But **if biomedical research slows, and public health is weakened, then people die**," he said. **Humanity clearly will not benefit from policies that slow development of treatments and vaccines against global killers such as AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis—yet this is the research community currently under siege.** Post—September 11 laws, regulations, and directives affecting infectious disease research fall into three broad categories: • Intense government scrutiny of research on an expanded list of "select agents"—organisms, toxins, or delivety systems that can be used for peaceful purposes or as weapons. • Exclusion of certain international researchers from select-agents research and mandatory background checks for U.S. researchers to ensure that they are not what the Patriot Act defines as "restricted persons." • Creation of a "sensitive but unclassified" or "sensitive homeland security information" designation as a rationale for blocking publication of certain research findings generated by government-supported research on open campuses. **At the same time, biodefense research is being stimulated by huge spending increases** that will lure hundreds, perhaps thousands, of new scientists into the field. Nowhere is the increase more dramatic than at the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, where the budget for bioterrorism projects has soared from $52.8 million to $1.7 billion in only two years. Although pan of this huge increase will be used to build special biodefense laboratories, there are plenty of new grants and contracts to go around. **Academic researchers don't know whether to be thrilled at the flood of new research money or deeply disturbed because the government views their organisms as potential weapons, their graduate students as possible spies, and their scientific publications as potential recipes for bioterrorism**. But one thing is clear: In a situation this dynamic and politically charged, the scientific community cannot afford to sit back and do nothing. So far, scientists have successfully used their own institutions, such as the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) and the American Society for Microbiology (ASM), to set limits on their professional behavior before Attorney General John Ashcroft does it for them. **Universities are scrambling to comply with new demands and restrictions, solve visa problems for international scholars, install expensive security systems for labs, and negotiate contracts with federal funding agencies that won't trample academic freedom. What follows is a portrait of life-science research for now, after September 11 and the 2001 anthrax attacks, and before bioterrorism strikes a second time.**

#### We outweigh on reversability and ease of access. It is nearly impossible to stop Biological weapons acquisition and they are more devastating than nuclear weapons.

Mead 10 (Walter Russell Mead, "Apples of Discord", The American Interest Online, April 14, 2010, http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2010/04/14/apples-of-discord/)

**Biology is much more frightening than physics.** Biology is the field where science is making the most rapid strides and the coming decades are going to see a biotech revolution that could be as revolutionary and disruptive as the Neolithic Revolution all those millenniums ago when people first figured out that whole farming thing. **Genetically-engineered plagues** that attack either humans or crops, **biologically** **produced toxins** that can be released **in**to **the water or** the **air: the possibilities** unfortunately **are nearly endless for weapons that in their potency make** those **nuclear [weapons]** apples **look like duds. Worse still,** it’s likely that **these weapons will be easier to make and that efforts to make them will be harder to detect.**  Iran and North Korea have not been able to conceal their nuclear programs and it has been possible to take countermeasures against them. (Sorry those centrifuges don’t seem to work as well as advertised, Mr. Ahmadinejad — and it’s a shame that those scientists keep defecting.) **Enriching uranium** still **requires a major industrial** **effort and the purchase of specialized equipment and materials** it **is relatively easy** **to detect.** It’s likely, however, that building biotech weapons will be considerably harder to detect. **A** biology **lab doing gene research leading to the production of plagues might not look** all that **different from a lab researching cures.** **Uranium comes from a handful of locations and** the output of uranium mines **can be monitored.** The raw materials of biological weapons — **bacteria — are abundant and widely distributed.** As our ability to understand and manipulate genetic information increases, we are likely to live in a world in which fairly large numbers of people either have or can easily acquire both the know how and the raw materials to make devastating weapons. **Pound for pound, [a] genetically altered plague** bacillus **could be much deadlier than plutonium, much easier and cheaper to make, and much more likely to fall into the wrong hands.**

#### And, we outweigh on magnitude and probability. Biological weapons are more likely to threaten all life on the planet than nuclear weapons

Steinbrunner 98 (John Steinbrunner, Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution and vice chair of the committee on international security and arms control of the National Academy of Sciences, “Biological Weapons: A Plague on all Houses”, Foreign Policy, Winter 1997-1998.)

Although human pathogens are often lumped with nuclear explosives and lethal chemicals as potential weapons of mass destruction, there is an obvious, fundamentally important difference: **Pathogens are alive,** weapons are not. **Nuclear** and chemical **weapons do not reproduce themselves and do not independently engage in adaptive behavior; pathogens do** both of these things. That deceptively simple observation has immense implications. The use of a manufactured weapon is a singular event. Most of the damage occurs immediately. The aftereffects, whatever they may be, decay rapidly over time and distance in a reasonably predictable manner. Even before a nuclear warhead is detonated, for instance, it is possible to estimate the extent of the subsequent damage and the likely level of radioactive fallout. Such predictability is an essential component for tactical military planning. The use of a pathogen, by contrast, is an extended process whose scope and timing cannot be precisely controlled. For most potential biological agents, the predominant drawback is that they would not act swiftly or decisively enough to be an effective weapon. But for a few **pathogens---ones most likely to have a decisive effect and therefore the ones most likely to be contemplated for** deliberately **hostile use**--the risk runs in the other direction. A lethal pathogen that **could efficiently spread from one victim to another [and] would be capable of initiating an intensifying cascade of disease that might ultimately threaten the entire world population.**

#### And, Independently disease causes extinction

Karl-Heinz Kerscher 14, Professor, “Space Education”, Wissenschaftliche Studie, 2014, 92 Seiten

The death toll for a pandemic is equal to the virulence, the deadliness of the pathogen or pathogens, multiplied by the number of people eventually infected. It has been hypothesized that there is an upper limit to the virulence of naturally evolved pathogens. This is because a pathogen that quickly kills its hosts might not have enough time to spread to new ones, while one that kills its hosts more slowly or not at all will allow carriers more time to spread the infection, and thus likely out-compete a more lethal species or strain. This simple model predicts that if virulence and transmission are not linked in any way, pathogens will evolve towards low virulence and rapid transmission. However, this assumption is not always valid and in more complex models, where the level of virulence and the rate of transmission are related, high levels of virulence can evolve. The level of virulence that is possible is instead limited by the existence of complex populations of hosts, with different susceptibilities to infection, or by some hosts being geographically isolated. The size of the host population and competition between different strains of pathogens can also alter virulence. There are numerous historical examples of pandemics that have had a devastating effect on a large number of people, which makes the possibility of global pandemic a realistic threat to human civilization.

## Underviews

### K underview

#### We disidentify with the state as a survival tactic, taking what we can get in an attempt to cope with the daily violence of oppression, while leaving the rest of our identity intact. The question shouldn’t be about whether we ought to revolt-but rather how we stay safe while doing so.

Muñoz 99 [José Esteban. Disidentifications: Queers of color and the performance of politics. Vol. 2. U of Minnesota Press, P. 10-12. 1999. ~Professor of Performance arts at NYU]

The theory of **disidentification** that I am offering is meant to **contribute to an understanding of the ways in which queers of color** identify with ethnos or queerness despite the phobic charges in both fields. The French linguist Michel Pécheux extrapolated a theory of disidentification from Marxist theorist Louis Althusser's influential theory of subject formation and interpellation. Althusser's "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" was among the first articulations of the role of ideology in theorizing subject formation. For Althusser, ideology is an inescapable realm in which subjects are called into being or "hailed," a process he calls interpellation. **Ideology is the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence. The location of ideology is always within an apparatus and its practice or practices, such as the State apparatus**. 12 Pécheux built on this theory by describing **the[re are]** **three modes in which a subject is constructed by ideological practices**. In this schema, **the** **first** mode **is** understood as "**identification," where a "Good Subject" chooses the path of identification** with discursive and ideological forms. "**Bad Subjects" resist** andattempt to reject the images and identificatory sites offered by dominant ideology and proceed to rebel, to "**counteridentify" and turn against this symbolic system**. **The danger** that Pécheux sees **in such an operation would be the counterdetermination that** such a system installs, a structure that **validates the dominant ideology by reinforcing its dominance through the controlled symmetry of "counterdetermination**." **Disidentification** is the third mode of dealing with dominant ideology, one that **neither opts to assimilate within such a structure nor strictly opposes it; rather**, disidentification is a strategy that **works on and against dominant ideology**. 13 **Instead of buckling** under the pressures of dominant ideology (identification, assimilation) **or attempting to break free** of its inescapable sphere (counteridentification, utopianism), **this "working on and against" is a strategy that tries to transform a cultural logic from within, always laboring to enact permanent structural change while at the same time valuing the importance of local or everyday struggles of resistance**. Judith Butler gestures toward the uses of disidentification when discussing the failure of identification. She parries with Slavoj Zizek, who understands disidentification as a breaking down of political possibility, "a fictionalization to the point of political immobilization." 14 She counters zizek by asking the following question of his formulations: "What are the possibilities of politicizing disidentification, this experience of misrecognition, this uneasy sense of standing under a sign to which one does and does not belong?" Butler answers: "it may be that the affirmation of that slippage, that the failure of identification, is itself the point of departure for a more democratizing affirmation of internal difference." 15 Both Butler's and Pécheux's accounts of disidentification put forward an understanding of identification as never being as seamless or unilateral as the Freudian account would Both theorists construct the subject as inside ideology. Their models permit one to examine theories of a subject who is neither the "Good Subject," who has an easy or magical identification with dominant culture, or the "Bad Subject," who imagines herself outside of ideology. Instead, they pave the way to an understanding of a "disidentificatory subject" who tactically and simultaneously works on, with, and against a cultural form. As a practice, disidentification does not dispel those ideological contradictory elements; rather, like a melancholic subject holding on to a lost object, a disidentifying subject works to hold on to this object and invest it with new life.

### Theory Underview

#### 1. Aff gets RVIs if the neg reads multiple shells b/c a) It’s unreciprocal because they can read as many shells as they want in the 1N and I have to allocate time to each shell to ensure I don’t lose but they can always collapse to one shells making all the other shells no-risk issues b) the strategic incentive will always be to up-layer with as many shells as possible so engaging in the RVI is a independent strat skew since it’s another layer I have to go through which they don’t if they’re collapsing in the 2N.

#### 2. Granting new 2N response is bad a) clash- it allows for less developed debate since there’s on a 1 speech interaction b) resolvability- makes it impossible for the judges to determine how credence to give the 2AR responses.

#### 3. If the neg reads a PIC they must read a counter-solvency advocate in the 1NC. This key to predictability since there’s a litany of alternatives they could use to solve the aff especially on this topic since the aff has to defend all speech and the neg can spec one type. They also kill ground since absent the advocate they can defend an alternative that’s so stringent that nobody indicts it’s validity. In the 1NC is key otherwise you use showing the evidence as time suck.

#### 4. 2NR meta-theory is drop the arg since otherwise the neg can read 6 minutes of offense on the highest layer given them a 2:1 time ratio.

#### 5. Fairness is necessary to determine who does the better debating so it precedes substance. And, education is goal of the debate so it’s intrinsically valuable. That means you assume Competing Interps the application of reasonability is arbitrarily established by the debater tyring to be reasonable.