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### 1ac - advantage – terror

#### Authoritarianism and terrorism are on the rise in the status quo. Political freedom is the single best check against terror.

Nilay Saiya 5/17 [Nilay Saiya is assistant professor of public policy and global affairs at Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. His research concerns the influence of religion on global politics. He is author of the book Weapon of Peace: How Religious Liberty Combats Terrorism (2018). He earned his Ph.D. from the University of Notre Dame. “Strongmen Don’t Fight Terrorism. They Fuel It.” Slate, MAY 17, 2021 https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2021/05/dictators-terrorism-authoritarianism-strongmen.html]

The nearly two decades since 9/11 have confirmed a simple truth: The greatest weapon against terrorism is freedom, which strikes at the root of terrorist violence by making it more difficult for extremists to win the battle for hearts and minds. Moreover, free countries enjoy a robust counterterrorism advantage over authoritarian states. The record of post-9/11 terrorist activity attacks suggests that states have a national-security stake in guaranteeing basic rights at home and promoting freedom abroad.

Since 2001, the world has experienced a sharp increase in Jihadi terrorism. My analysis reveals that in 2000, the world witnessed 255 identifiable Jihadi terrorist attacks; as of 2018, that number had risen to 3,243, a more than twelvefold increase. Meanwhile, the world has witnessed a striking recession in global levels of freedom: Democracy-watchdog Freedom House has documented fifteen consecutive years of decline in political freedom and civil liberties, across authoritarian and democratic regimes alike.

According to Freedom House data, countries that respect political rights and civil liberties experience very little terrorism in general when compared to those that do not. States with high political rights scores (1 or 2 on Freedom House’s seven-point scale, where 7 denotes the heaviest repression) witnessed on average only 7 percent of Jihadi terrorist attacks (0.06 attacks per year per million people). Countries with high levels of civil liberties witnessed a mere 2 percent (0.04 attacks per year per million people). States with intermediate (a score of 3 to 5) and low (6 or 7) levels of political rights, by contrast, experienced a yearly average of 0.35 and 0.72 terrorist attacks per million people, respectively. Similarly, countries with intermediate and low levels of civil liberties experienced a yearly average of 0.13 and 1.63 terrorist attacks per million people, respectively. Regardless of region, history, or development, there is a powerful relationship between levels of freedom and terrorist violence.

Strikingly, we observe the same pattern even within the subset of states in which Muslims are a majority or plurality of the population—which are themselves the worst victims of this type of terrorism. In Southeast Asia, Indonesia and Malaysia are some of the most democratic countries in the Muslim world. No jihadist civil war has taken place in the region since 1975. The two freest countries in Africa, Senegal and Sierra Leone (which together have an average combined political-rights score of 2.7 and civil-liberties score of 2.9 from 2001–18), have not suffered any identifiable Jihadi terrorist attacks, largely a result of the religious harmony in those countries. The countries most ravaged by terrorism—Afghanistan, Iraq, Nigeria, Somalia, and Yemen—have average political-rights and civil-liberties scores of 5.65 and 5.72, respectively, making them among the most repressive in the Islamic world.

Restricting freedom in the Muslim world and beyond has fueled terrorism in two ways: by embittering minorities and by radicalizing majorities. First, repression breeds anti-state resentment among minority groups by generating religion-based grievances, exacerbating existing sectarian tensions. Second, when a state selectively restricts the activities of certain minorities within its borders, other groups may arrive at the reasonable conclusion that the authorities have given their tacit approval to discrimination, harassment, and even violence against those targeted.

Freedom, by contrast, levels the playing field among different religious groups in society. The freedom of thought and exchange of ideas intrinsic to democracy serve to empower liberal and moderate voices that challenge the claims made by religious extremists. Liberty removes one of the chief grievances that people of faith have against the state. When state policies respect rights, it is harder for religious militants to credibly claim that their faith is under attack by secular authorities and that violence is necessary.

#### Affirming solves:

#### 1] The right to strike is essential to protect rights and check the concentration of power

UN 2017: UN Press Release, ‘UN rights expert: Fundamental right to strike must be preserved’, 9 March 2017. https://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=21328&LangID=E]

The right to strike is also an intrinsic corollary of the fundamental right of freedom of association. It is crucial for millions of women and men around the world to assert collectively their rights in the workplace, including the right to just and favourable conditions of work, and to work in dignity and without fear of intimidation and persecution. Moreover, protest action in relation to government social and economic policy, and against negative corporate practices, forms part of the basic civil liberties whose respect is essential for the meaningful exercise of trade union rights. This right enables them to engage with companies and governments on a more equal footing, and Member States have a positive obligation to protect this right, and a negative obligation not to interfere with its exercise. Moreover, protecting the right to strike is not simply about States fulfilling their legal obligations. It is also about them creating democratic and equitable societies that are sustainable in the long run. The concentration of power in one sector – whether in the hands of government or business – inevitably leads to the erosion of democracy, and an increase in inequalities and marginalization with all their attendant consequences. The right to strike is a check on this concentration of power.

#### 2] Strikes have empirically played a significant role in checking authoritarianism.

Vogt et al. 20 [Vogt, Jeffrey, et al. The right to strike in international law. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020.]

Of course, the protection of the right to strike is essential not only for the promotion of workplace democracy, but democracy writ large. Former UN Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Association and Assembly, Maina Kiai, importantly drew a direct link between the right to strike and enduring democracies.[28] Indeed, on numerous occasions, strikes have played an important role in the xii destabilisation of repressive or authoritarian governments, and ushered in new, democratic possibilities. Trade unions have accomplished this because of their organisation, structure and capacity for mobilisation, based on common workers’ interests and solidarity. The union’s ability to strike also disrupts the capitalist accumulation on which the maintenance of the status quo depends.[29] For example, political scientist Ruth Collier has underscored the important role of trade unions in the third democratisation wave (mid- 1960s to 1980s) in Latin America and Southern Europe. Rather than seeing democratisation as resulting from the strategic choices of elites, as many had posited, she explained that labour’s role was central and not indirect and ancillary to workplace demands: [I]n all third wave cases the working class was an important actor in the political opposition, explicitly demanding a democratic regime. Beyond that, labor often played an autonomous role in affecting the rhythm and pace of the transitions, and in some cases working-class protest for democracy contributed to a climate of ungovernability and delegitimisation that led directly to a general destabilization of authoritarian regimes.[30] In ushering out the old order, the role of strikes was key. She notes: In one pattern of third wave democratization, characterizing Peru, Argentina, and Spain, massive labor protests destabilized authoritarianism and opened the way for the establishment of democracy. In these cases, the working class was the initial and most important anti-authoritarian actor, leading an offensive in the form of strikes and protests against the regime. Regime incumbents were unable to ignore such working-class opposition or formulate a response to these challenges from below.[31] The Arab Spring represents perhaps the most recent democratisation wave, and one in which trade unions were important actors.[32] Indeed, the participation of the Union Générale Tunisienne du Travail (UGTT) rank and file in strikes in the years preceding the Arab Spring and in its early days following the self-immolation of Mohammed Bouazizi was critical to the success of the revolution and the ouster of President Ben Ali.[33] Afterwards, the UGTT pushed the transitional xiiigovernment to make fundamental changes which helped prevent a return to the old order.[34] In Egypt, despite few trade unions outside the official, pro-regime Egyptian Trade Union Federation (ETUF), the number and length of strikes by independent unions had steadily climbed in the period leading up to 2011. In the days before, during and after the ‘Days of Rage’, trade union strikes throughout the country, in the public and private sectors, contributed to the destabilisation of the Mubarak regime and led to his eventual ouster. The revolution was short-lived, however. With a small and fractured independent labour movement unable to push back, the military toppled the failing Morsi government and resumed control in 2013.[35]

#### Independently, there’s a coming wave of personalist dictators likely to proliferate---causes global nuclear wars and no prolif defense applies

Scott D. Sagan 18, senior fellow at FSI’s Center for International Security and Cooperation, the Caroline S.G. Munro Professor of Political Science, and the Mimi and Peter Haas University Fellow in Undergraduate Education, November/December 2018, “Armed and Dangerous: When Dictators Get the Bomb,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 97, No. 6

Today, however, there is another reason to worry about nuclear weapons: the rise of personalist dictatorships in states that possess or could acquire the bomb. These dictatorships differ from other autocratic governments because their leaders have such dominant personal power that other state institutions-such as parties, politburos, or military officers--cannot overrule the decisions made at the top. Personalist dictators can make decisions on a whim, which creates a grave challenge to the concept of nuclear stability. The world has faced this particular nuclear danger only once before: between 1949 and 1953, when Joseph Stalin enjoyed unchallenged personal dominion over a nuclear-armed Soviet Union.

Of course, other threats from nuclear proliferation persist. Pakistan's nuclear arsenal is growing, for example. But it remains in the hands of professional military officers who share at least some degree of power with a democratically elected civilian government. Iran also has latent nuclear capabilities. Yet despite the Trump administration's unilateral withdrawal from the 2015 agreement that limited Iran's nuclear activities and the reimposition of U.S. economic sanctions on Iran, the Islamic Republic has, at least for now, decided to keep its commitments to not enrich uranium to bomb-grade levels and to permit international inspectors to monitor any suspected nuclear facilities.

To understand why a nuclear-armed personalist dictatorship poses a much graver danger than those countries, look no further than Kim Jong Un, the eccentric ruler of North Korea. In the six years since he came to power following the death of his father, Kim has solidified his control of the state apparatus and purged potential rivals, including his uncle, whom he executed in 2013, and his half brother, who was murdered in an airport in Malaysia in 2017 by assailants armed with the chemical weapon vx--almost certainly on Kim's orders. At the same time, Kim has achieved unprecedented success in North Korea's pursuit of nuclear weapons. After testing a thermonuclear device in September 2017 and an intercontinental ballistic missile in November of that year, Kim announced in his 2018 New Year's address that North Korea had "perfected" its nuclear arsenal and that "the nuclear button is on my office desk all the time."

Kim soon entered into direct negotiations with South Korea and, separately, with the United States. Like his three immediate predecessors, U.S. President Donald Trump seeks North Korea's "complete, verifiable, and irreversible nuclear disarmament." After meeting with Kim in June, Trump announced that the United States would suspend what he called "tremendously expensive" and "very provocative" military exercises with South Korea and declared that "there is no longer a nuclear threat from North Korea." In fact, Kim has shown no intention of giving up his weapons, and it is unclear how Washington can achieve its ambitious goal.

This dynamic is unlikely to remain confined to North Korea. Personalist dictators elsewhere are more likely to seek nuclear weapons in the future and, if they get them, more likely than other leaders to use them. The United States therefore needs to tailor its nuclear doctrine to better deter such leaders--and, if necessary, to fight and defeat them more effectively and ethically. The problem is daunting. The good news is that Washington and its allies have successfully adapted their strategies to meet new nuclear threats in the past, and the steps they must take to do so once again are well within reach. But the bad news is that the Trump administration is not thinking creatively enough and the president is making matters worse by issuing belligerent threats and making unfounded claims of success.

BOMB THROWERS

After 1945, the list of nuclear states grew to include five democracies (the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Israel, and India) and five non-democratic states (the Soviet Union, China, Pakistan, North Korea, and apartheid South Africa). A number of democracies, such as Australia and Sweden, started nuclear weapons programs and then abandoned them, as have a few nondemocracies, such as Brazil and Egypt in the 1970s. Democracies and autocracies alike have joined the 1968 Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), pledging "not to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons."

Yet only autocracies have started or maintained illicit nuclear weapons programs after joining the NPT. These nuclear cheaters were Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Romania, Syria, Taiwan, and, for a brief period in the 1970s, South Korea. When they began their nuclear weapons programs, all these states were led by autocrats who enjoyed nearly unchallenged authority. Such dictators find nuclear weapons particularly appealing, in part for the usual reason of warding off foreign military intervention, but also because nuclear weapons, unlike conventional ones, provide a way of countering external threats without increasing the risk of internal threats, especially that of a military coup. Such leaders are also less likely to fear the effects of international economic isolation and are not constrained by domestic rivals who might oppose spending scarce resources on a nuclear weapons program. Nor are personalist dictators constrained much by the rule of law, which emboldens them to engage in nuclear cheating, since they face little chance of being outed by internal whistleblowers and because, even if they are caught cheating by foreign powers, they will pay few domestic political costs.

Yet many of the traits that make personalist dictatorships dangerous also make them incompetent. Such dictators often weaken their state institutions by prizing loyalty over professionalism in military and scientific organizations, thus impeding their nuclear ambitions. In the 1980s, Romania's laughable nuclear program was run as a pet project by Elena Ceausescu, the wife of the strongman leader Nicolae Ceausescu, who was appointed the head of the National Council for Science and Technology despite having no serious background in scientific research. In Iraq during the late 1970s and early 1980s, the dictator Saddam Hussein executed his deputy prime minister, reportedly for opposing his defense spending plans, and sent a number of senior nuclear scientists to prison because he deemed them insufficiently loyal. During the late 1990s, the Libyan strongman Muammar al-Qaddafi put together a gang that couldn't proliferate straight: program managers imported the wrong nuclear components because they did not consult scientists first, and no one monitored progress in the program. Indeed, when the International Atomic Energy Agency inspected Libya's nuclear sites in 2003, they found smuggled-in centrifuges still in their packing crates.

North Korea's success therefore represents a watershed. For the first time, a poor and highly personalist dictatorship has developed large numbers of nuclear weapons and long-range missiles to deliver them. North Korea's persistence, skillful engineering, and extensive support for its scientists helped. So, too, did the illicit assistance that the regime received from the proliferation network run by the Pakistani nuclear physicist A. Q. Khan (which provided centrifuges to enrich uranium) and from companies in Ukraine (which supplied the North Koreans with high-performance liquid-propellant rocket engines). Lastly, Washington failed to get strong global sanctions placed on North Korea until after Pyongyang had already tested its first nuclear weapon, in 2006; by then, it was too late.

North Korea's success may now serve as an inspiration. Other governments may calculate that they can copy the North Korean model, especially if Pyongyang offers to carry them across the nuclear threshold, as it has attempted to do at least once in the past. In 2007, the North Koreans were caught helping Bashar al-Assad's regime construct a secret plutonium-producing reactor in the Syrian desert, which the Israeli Air Force promptly destroyed.

THIS IS NOT A DRILL

It is difficult to predict which country with a personalist regime--or with a leader who is working to establish such a regime--will be the next to pursue nuclear weapons. Egypt, Syria, and Turkey all seem like contenders. Saudi Arabia might be next in line, if Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman continues his ruthless consolidation of power when he eventually becomes king. Armed with nuclear weapons, the personalist rulers of these countries will be difficult to deter. They likely value their own lives and those of their family members and cronies more than the lives of their countries' citizens. They vanquish rivals in order to make their regimes coup-proof and rely on sycophants, often family members, to run their regimes, prizing personal loyalty over professional competence or expertise. A leader surrounded by yes men will have no one who can question faulty assumptions, much less challenge his decision-making authority.

Recent history demonstrates how such proclivities make personalist dictators particularly likely to miscalculate. In 1986, Libyan operatives, following Qaddafi's orders to carry out a campaign of terrorism against Americans, planted a bomb at a nightclub in Berlin popular with U.S. service members, killing two U.S. soldiers and one foreign civilian and injuring 229 other service members and civilians. In response, the United States launched air strikes against military targets in Libya and the compound outside Tripoli where Qaddafi lived with his family. In 1980, Saddam decided to attack Iran without consulting his advisers (resulting in an eight-year-long war), and in 1990, he ordered an attack on Kuwait after consulting with only his son-in-law (leading to the humiliating Persian Gulf War). Saddam even forbade his intelligence agencies from providing reports on the United States, telling them that intelligence was his "specialty." (He also elaborated on the sources of his unique insight: "some of it out of deduction, some of it through invention and connecting the dots, all without having hard evidence.")

Flawed decision-making of this sort also makes personalist regimes accident-prone. According to North Korean government pronouncements, Pyongyang has a preemptive military doctrine, which calls for striking first if Kim receives intelligence that a U.S. attack is deemed imminent and unavoidable. But no outsiders know the exact indicators on which Kim would base his decision. Perhaps he might react to a formal warning issued by trusted organizations within the state. But even in technologically sophisticated societies, these are imperfect. In January, for example, the Hawaii Emergency Management Agency issued a false alarm: "Ballistic missile threat inbound to Hawaii. Seek immediate shelter. This is not a drill." Throughout the islands, citizens panicked, some running for the beaches, others (more appropriately) sheltering inside their homes. In Washington, fortunately, no one panicked: the U.S. military's sophisticated sensors did not detect an inbound missile, highly professional military officers quickly reported up the chain of command that the Hawaiian agency had made a mistake, and no high-level official believed that Kim would launch an unprovoked nuclear attack on Hawaii.

#### 3] The right to strike is key to reduce economic inequality which causes elite control of politics

Vogt et al. 20 [Vogt, Jeffrey, et al. The right to strike in international law. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020.]

Until recently, the exercise of the right to strike had been on the decline in many industrialised countries, in some to the point of near obsolescence. In the United States, for example, there had been a long-term decline in the frequency of major strikes, from a peak of 470 strikes in 1952 involving 2.75 million workers and resulting in nearly 49 million lost work days to seven strikes in 2017, involving 25,000 workers and 440,00 lost work days.[36] A similar pattern is observed in the United Kingdom, where the 1979 ‘Winter of Discontent’ (29.5 million lost work days) and the 1984–85 miners’ strike (27 million lost work days) were significant exceptions to an otherwise long-term decline in strike action since the 1926 General Strike.[37] A similar story is repeated through much of the ‘Anglo-Saxon’ world, including Canada, Australia and New Zealand, where both the frequency and duration of strikes peaked in the late 1970s and early 1980s.[38] Of course, there are outliers like France, where the frequency of strikes has been and continues to be relatively high. The decline can be explained in some countries by regressive labour reforms (eg, the United Kingdom) which made the resort to the strike far more difficult, while in others (eg, the United States), policy changes, such as the exploitation of the absence of legal restriction on the use of replacement workers was used by the xivUS government in the PATCO (air traffic controllers’) strike in 1981, which gave employers in the private sector a green light to do the same.[39] With the decline in the power of unions to bargain collectively and to strike, constraints on income inequality have obviously loosened. The result has been historically high wealth and income inequality, and diminished democracy in much of the industrialised world. Indeed, while corporate executives saw extraordinary rises in wages, for most workers, the real wage is largely the same as it was 40 years ago in terms of purchasing power.[40] It is well understood that the rise in income inequality is in part the result of a sharp decline in labour’s power.[41] In the United States, research demonstrates that unions at their peak had the ability to constrain income inequality not only for their members, but to the company, the industry and the broader workforce.[42] As Oxfam International reported in 2019, ‘The wealth of the world’s billionaires increased by $900bn in the last year alone, or $2.5bn a day. Meanwhile the wealth of the poorest half of humanity, 3.8 billion people fell by 11%’.[43] According to the Swiss bank, UBS, ‘The past 30 years have seen far greater wealth creation than the Gilded Age’.[44] In 2017 alone, UBS noted that billionaires’ wealth increased by $1.4 trillion, now standing at combined total wealth of $8.9 trillion.[45] Within countries, the distribution of wealth follows a similar pattern. In the United States, for example, three people hold the combined wealth of the bottom half of the population.[46] As to income inequality, pay data collected by the US Securities and Exchange Commission, required under the 2010 ‘Dodd–Frank’ law, show that the average CEO-to-median-worker pay ratio among Fortune 500 companies in 2017 was 339:1, up from a 20:1 ratio in 1965.[47] At the extremes, the pay ratio at fast food giant xvMcDonald’s – a company known for low wages, irregular scheduling practices, and for its aggressive anti-union posture – is a shocking 3,101:1. While the pay ratio is narrower in European countries, the gap is still significant and growing.[48] As to income inequality, pay data collected by the US Securities and Exchange Commission, required under the 2010 ‘Dodd–Frank’ law, show that the average CEO-to-median-worker pay ratio among Fortune 500 companies in 2017 was 339:1, up from a 20:1 ratio in 1965.[47] At the extremes, the pay ratio at fast food giant xvMcDonald’s – a company known for low wages, irregular scheduling practices, and for its aggressive anti-union posture – is a shocking 3,101:1. While the pay ratio is narrower in European countries, the gap is still significant and growing.[48] The concentration of power and wealth is also impacting the quality of democracy. As Colin Crouch has argued, many advanced industrial nations have become ‘post-democratic’, meaning that while the basic features of democracy are in place, such as open elections and universal suffrage, ‘politics and government are increasingly slipping back into the control of privileged elites in the manner of pre-democratic times’.[49] Economic globalisation has strengthened the bargaining power of business and de-industrialisation has weakened that of trade unions. One result has been that political parties which used to respond to the needs of labour have sought support from business and have become increasing more responsive to their views.

#### Income inequality increases terrorism – best statistical evidence

Krieger and Meierrieks 15 [Tim Krieger (the Wilfried Guth Professor of Constitutional Political Economy and Competition Policy at Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Germany) and Daniel Meierrieks (Research Fellow at the WZB Berlin Social Science Center; Ph.D. in Economics, University of Paderborn) "Does income inequality lead to terrorism? Evidence from the post-9/11 era." Diskussionsbeiträge, No. 2015-04, Albert-LudwigsUniversität Freiburg, Wilfried-Guth-Stiftungsprofessur für Ordnungs- und Wettbewerbspolitik https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/111351/1/827719736.pdf]

In this contribution we analyze the relationship between income inequality and terrorism for 79 countries for the 2002-2012 period. Ordinary OLS and count-data models suggest that inequality does not influence terrorist activity. Once endogeneity is considered, however, our results strongly indicate that higher levels of income inequality lead to more terrorist activity. The latter result is robust to different definitions of the dependent variable, different econometric approaches and different instruments for income inequality. Our empirical findings thus suggest that endogeneity matters to the inequality-terrorism nexus and may mask the terror-augmenting effect of inequality; previous empirical studies may have underestimated the role of inequality in terrorism. Here, endogeneity may be due to measurement error but also be a consequence of feedback/simultaneity between inequality and terrorism, e.g., due to the distributional effects of terrorism. In sum, our statistical analysis suggest that in the post-9/11 era higher levels of income inequality lead to more terrorism. We argue that, on the one hand, inequality may fuel terrorism by promoting societal frustration, in line with relative deprivation theory. For instance, such frustration may manifest itself through increased tensions along ethnic and/or religious lines. On the other hand, inequality may also exacerbate institutional and socioeconomic conditions (such as poor socio-economic development) that are by themselves potentially conducive to terrorism. Our findings suggests that policymakers are well advised to keep inequality in check to accommodate grievances that may otherwise result in violence. Here, inequality may be countered through (targeted) public spending, e.g., through the provision of social policies that reduce inequality in the long run. Indeed, some evidence suggests that higher levels of public spending on education and health may be a disincentive to terrorism (Burgoon, 2006; Krieger and Meierrieks, 2010). However, public spending—particularly when excessive— may be harmful to economic growth, e.g., by introducing inefficiencies or crowding out private economic activity (Scully, 2002). Thus, policymakers may also try to counter inequality through the provision and protection of institutions which level the playing-field but do not interfere strongly with market activity. Such sound institutions may in turn have inequality-reducing effects. For instance, Scully (2002) shows that higher levels of economic freedom—safeguarded by governmental action—can also be conducive to income equity.

#### Terrorist attacks will escalate and lead to extinction

Myhrvold 14 (Nathan P [chief executive and founder of Intellectual Ventures and a former chief technology officer at Microsoft]; Strategic Terrorism: A Call to Action; cco.dodlive.mil/files/2014/04/Strategic\_Terrorism\_corrected\_II.pdf; kdf)

Technology contains no inherent moral directive—it empowers people, whatever their intent, good or evil. This has always been true: when bronze implements supplanted those made of stone, the ancient world got scythes and awls, but also swords and battle-axes. The novelty of our present situation is that modern technology can provide small groups of people with much greater lethality than ever before. We now have to worry that private parties might gain access to weapons that are as destructive as—or possibly even more destructive than— those held by any nation-state. A handful of people, perhaps even a single individual, could have the ability to kill millions or even billions. Indeed, it is possible, from a technological standpoint, to kill every [person] man, woman, and child on earth. The gravity of the situation is so extreme that getting the concept across without seeming silly or alarmist is challenging. Just thinking about the subject with any degree of seriousness numbs the mind. The goal of this essay is to present the case for making the needed changes before such a catastrophe occurs. The issues described here are too important to ignore. Failing nation-states—like North Korea—which possess nuclear weapons potentially pose a nuclear threat. Each new entrant to the nuclear club increases the possibility this will happen, but this problem is an old one, and one that existing diplomatic and military structures aim to manage. The newer and less understood danger arises from the increasing likelihood that stateless groups, bent on terrorism, will gain access to nuclear weapons, most likely by theft from a nation-state. Should this happen, the danger we now perceive to be coming from rogue states will pale in comparison. The ultimate response to a nuclear attack is a nuclear counterattack. Nation states have an address, and they know that we will retaliate in kind. Stateless groups are much more difficult to find which makes a nuclear counterattack virtually impossible. As a result, they can strike without fear of overwhelming retaliation, and thus they wield much more effective destructive power. Indeed, in many cases the fundamental equation of retaliation has become reversed. Terrorists often hope to provoke reprisal attacks on their own people, swaying popular opinion in their favor. The aftermath of 9/11 is a case in point. While it seems likely that Osama bin Laden and his henchmen hoped for a massive overreaction from the United States, it is unlikely his Taliban hosts anticipated the U.S. would go so far as to invade Afghanistan. Yes, al-Qaeda lost its host state and some personnel. The damage slowed the organization down but did not destroy it. Instead, the stateless al-Qaeda survived and adapted. The United States can claim some success against al-Qaeda in the years since 9/11, but it has hardly delivered a deathblow. Eventually, the world will recognize that stateless groups are more powerful than nation-states because terrorists can wield weapons and mount assaults that no nation-state would dare to attempt. So far, they have limited themselves to dramatic tactical terrorism: events such as 9/11, the butchering of Russian schoolchildren, decapitations broadcast over the internet, and bombings in major cities. Strategic objectives cannot be far behind.

#### Extinction – nuke terror guarantees retaliation – their impact defense is dated and wrong

Peter Hayes 18, PhD from Berkeley, Director of the Nautilus Institute and Honorary Professor at the Centre for International Security Studies at the University of Sydney, "NON-STATE TERRORISM AND INADVERTENT NUCLEAR WAR", NAPSNet Special Reports, January 18, 2018, https://nautilus.org/napsnet/napsnet-special-reports/non-state-terrorism-and-inadvertent-nuclear-war/

Nuclear terrorism post-cold war: trigger for inadvertent nuclear war? The possible catalytic effect of nuclear terrorism on the risk of state-based nuclear war is not a simple linkage. The multiple types and scales of nuclear terrorism may affect state-nuclear use decisions along multiple pathways that lead to inadvertent nuclear war. These include: Early warning systems fail or are “tripped” in ways that lead to launch-on-warning Accidental nuclear detonation, including sub-critical explosions. Strategic miscalculation in crisis, show of force Decision-making failure (such as irrational, misperception, bias, degraded, group, and time-compressed decision-making) Allied or enemy choices (to seek revenge, to exploit nuclear risk, to act out of desperation) Organizational cybernetics whereby a nuclear command-control-and communications (NC3) system generates error, including the interplay of national NC3 systems in what may be termed the meta-NC3 system. Synchronous and coincident combinations of above.[4] Exactly how, where, and when nuclear terrorism may “ambush” nuclear armed states already heading for or on such a path to inadvertent nuclear war depends on who is targeting whom at a given time, either immediately due to high tension, or generally due to a structural conflict between states. Nuclear armed states today form a complex set of global threat relationships that are not distributed uniformly across the face of Earth. Rather, based on sheer firepower and reach, the nine nuclear weapons states form a global hierarchy with at least four tiers, viz: Tier 1: United States, clear technological supremacy and qualitative edge. Tier 2: Russia, China, global nuclear powers and peers with the United States due to the unique destructive power of even relatively small nuclear arsenals, combined with global reach of missile and bomber delivery systems, thereby constituting a two-tiered global “nuclear triangle” with the United States. Tier 3: France, UK, NATO nuclear sharing and delivery NATO members (Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and Turkey) and the NATO and Pacific nuclear umbrella states (Japan, South Korea, Australia) that depend on American nuclear extended deterrence and directly and indirectly support US and US-allied nuclear operations even though they do not host nor deliver nuclear weapons themselves. Tier 4: India, Pakistan, Israel, DPRK. The first two tiers constitute the global nuclear threat triangle that exists between the United States, Russia, and China, forming a global nuclear “truel.” Each of these states targets the others; each represents an existential threat to the other; and each has a long history of mutual nuclear threat that is now a core element of their strategic identity. Tier three consists of states with their own nuclear force but integrated with that of the United States (even France!) that expand the zone of mutual nuclear threat over much of the northern and even parts of the southern hemisphere; and states that host American nuclear command, control, communications, and intelligence systems that support US nuclear operations and to whom nuclear deterrence is “extended” (if, for example, Australia’s claim to having an American nuclear umbrella is believed). The fourth tier is composed of smaller nuclear forces with a primarily regional reach and focus. Between most of these nuclear armed states and across the tiers, there are few shared “rules of the road.” The more of these states that are engaged in a specific conflict and location, the more unpredictable and unstable this global nuclear threat system becomes, with the potential for cascading and concatenating effects. Indeed, as the number of nuclear states projecting nuclear threat against each other increases, the notion of strategic stability may lose all meaning. The emergence of a fifth tier—of non-state actors with the capacity to project nuclear threat against nuclear-armed and nuclear umbrella states (although not only these states)—is a critically important possible catalytic actor in the new conditions of nuclear threat complexity that already exist today. Such a layer represents an “edge of chaos” where the attempts by nuclear armed states to exert absolute “vertical” control over the use of nuclear weapons confront the potential of non-state entities and even individuals (insiders) to engage in “horizontal” nuclear terrorism, presenting radically different control imperatives to the standard paradigm of organizational procedures, technical measures, and safeguards of various kinds. This tier is like the waves and tides on a beach that quickly surrounds and then causes sand castles to collapse. In 2010, Robert Ayson reviewed the potential linkages between inter-state nuclear war and non-state terrorism. He concluded: “…[T]hese two nuclear worlds—a non-state actor nuclear attack and a catastrophic interstate nuclear exchange—are not necessarily separable. It is just possible that some sort of terrorist attack, and especially an act of nuclear terrorism, could precipitate a chain of events leading to a massive exchange of nuclear weapons between two or more of the states that possess them.”[5] How this linkage might unfold is the subject of the next sections of this essay. Are non-state actors motivated and able to attempt nuclear terrorism? A diverse set of non-state actors have engaged in terrorist activities—for which there is no simple or consensual definition. In 2011, there were more than 6,900 known extremist, terrorist and other organizations associated with guerrilla warfare, political violence, protest, organized crime and cyber-crime. Of these, about 120 terrorist and extremist groups had been blacklisted by the United Nations, the European Union and six major countries.[6] Some have argued that the technical, organizational, and funding demanded for a successful nuclear attack, especially involving nuclear weapons, exceeds the capacity of most of the non-state actors with terrorist proclivities. Unfortunately, this assertion is not true, especially at lower levels of impact as shown in Figure 1; but even at the highest levels of obtaining authentic nuclear weapons capabilities, a small number of non-state actors already exhibit the motivation and possible capacity to become nuclear-armed. Ellingsen suggests a useful distinction that nuclear terrorists may be impelled by two divergent motivations, as shown in Figure 2, creating “opportunistic” and “patient” profiles.[7] The requirements for an opportunist non-state nuclear terrorist tend towards immediate use and the search for short-term payoffs with only tactical levels of commitment; whereas the patient non-state nuclear terrorist is able and willing to sustain a long-term acquisition effort to deal a strategic blow to an adversary in a manner that could be achieved only with nuclear weapons. In turn, many factors will drive how a potential nuclear terrorist non-state organization that obtains nuclear weapons or materials may seek to employ them, especially in its nuclear command-and-control orientations. Blair and Ackerman suggest that the goals, conditions, and capacity limitations that shape a possible nuclear terrorist’s posture lead logically to three types of nuclear terrorist nuclear command-and-control postures, viz: pre-determined (in which the leadership sends a fire order to a nuclear-armed subordinate and no change is entertained and no capacity to effect change is established in the field, that is, the order is fire-and-forget); assertive (in which only the central command can issue a nuclear fire order, central control is maintained at all times, with resulting demanding communications systems to support such control); and delegative (in which lower level commanders control nuclear weapons and have pre-delegated authority to use them in defined circumstances, for example, evidence of nuclear explosions combined with loss-of-connectivity with their central command).[8] An example of such delegative control system was the November 26, 2008 attack on Mumbai that used social media reporting to enable the attacking terrorists to respond to distant controller direction and to adapt to counter-terrorist attacks—a connectivity tactic that the authorities were too slow to shut down before mayhem was achieved.[9] Logically, one might expect nuclear terrorists oriented toward short-term, tactical goals to employ pre-determined nuclear command-and-control strategies in the hope that the speed of attack and minimum field communications avoids discovery and interdiction before the attack is complete; whereas nuclear terrorists oriented toward long-term, strategic goals might employ more pre-delegative command-and-control systems that would support a bargaining use and therefore a field capacity to deploy nuclear weapons or materials that can calibrate actual attack based on communications with the central leadership with the risk of interdiction through surveillance and counter-attack. These differing strategic motivations, timelines, and strategies in many respects invert those of nuclear weapons states that rely on large organizations, procedures, and technical controls, to ensure that nuclear weapons are never used without legitimate authorization; and if they are used, to minimize needless civilian casualties (at least some nuclear armed states aspire to this outcome). The repertoire of state-based practices that presents other states with credible nuclear threat and reassures them that nuclear weapons are secure and controlled is likely to be completely mismatched with the strengths and strategies of non-state nuclear terrorists that may seek to maximize civilian terror, are not always concerned about their own survival or even that of their families and communities-of-origin, and may be willing to take extraordinary risk combined with creativity to exploit the opportunities for attack presented by nuclear weapons, umbrella, and non-nuclear states, or their private adversaries. For non-state actors to succeed at complex engineering project such as acquiring a nuclear weapons or nuclear threat capacity demands substantial effort. Gary Ackerman specifies that to have a chance of succeeding, non-state actors with nuclear weapons aspirations must be able to demonstrate that they control substantial resources, have a safe haven in which to conduct research and development, have their own or procured expertise, are able to learn from failing and have the stamina and strategic commitment to do so, and manifest long-term planning and ability to make rational choices on decadal timelines. He identified five such violent non-state actors who already conducted such engineering projects (see Figure 3), and also noted the important facilitating condition of a global network of expertize and hardware. Thus, although the skill, financial, and materiel requirements of a non-state nuclear weapons project present a high bar, they are certainly reachable.

Figure 3: Complex engineering projects by five violent non-state actors & Khan network Source: G. Ackerman, “Comparative Analysis of VNSA Complex Engineering Efforts,” Journal of Strategic Security, 9:1, 2016, at: http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jss/vol9/iss1/10/ Along similar lines, James Forest examined the extent to which non-state actors can pose a threat of nuclear terrorism.[10] He notes that such entities face practical constraints, including expense, the obstacles to stealing many essential elements for nuclear weapons, the risk of discovery, and the difficulties of constructing and concealing such weapons. He also recognizes the strategic constraints that work against obtaining nuclear weapons, including a cost-benefit analysis, possible de-legitimation that might follow from perceived genocidal intent or use, and the primacy of political-ideological objectives over long-term projects that might lead to the group’s elimination, the availability of cheaper and more effective alternatives that would be foregone by pursuit of nuclear weapons, and the risk of failure and/or discovery before successful acquisition and use occurs. In the past, almost all—but not all—non-state terrorist groups appeared to be restrained by a combination of high practical and strategic constraints, plus their own cost-benefit analysis of the opportunity costs of pursuing nuclear weapons. However, should some or all of these constraints diminish, a rapid non-state nuclear proliferation is possible. Although only a few non-state actors such as Al Qaeda and Islamic State have exhibited such underlying stamina and organizational capacities and actually attempted to obtain nuclear weapons-related skills, hardware, and materials, the past is not prologue. An incredibly diverse set of variously motivated terrorist groups exist already, including politico-ideological, apocalyptic-millenarian, politico-religious, nationalist-separatist, ecological, and political-insurgency entities, some of which converge with criminal-military and criminal-scientist (profit based) networks; but also pyscho-pathological mass killing cults, lone wolves, and ephemeral copy-cat non-state actors. The social, economic, and deculturating conditions that generate such entities are likely to persist and even expand. In particular, rapidly growing coastal mega-cities as part of rapid global urbanization offer such actors the ability to sustain themselves as “flow gatekeepers,” possibly in alliance with global criminal networks, thereby supplanting the highland origins of many of today’s non-state violent actors with global reach.[11] Other contributing factors contributing to the supply of possible non-state actors seeking nuclear weapons include new entries such as city states in search of new security strategies, megacities creating their own transnationally active security forces, non-states with partial or complete territorial control such as Taiwan and various micro-states, failing states, provinces in dissociating, failing states that fall victim to internal chaos and the displacement effects of untrammeled globalization, and altogether failed states resulting in ungoverned spaces. To this must be added domestic terrorist entities in the advanced industrial states as they hollow out their economies due to economic globalization and restructuring, adjust to cross-border migration, and adapt to cultural and political dislocation. In short, the prognosis is for the fifth tier of non-state actors to beset the other four tiers with intense turbulence just as waves on a beach swirl around sandcastles, washing away their foundations, causing grains of sand to cascade, and eventually collapsing the whole structure. Observed non-state nuclear threats and attacks In light of the constraints faced by non-state terrorist actors in past decades, it is not surprising that the constellation of actual nuclear terrorist attacks and threats has been relatively limited during and since the end of the Cold War. As Martha Crenshaw noted in a comment on the draft of this paper: We still don’t know why terrorists (in the sense of non-state actors) have not moved into the CBRN [chemical,biological, radiological or nuclear ] domain. (Many people think biosecurity is more critical, for that matter.) Such a move would be extremely risky for the terrorist actor, even if the group possessed both capability (resources, secure space, time, patience) and motivation (willingness to expend the effort, considering opportunity costs). So far it appears that “conventional” terrorism serves their purposes well enough. Most of what we have seen is rhetoric, with some scattered and not always energetic initiatives.[12] Nonetheless, those that have occurred demonstrate unambiguously that such threats and attacks are not merely hypothetical, in spite of the limiting conditions outlined above. One survey documented eighty actual, planned attacks on nuclear facilities containing nuclear materials between 1961-2016[13] as follows: 80 attacks in 3 waves (1970s armed assaults, 1990s thefts, post-2010, breaches) High threat attacks: 32/80 attacks posed substantial, verified threat of which 44 percent involved insiders. All types of targets were found in the data set—on reactors, other nuclear facilities, military bases leading Gary Ackerman and to conclude: “Overall, empirical evidence suggests that there are sufficient cases in each of the listed categories that no type of threat can be ignored.”[14] No region was immune; no year was without such a threat or attack. Thus, there is a likely to be a coincidence of future non-state threats and attacks with inter-state nuclear-prone conflicts, as in the past, and possibly more so given the current trend in and the generative conditions for global terrorist activity that will likely pertain in the coming decades. Of these attacks, about a quarter each were ethno-nationalist, secular utopian, or unknown in motivation; and the remaining quarter were a motley mix of religious (11 percent), “other” (5 percent), personal-idiosyncratic (4 percent), single issue (2 percent) and state sponsored (1 percent) in motivation. The conclusion is unavoidable that there a non-state nuclear terrorist attack in the Northeast Asia region is possible. The following sections outline the possible situations in which nuclear terrorist attacks might be implicated as a trigger to interstate conflict, and even nuclear war. Particular attention is paid to the how nuclear command, control and communications systems may play an independent and unanticipated role in leading to inadvertent nuclear war, separate to the contributors to inadvertency normally included such as degradation of decision-making due to time and other pressures; accident; “wetware” (human failures), software or hardware failures; and misinterpretation of intended or unintended signals from an adversary. Regional pathways to interstate nuclear war At least five distinct nuclear-prone axes of conflict are evident in Northeast Asia. These are: US-DPRK conflict (including with United States, US allies Japan, South Korea and Australia; and all other UNC command allies. Many permutations possible ranging from non-violent collapse to implosion and civil war, inter-Korean war, slow humanitarian crisis. Of these implosion-civil war in the DPRK may be the most dangerous, followed closely by an altercation at the Joint Security Area at Panmunjon where US, ROK, and DPRK soldiers interact constantly. China-Taiwan conflict, whereby China may use nuclear weapons to overcome US forces operating in the West Pacific, either at sea, or based on US (Guam, Alaska) or US allied territory in the ROK, Japan, the Philippines, or Australia); or US uses nuclear weapons in response to Chinese attack on Taiwan. China-Japan conflict escalates via attacks on early warning systems, for example, underwater hydrophone systems (Ayson-Ball, 2011). China-Russia conflict, possibly in context of loss-of-control of Chinese nuclear forces in a regional conflict involving Taiwan or North Korea. Russia-US conflict, involving horizontal escalation from a head-on collision with Russian nuclear forces in Europe or the Middle East; or somehow starts at sea (mostly likely seems ASW) or over North Korea (some have cited risk of US missile defenses against North Korean attack as risking Russian immediate response). Combinations of or simultaneous eruption of the above conflicts that culminate in nuclear war are also possible. Other unanticipated nuclear-prone conflict axes (such as Russia-Japan) could also emerge with little warning. Precursors of such nuclear-laden conflicts in this region also exist that could lead states to the brink of nuclear war and demonstrate that nuclear war is all too possible between states in this region. Examples include the August 1958 Quemoy-Matsu crisis, in which the United States deployed nuclear weapons to Taiwan, and the US Air Force has only a nuclear defense strategy in place to defend Taiwan should China have escalated its shelling campaign to an actual attack; the October 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, when a US nuclear armed missile was nearly fired from Okinawa due to a false fire order; the March 1969 Chinese-Soviet military clash and resulting consideration of nuclear attacks by both sides; and the August 1976 poplar tree crisis at Panmunjon in Korea, when the United States moved nuclear weapons back to the DMZ and the White House issued pre-delegated orders to the US commander in Korea to attack North Korea if the tree cutting task force was attacked by North Korean forces. Loss-of-control of Nuclear Weapons As is well known, nuclear armed states must routinely—and in the midst of a crisis—ensure that their nuclear weapons are never used without legitimate authority, but also ensure at the same time that they are always available for immediate use with legitimate authority. This “always-never” paradox is managed in part by a set of negative and positive controls, reliant upon procedural and technical measures, to maintain legitimate state-based command-and-control (see Figure Four). Figure Four: Controls and Measures on Nuclear Weapons Use Source: Virginia Tech Applied Research Corporation, Nuclear Command, Control, and Stability Framework, December 29, 2016, at: https://calhoun.nps.edu/bitstream/handle/10945/48707/Nuclear%20Command%20Control%20and%20Stability%20Assessment\_Final%20report\_29Dec15%20rev2.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y In this framework, Jerry Conley has produced a taxonomy of nuclear command-and-control structures that embody varying notional national “command-and-control” orientations (also referred to as stability points or biases). Each nuclear armed state exhibits a distinct preference for technical and procedural measures to achieve negative and positive control of nuclear weapons. The way that a state constructs its control system varies depending on its size, wealth, technology, leadership, and strategic orientation, lending each state a unique use propensity affected by the information processing and transmission functions of the nuclear command-and-control system, that in part determines the use or non-use decisions made by the leaders of nuclear armed states. The resulting ideal nuclear command-and-control state structures are shown in Table 1. Table 1: Ideal Nuclear command-and-control structures Wealthy A nuclear program that has economic resources to research, expand, and bolster itself with both experienced people and technical innovations. Poor A nuclear program that does not have sufficient economic resources to properly research, expand, and bolster itself and relies on procedures instead of technology and experience. Complex A nuclear program that has the material resources and personnel to support a wide range of controls and redundancies. Simple A nuclear program that has minimal material resources or personnel to adequately support a robust and redundant C2 structure. Centralized A nuclear program that maintains authority and control of its nuclear armament as a singular capability through a defined chain of command. Decentralized A nuclear program that distributes authority of its nuclear armament to a network of commanders or individuals who operate as independent decision makers with minimal oversight. Civilian A nuclear program that is governed by an elected, non-military government that maintains authority and control over the nuclear arsenal through a defined chain of authority. Military A nuclear program that is governed by a weak civilian government and/or the military maintains control and authority over the nuclear arsenal. Source: Virginia Tech Applied Research Corporation, Nuclear Command, Control, and Stability Framework, December 29, 2016, at: https://calhoun.nps.edu/bitstream/handle/10945/48707/Nuclear%20Command%20Control%20and%20Stability%20Assessment\_Final%20report\_29Dec15%20rev2.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y These ideal types are summarized with respect to the defining axes of control measure in Figure Five. Figure Five: State nuclear weapons control biases by NC3 type Note: according to dominant characteristic shown in orange circle; also, real states may exhibit more than one characteristic Source: Virginia Tech Applied Research Corporation, Nuclear Command, Control, and Stability Framework, December 29, 2016, at: https://calhoun.nps.edu/bitstream/handle/10945/48707/Nuclear%20Command%20Control%20and%20Stability%20Assessment\_Final%20report\_29Dec15%20rev2.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y In Northeast Asia, a four-way nuclear threat system exists that has a three world-class nuclear armed states, the United States, Russia and China, interacting with a fourth tier, barely nuclear armed state, the DPRK. In this quadrilateral nuclear standoff, the DPRK’s simple NC3 system likely is an amalgam of a poorly resourced, militarized, and personalized leadership—which may lead it to oscillate between procedural and technical measures as the basis of control, with a primary emphasis on positive use control, not negative control to avoid unauthorized use. China’s large, centralized NC3 system co-mingles nuclear and conventional communications between national commanders and deployed nuclear forces and may emphasize negative more than positive use controls to ensure Party control. Russia’s highly centralized, complex NC3 system relies on legacy technology and limited economic base for modernization. It too may be more oriented towards negative controls in peacetime, but have the capacity to spring almost instantly to primary reliance on positive controls in times of crisis or tension. The US NC3 system is large, complex and based on wealth and technological prowess. It is under civilian, not military control, at least in principle and in peacetime, and is redundant, diverse, and relatively resilient. Non-state nuclear attack as trigger of inter-state nuclear war in Northeast Asia The critical issue is how a nuclear terrorist attack may “catalyze” inter-state nuclear war, especially the NC3 systems that inform and partly determine how leaders respond to nuclear threat. Current conditions in Northeast Asia suggest that multiple precursory conditions for nuclear terrorism already exist or exist in nascent form. In Japan, for example, low-level, individual, terroristic violence with nuclear materials, against nuclear facilities, is real. In all countries of the region, the risk of diversion of nuclear material is real, although the risk is likely higher due to volume and laxity of security in some countries of the region than in others. In all countries, the risk of an insider “sleeper” threat is real in security and nuclear agencies, and such insiders already operated in actual terrorist organizations. Insider corruption is also observable in nuclear fuel cycle agencies in all countries of the region. The threat of extortion to induce insider cooperation is also real in all countries. The possibility of a cult attempting to build and buy nuclear weapons is real and has already occurred in the region.[15] Cyber-terrorism against nuclear reactors is real and such attacks have already taken place in South Korea (although it remains difficult to attribute the source of the attacks with certainty). The stand-off ballistic and drone threat to nuclear weapons and fuel cycle facilities is real in the region, including from non-state actors, some of whom have already adopted and used such technology almost instantly from when it becomes accessible (for example, drones).[16] Two other broad risk factors are also present in the region. The social and political conditions for extreme ethnic and xenophobic nationalism are emerging in China, Korea, Japan, and Russia. Although there has been no risk of attack on or loss of control over nuclear weapons since their removal from Japan in 1972 and from South Korea in 1991, this risk continues to exist in North Korea, China, and Russia, and to the extent that they are deployed on aircraft and ships of these and other nuclear weapons states (including submarines) deployed in the region’s high seas, also outside their territorial borders. The most conducive circumstance for catalysis to occur due to a nuclear terrorist attack might involve the following nexi of timing and conditions: Low-level, tactical, or random individual terrorist attacks for whatever reasons, even assassination of national leaders, up to and including dirty radiological bomb attacks, that overlap with inter-state crisis dynamics in ways that affect state decisions to threaten with or to use nuclear weapons. This might be undertaken by an opportunist nuclear terrorist entity in search of rapid and high political impact. Attacks on major national or international events in each country to maximize terror and to de-legitimate national leaders and whole governments. In Japan, for example, more than ten heads of state and senior ministerial international meetings are held each year. For the strategic nuclear terrorist, patiently acquiring higher level nuclear threat capabilities for such attacks and then staging them to maximum effect could accrue strategic gains. Attacks or threatened attacks, including deception and disguised attacks, will have maximum leverage when nuclear-armed states are near or on the brink of war or during a national crisis (such as Fukushima), when intelligence agencies, national leaders, facility operators, surveillance and policing agencies, and first responders are already maximally committed and over-extended. At this point, we note an important caveat to the original concept of catalytic nuclear war as it might pertain to nuclear terrorist threats or attacks. Although an attack might be disguised so that it is attributed to a nuclear-armed state, or a ruse might be undertaken to threaten such attacks by deception, in reality a catalytic strike by a nuclear weapons state in conditions of mutual vulnerability to nuclear retaliation for such a strike from other nuclear armed states would be highly irrational. Accordingly, the effect of nuclear terrorism involving a nuclear detonation or major radiological release may not of itself be catalytic of nuclear war—at least not intentionally–because it will not lead directly to the destruction of a targeted nuclear-armed state. Rather, it may be catalytic of non-nuclear war between states, especially if the non-state actor turns out to be aligned with or sponsored by a state (in many Japanese minds, the natural candidate for the perpetrator of such an attack is the pro-North Korean General Association of Korean Residents, often called Chosen Soren, which represents many of the otherwise stateless Koreans who were born and live in Japan) and a further sequence of coincident events is necessary to drive escalation to the point of nuclear first use by a state. Also, the catalyst—the non-state actor–is almost assured of discovery and destruction either during the attack itself (if it takes the form of a nuclear suicide attack then self-immolation is assured) or as a result of a search-and-destroy campaign from the targeted state (unless the targeted government is annihilated by the initial terrorist nuclear attack). It follows that the effects of a non-state nuclear attack may be characterized better as a trigger effect, bringing about a cascade of nuclear use decisions within NC3 systems that shift each state increasingly away from nuclear non-use and increasingly towards nuclear use by releasing negative controls and enhancing positive controls in multiple action-reaction escalation spirals (depending on how many nuclear armed states are party to an inter-state conflict that is already underway at the time of the non-state nuclear attack); and/or by inducing concatenating nuclear attacks across geographically proximate nuclear weapons forces of states already caught in the crossfire of nuclear threat or attacks of their own making before a nuclear terrorist attack.[17] An example of a cascading effect would be a non-state attack on a key node of linked early warning systems that is unique to and critical for strategic nuclear forces to be employable, or the effect of multiple, coincident and erroneous sensor alerts of incoming attacks (as occurred during the Cuban Missile Crisis with radar in Florida monitoring Soviet missiles in Cuba that mistakenly fused an erroneous reading of a missile trajectory with a real observation of a Soviet satellite that happened to be passing overhead). An example of a concatenating effect would an attack that leads a nuclear weapons state to target two other states forces because it cannot determine whose forces attacked its own. This circumstance might arise if key anti-submarine forces or an aircraft carrier battle group were attacked and it was impossible to determine in a given waterway or area of ocean whose submarines were present or responsible for the attack, leading the attacked state to destroy all the submarines presenting on-going threat to its strategic forces. As we noted above, a terrorist nuclear shock may take various forms and appear in different places. Ever since an extortion attempt in Boston in 1974 based on the threat of nuclear detonation, the threat of an improvised nuclear device has been credible. For such a threat to be credible, a non-state terrorist entity must release a plausible precursor such as nuclear material or warhead design information, or stage an actual demonstration attack that makes it plausible that the attacker controls a significant quantity of fissile material (most likely plutonium, or simply radioactive materials suitable for a radiological device that might be used to draw in first responders and then detonate a warhead to maximize damage and terror). Such an attack might be combined with a separate attack on critical infrastructure such as a cyberattack. The attacker might retain sufficient material for bargaining and insurance should the initial attack fail. Given the need to adapt to circumstances, such an attacker is likely to be patient and strategic, in the terms defined earlier, and to have extensive organizational and communication capacities; and to be able to operate at multiple targeted sites, possibly in multiple countries. Given its patience and stamina, such an attacker would select a highly symbolic target such as a high level meeting. Such a case would present the targeted state with an exquisite dilemma: bargaining and negotiation with the non-state actor threatening such an attack may be justified given the explicit and plausible nature of the threat, which may be politically impossible while making counter-terrorism operations very risky and only possible with extreme caution. And, such an attacker might well issue a false statement about state-sponsorship to invoke third parties in ways that vastly complicate the response to the threat. If the attacker is less capable and driven for immediate political or other returns, then it may be satisfied with highly delegated delivery with no recall option, and no use of communications to minimize the risk of discovery or interdiction. Such an attacker is also less likely to wait for the circumstances in which inter-state nuclear war is more likely due to inter-state tension; and also less likely to seek third party effects beyond the damage to the immediate target and resulting terror. Should surveillance indicate that an improvised nuclear device is in motion, then an all-out search to interdict the attackers and to retrieve the device or materials would likely ensue. In these two instances of credible threat of non-state nuclear attack, the insider versus outsider perpetrator factor will affect significantly how the attack affects possible inter-state conflicts. In Kobe’s terms, if the perpetrator is confirmed to be an outsider, then a country-of-origin suspicion matrix may cast suspicion onto another state as possible sponsor. For an attack threatened in China, the linkage might be back to Russia, the United States, or North Korea. For an attack threatened in Russia, the linkage might be back to the United States, China, or North Korea. For an attack threatened in North Korea, the linkage might be back to the United States, China, or Russia. And for an attack threatened in one of the umbrella states in the region, South Korea and Japan, such an attack might be linked to each other, as well as to China, North Korea, or Russia. In each case, the shadow of suspicion and possible accusations could tilt decision-making processes in one or more of these states and ways that could worsen pre-existing views about the nuclear use propensity of an opposing nuclear armed state. Should an actual nuclear attack occur, the situation is even more complex and problematic. Such an attack might be purely accidental, due to hardware, software, or human error while nuclear materials or weapons are in transit. In principle, this limits the site of such an event to the nuclear weapons states or their ships and aircraft as neither South Korea nor Japan host nuclear weapons today. If an insider is involved, then the perpetrator may be identified quickly, and whether there is a linkage with another state may become evident (depending on nuclear forensics as well as insight obtained from surviving attackers). If an outsider is the perpetrator, then the suspicion matrix will come into play again, with possibly severe effects on inter-state tension due to accusation, suspicion, and fear of follow-on attacks. During the attack, especially if it is a hostage-taking type of attack, the identity of the perpetrator may be unknown or ambiguous, and maintaining this ambiguity or even opacity as to the attacker may be deliberate—as was the case with the 2008 Mumbai attack in which the controller tried to ensure that all the attackers were killed in the course of the twelve separate but coordinated attacks across the city over four days. Although much progress has been made in establishing local nuclear forensics capability in Japan,[18] China, and South Korea, there is no certainty that it is sufficiently developed to identify the perpetrator of an act of nuclear terrorism, especially if there is a state sponsor and deception involved. Conclusion We now move to our conclusion. Nuclear-armed states can place themselves on the edge of nuclear war by a combination of threatening force deployments and threat rhetoric. Statements by US and North Korea’s leaders and supporting amplification by state and private media to present just such a lethal combination. Many observers have observed that the risk of war and nuclear war, in Korea and globally, have increased in the last few years—although no-one can say with authority by how much and exactly for what reasons. However, states are restrained in their actual decisions to escalate to conflict and/or nuclear war by conventional deterrence, vital national interests, and other institutional and political restraints, both domestic and international. It is not easy, in the real world, or even in fiction, to start nuclear wars.[19] Rhetorical threats are standard fare in realist and constructivist accounts of inter-state nuclear deterrence, compellence, and reassurance, and are not cause for alarm per se. States will manage the risk in each of the threat relationships with other nuclear armed states to stay back from the brink, let alone go over it, as they have in the past. This argument was powerful and to many, persuasive during the Cold War although it does not deny the hair-raising risks taken by nuclear armed states during this period. Today, the multi-polarity of nine nuclear weapons states interacting in a four-tiered nuclear threat system means that the practice of sustaining nuclear threat and preparing for nuclear war is no longer merely complicated, but is now enormously complex in ways that may exceed the capacity of some and perhaps all states to manage, even without the emergence of a fifth tier of non-state actors to add further unpredictability to how this system works in practice. The possibility that non-state actors may attack without advance warning as to the time, place, and angle of attack presents another layer of uncertainty to this complexity as to how inter-state nuclear war may break out. That is, non-state actors with nuclear weapons or threat goals and capacities do not seek the same goals, will not use the same control systems, and will use radically different organizational procedures and systems to deliver on their threats compared with nuclear armed states. If used tactically for immediate terrorist effect, a non-state nuclear terrorist could violently attack nuclear facilities, exploiting any number of vulnerabilities in fuel cycle facility security, or use actual nuclear materials and even warheads against military or civilian targets. If a persistent, strategically oriented nuclear terrorist succeed in gaining credible nuclear threat capacities, it might take hostage one or more states or cities. If such an event coincides with already high levels of tension and even military collisions between the non-nuclear forces of nuclear armed states, then a non-state nuclear terrorist attack could impel a nuclear armed state to escalate its threat or even military actions against other states, in the belief that this targeted state may have sponsored the non-state attack, or was simply the source of the attack, whatever the declared identity of the attacking non-state entity. This outcome could trigger these states to go onto one or more of the pathways to inadvertent nuclear war, especially if the terrorist attack was on a high value and high risk nuclear facility or involved the seizure and/or use of fissile material. Some experts dismiss this possibility as so remote as to be not worth worrying about. Yet the history of nuclear terrorism globally and in the Northeast Asian region suggests otherwise. Using the sand castle metaphor, once built on the high tide line, sand castles may withstand the wind but eventually succumb to the tide once it reaches the castle—at least once, usually twice a day. Also, theories of organizational and technological failure point to the coincidence of multiple, relatively insignificant driving events that interact or accumulate in ways that lead the “metasystem” to fail, even if each individual component of a system works perfectly. Thus, the potential catalytic effect of a nuclear terrorist incident is not that it would of itself lead to a sudden inter-state nuclear war; but that at a time of crisis when alert levels are already high, when control systems on nuclear forces have already shifted from primary emphasis on negative to positive control, when decision making is already stressed, when the potential for miscalculation is already high due to shows of force indicating that first-use is nigh, when rhetorical threats promising annihilation on the one hand, or collapse of morale and weakness on the other invite counter-vailing threats by nuclear adversaries or their allies to gain the upper hand in the “contest of resolve,” and when organizational cybernetics may be in play such that purposeful actions are implemented differently than intended, then a terrorist nuclear attack may shift a coincident combination of some or all of these factors to a threshold level where they collectively lead to a first-use decision by one or more nuclear-armed states. If the terrorist attack is timed or happens to coincide with high levels of inter-state tension involving nuclear-armed states, then some or all of these tendencies will likely be in play anyway—precisely the concern of those who posit pathways to inadvertent nuclear war as outlined in section 2 above.

#### Bioterrorism causes extinction.

Hamish De Bretton-Gordon, CBRN Expert @ British Army, 20 [Director @ DBG Defense, Consultant on CBRN and Biosecurity], “Biosecurity in the Wake of COVID-19: The Urgent Action Needed,” Combatting Terrorism Center Sentinel, November/December 2020, Volume 13, Issue 11, <https://ctc.usma.edu/biosecurity-in-the-wake-of-covid-19-the-urgent-action-needed/> C.VC

Policymakers around the world did not grasp just how large the impact of a bio threat could be. Beyond the enormous human and economic impact, the current pandemic has exposed the weakness, lack of preparedness, and poor responsiveness of healthcare systems of even highly developed countries like the United States and the United Kingdom. And the virus has inflicted carnage, even though SARS-CoV-2 (the virus that causes COVID-19) is not especially virulent. The world may be confronted with other viruses in the future whose combination of virulence (the harm a pathogen does to its host), transmissibility, and other characteristics pose much greater danger.

While overwhelming evidence points to SARS-CoV-2 spontaneously spreading to humans, the advances in synthetic biology and the growth in the number of Level 3 and 4 biocontainment facilities around the world storing deadly viruses1 mean there is also the very real possibility that in the future, bad actors will try to engineer or steal/obtain a highly transmissible and highly virulent virus and unleash it onto the world. Another risk is accidental releases from such biocontainment facilities.

COVID-19, a highly transmissible but not very virulent pathogen, has had a devastating global impact, a fact that will not have gone unnoticed by rogue states and terror organizations. Advances in synthetic biology have created tools that could be put to malevolent use. In the last two decades, scientists synthesized the poliovirus from its genetic sequence,2 recreated the 1918 Spanish flu virus,3 and succeeded in modifying the H5N1 avian flu virus so that it resulted (in a research laboratory) in airborne transmission among mammals.4 In the future, we should think of weaponized biology as no less of an existential threat to the planet than weaponized atomic science. It should also be noted that the fear and panic that even a medium-scale bioterror attack could create could have dangerous implications that may rival or even surpass the immediate loss of life.

The Need to Rethink Likelihood

Given the fact that in late 2019 when, as far as is known, COVID-19 cases first started emerging in China, it had been more than a century since the previous catastrophic outbreak (the 1918-1919 “Spanish flu” pandemic),d it was unsurprising that many thought of such pandemics as a one-in-a-100-year event. Such assumptions should no longer hold. The encroachment of human settlements into areas that had previously been sanctuaries for wildlife5 and the popularity in some parts of the world of markets where people and wild animals are brought into proximity have made it more likely viruses will make the species leap to human beings.e And when they do, as the COVID-19 pandemic illustrated, the interconnectedness of a world in which millions of people fly each day6 means they can spread very rapidly.

There is also growing concern about engineered viruses. Not only have advances in synthetic biology (SynBio) created growing capacity for extremely dangerous viruses to be engineered in a laboratory, but the number of people with access to potentially dangerous ‘dual use’ technology has greatly expanded and continues to expand, making malevolent use of such technology ever more likely.

In the August 2020 issue of this publication, scientists at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point warned that:

The wide availability of the protocols, procedures, and techniques necessary to produce and modify living organisms combined with an exponential increase in the availability of genetic data is leading to a revolution in science affecting the threat landscape that can be rivaled only by the development of the atomic bomb. As the technology improves, the level of education and skills necessary to engineer biological agents decreases. Whereas only state actors historically had the resources to develop and employ biological weapons, SynBio is changing the threat paradigm.

The cost threshold of engineering viruses is also lowering, with the West Point scientists warning that synthetic biology has “placed the ability to recreate some of the deadliest infectious diseases known well within the grasp of the state-sponsored terrorist and the talented non-state actor.”7

As already noted, another source of vulnerability is that deadly viruses could be stolen from or escape from a research laboratory. There are now around 50 Biosafety Level 4f facilities around the world, where the deadliest pathogens are stored and worked on, and this figure is set to increase in the next few years.g This is a large increase over the last 30 years, creating bigger risk of a breach. Of equal, if not greater concern are the thousands of Biosafety Level 3 labs globally,8 which handle deadly pathogens like COVID-19.9

Given what has been outlined above, the risk of a future destructive biological attack or another devastating global pandemic should no longer be seen as low. From this point forward, there should no higher priority for the international community than biosecurity.

### 1ac – plan

#### Thus I affirm the resolution resolved: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike. As a general principal

#### Collin’s Dictionary defines “unconditional”: [https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/unconditional]

If you describe something as unconditional, you mean that the person doing or giving it does not require anything to be done by other people in exchange.

#### PICs don’t negate: a] General principles don’t defend an absolute action, so they tolerate exceptions – its better for debate because any other interp allows them to run infinite pics that the aff cant possibly prep – kills fairness and ed.

### 1ac – fwrk

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing. To clarify hededonistic act utilitarianism

#### 1] Actor spec—governments must use util because they don’t have intentions and are constantly dealing with tradeoffs—takes out calc indicts since they are empirically denied.

#### 2] Death is bad and outweighs – a] agents can’t act if they fear for their bodily security which constrains every ethical theory, b] it destroys the subject itself – kills any ability to achieve value in ethics since life is a prerequisite which means it’s a side constraint since we can’t reach the end goal of ethics without life

#### 3] Pleasure and pain are the starting point for moral reasoning—they’re our most baseline desires and the only things that explain the intrinsic value of objects or actions

Moen 16, Ole Martin (PhD, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo). "An Argument for Hedonism." Journal of Value Inquiry 50.2 (2016): 267.

Let us start by observing, empirically, that **a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value** and disvalue **is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable**. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues. This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for **there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels**, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” **are** here **understood inclusively**, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative. 2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values. If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store**, I might ask: “What for**?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. **The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good**. 3 As Aristotle observes: “**We never ask** [a man] **what** his **end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself**.”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that **if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad**. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that **pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value**. Although **pleasure and pain thus seem to be good candidates for intrinsic value and disvalue**, several objections have been raised against this suggestion: (1) that pleasure and pain have instrumental but not intrinsic value/disvalue; (2) that pleasure and pain gain their value/disvalue derivatively, in virtue of satisfying/frustrating our desires; (3) that there is a subset of pleasures that are not intrinsically valuable (so-called “evil pleasures”) and a subset of pains that are not intrinsically disvaluable (so-called “noble pains”), and (4) that pain asymbolia, masochism, and practices such as wiggling a loose tooth render it implausible that pain is intrinsically disvaluable. I shall argue that these objections fail. Though it is, of course, an open question whether other objections to P1 might be more successful, I shall assume that if (1)–(4) fail, we are justified in believing that P1 is true itself a paragon of freedom—there will always be some agents able to interfere substantially with one’s choices. The effective level of protection one enjoys, and hence one’s actual degree of freedom, will vary according to multiple factors: how powerful one is, how powerful individuals in one’s vicinity are, how frequent police patrols are, and so on. Now, we saw above that what makes a slave unfree on Pettit’s view is the fact that his master has the power to interfere arbitrarily with his choices; in other words, what makes the slave unfree is the power relation that obtains between his master and him. The difﬁculty is that, in light of the facts I just mentioned, there is no reason to think that this power relation will be unique. A similar relation could obtain between the master and someone other than the slave: absent perfect state control, the master may very well have enough power to interfere in the lives of countless individuals. Yet it would be wrong to infer that these individuals lack freedom in the way the slave does; if they lack anything, it seems to be security. A problematic power relation can also obtain between the slave and someone other than the master, since there may be citizens who are more powerful than the master and who can therefore interfere with the slave’s choices at their discretion. Once again, it would be wrong to infer that these individuals make the slave unfree in the same way that the master does. Something appears to be missing from Pettit’s view. If I live in a particularly nasty part of town, then it may turn out that, when all the relevant factors are taken into account, I am just as vulnerable to outside interference as are the slaves in the royal palace, yet it does not follow that our conditions are equivalent from the point of view of freedom. As a matter of fact, we may be equally vulnerable to outside interference, but as a matter of right, our standings could not be more different. I have legal recourse against anyone who interferes with my freedom; the recourse may not be very effective—presumably it is not, if my overall vulnerability to outside interference is comparable to that of a slave— but I still have full legal standing.68 By contrast, the slave lacks legal recourse against the interventions of one speciﬁc individual: his master. It is that fact, on a Kantian view—a fact about the legal relation in which a slave stands to his master—that sets slaves apart from freemen. The point may appear trivial, but it does get something right: whereas one cannot identify a power relation that obtains uniquely between a slave and his master, the legal relation between them is undeniably unique. A master’s right to interfere with respect to his slave does not extend to freemen, regardless of how vulnerable they might be as a matter of fact, and citizens other than the master do not have the right to order the slave around, regardless of how powerful they might be. This suggests that Kant is correct in thinking that the ideal of freedom is essentially linked to a person’s having full legal standing. More speciﬁcally, he is correct in holding that the importance of rights is not exhausted by their contribution to the level of protection that an individual enjoys, as it must be on an instrumental view like Pettit’s. Although it does matter that rights be enforced with reasonable effectiveness, the sheer fact that one has adequate legal rights is essential to one’s standing as a free citizen. In this respect, Kant stays faithful to the idea that freedom is primarily a matter of standing—a standing that the freeman has and that the slave lacks. Pettit himself frequently insists on the idea, but he fails to do it justice when he claims that freedom is simply a matter of being adequately (and reliably) shielded against the strength of others. As Kant recognizes, the standing of a free citizen is a more complex matter than that. One could perhaps worry that the idea of legal standing is something of a red herring here—that it must ultimately be reducible to a complex network of power relations and, hence, that the position I attribute to Kant differs only nominally from Pettit’s. That seems to me doubtful. Viewing legal standing as essential to freedom makes sense only if our conception of the former includes conceptions of what constitutes a fully adequate scheme of legal rights, appropriate legal recourse, justiﬁed punishment, and so on. Only if one believes that these notions all boil down to power relations will Kant’s position appear similar to Pettit’s. On any other view—and certainly that includes most views recently defended by philosophers—the notion of legal standing will outstrip the power relations that ground Pettit’s theory.

#### 4] Extinction outweighs

MacAskill 14 [William, Oxford Philosopher and youngest tenured philosopher in the world, Normative Uncertainty, 2014]

The human race might go extinct from a number of causes: asteroids, supervolcanoes, runaway climate change, pandemics, nuclear war, and the development and use of dangerous new technologies such as synthetic biology, all pose risks (even if very small) to the continued survival of the human race.184 And different moral views give opposing answers to question of whether this would be a good or a bad thing. It might seem obvious that human extinction would be a very bad thing, both because of the loss of potential future lives, and because of the loss of the scientific and artistic progress that we would make in the future. But the issue is at least unclear. The continuation of the human race would be a mixed bag: inevitably, it would involve both upsides and downsides. And if one regards it as much more important to avoid bad things happening than to promote good things happening then one could plausibly regard human extinction as a good thing.For example, one might regard the prevention of bads as being in general more important that the promotion of goods, as defended historically by G. E. Moore,185 and more recently by Thomas Hurka.186 One could weight the prevention of suffering as being much more important that the promotion of happiness. Or one could weight the prevention of objective bads, such as war and genocide, as being much more important than the promotion of objective goods, such as scientific and artistic progress. If the human race continues its future will inevitably involve suffering as well as happiness, and objective bads as well as objective goods. So, if one weights the bads sufficiently heavily against the goods, or if one is sufficiently pessimistic about humanity’s ability to achieve good outcomes, then one will regard human extinction as a good thing.187 However, even if we believe in a moral view according to which human extinction would be a good thing, we still have strong reason to prevent near-term human extinction. To see this, we must note three points. First, we should note that the extinction of the human race is an extremely high stakes moral issue. Humanity could be around for a very long time: if humans survive as long as the median mammal species, we will last another two million years. On this estimate, the number of humans in existence in the The future, given that we don’t go extinct any time soon, would be 2×10^14. So if it is good to bring new people into existence, then it’s very good to prevent human extinction. Second, human extinction is by its nature an irreversible scenario. If we continue to exist, then we always have the option of letting ourselves go extinct in the future (or, perhaps more realistically, of considerably reducing population size). But if we go extinct, then we can’t magically bring ourselves back into existence at a later date. Third, we should expect ourselves to progress, morally, over the next few centuries, as we have progressed in the past. So we should expect that in a few centuries’ time we will have better evidence about how to evaluate human extinction than we currently have. Given these three factors, it would be better to prevent the near-term extinction of the human race, even if we thought that the extinction of the human race would actually be a very good thing. To make this concrete, I’ll give the following simple but illustrative model. Suppose that we have 0.8 credence that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 0.2 certain that it’s a good thing to produce new people; and the degree to which it is good to produce new people, if it is good, is the same as the degree to which it is bad to produce new people, if it is bad. That is, I’m supposing, for simplicity, that we know that one new life has one unit of value; we just don’t know whether that unit is positive or negative. And let’s use our estimate of 2×10^14 people who would exist in the future, if we avoid near-term human extinction. Given our stipulated credences, the expected benefit of letting the human race go extinct now would be (.8-.2)×(2×10^14) = 1.2×(10^14). Suppose that, if we let the human race continue and did research for 300 years, we would know for certain whether or not additional people are of positive or negative value. If so, then with the credences above we should think it 80% likely that we will find out that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 20% likely that we will find out that it’s a good thing to produce new people. So there’s an 80% chance of a loss of 3×(10^10) (because of the delay of letting the human race go extinct), the expected value of which is 2.4×(10^10). But there’s also a 20% chance of a gain of 2×(10^14), the expected value of which is 4×(10^13). That is, in expected value terms, the cost of waiting for a few hundred years is vanishingly small compared with the benefit of keeping one’s options open while one gains new information.

### 1ac - underview

#### 1AR theory is legit, drop the debater, and the highest layer- we need a way to check infinite NC abuse. 1AR is too short to go for drop the argument and gives the negative too much of an advantage in the 2NR. Even if the shell is 4 minutes, the neg can dump on it for 5:30 and go for 30 seconds of substance and auto win. Only DTD solves and allowing them to weigh against the shell only maximizes abuse.

#### Use a comparative worlds paradigm where the Affirmative must prove the plan is better than the status quo or a competitive policy option.

**Resolved denotes a proposal to be enacted by law**   
**Words and Phrases 1964** Permanent Edition   
Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “**to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;**” It is of **similar** force **to the word “enact,”** which is **defined** by Bouvier **as** meaning “**to establish by law**”.

**Prefer our definition – affirm and negate aren’t words in the resolution, and they don’t even appear on the ballot**

#### Net benefits:

#### 1] Topic Education – Truth-testing moots topic education because it allows debaters to recycle generic arguments which deny the truth of everything. Outweighs other forms of education – we only have 2 months to debate the topic and can have discussions about other issues out of round.

#### 2] AC tests new strategies in a way that turns power against itself to change the rigid political culture. Prefer abductive methods – avoids dogmatism – key to coalitions of change

#### 3] Frameworks must be reflective, else they replicate stereotypes that are counter-productive to solutions. This requires a praxis, or a dual commitment to theory and practice

#### **4] Reciprocal burdens – proving a deductive argument is false only requires you win defense and proving an inductive argument is false is more difficult because of squo bias. Comparative worlds solves because it eschews the idea that either side unilaterally carries the burden of proof**

**Presumption and permissibility affirm –**

**1. Statements are true before false since if I told you my name, you’d believe me.**

**2. Epistemics – we wouldn’t be able to start a strand of reasoning since we’d have to question that reason.**

**3. Illogical – presuming statements false is illogical since you can’t say things like P and ~P are both wrong.**

**4. Presuming obligations is logically safer since it’s better to be supererogatory than fail to meet an obligation.**

**5. Presuming statements false is impossible since we can’t operate in a world where we don’t trust anything.**

**6. To negate means to deny the truth of, which means if there isn’t offense to deny the truth of you should affirm.**

**7. Otherwise we’d have to have a proactive justification to do things like drink water.**

**8. If anything is permissible, then definitionally so is the aff since there is nothing that prevents us from doing it.**