## 1NC - Off

#### Interpretation: the affirmative may not spec a government

#### 1] The letter “A” is an indefinite article that modifies “just government” – the resolution must be proven true in all instances, not one particular instance

CCC ND Capital Community College [a nonprofit 501 c-3 organization that supports scholarships, faculty development, and curriculum innovation], “Articles, Determiners, and Quantifiers”, http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/determiners/determiners.htm#articles AG

The three articles — a, an, the — are a kind of adjective. The is called the definite article because it usually precedes a specific or previously mentioned noun; a and an are called indefinite articles because they are used to refer to something in a less specific manner (an unspecified count noun). These words are also listed among the noun markers or determiners because they are almost invariably followed by a noun (or something else acting as a noun). caution CAUTION! Even after you learn all the principles behind the use of these articles, you will find an abundance of situations where choosing the correct article or choosing whether to use one or not will prove chancy. Icy highways are dangerous. The icy highways are dangerous. And both are correct. The is used with specific nouns. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something that is one of a kind: The moon circles the earth. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something in the abstract: The United States has encouraged the use of the private automobile as opposed to the use of public transit. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something named earlier in the text. (See below..) If you would like help with the distinction between count and non-count nouns, please refer to Count and Non-Count Nouns. We use a before singular count-nouns that begin with consonants (a cow, a barn, a sheep); we use an before singular count-nouns that begin with vowels or vowel-like sounds (an apple, an urban blight, an open door). Words that begin with an h sound often require an a (as in a horse, a history book, a hotel), but if an h-word begins with an actual vowel sound, use an an (as in an hour, an honor). We would say a useful device and a union matter because the u of those words actually sounds like yoo (as opposed, say, to the u of an ugly incident). The same is true of a European and a Euro (because of that consonantal "Yoo" sound). We would say a once-in-a-lifetime experience or a one-time hero because the words once and one begin with a w sound (as if they were spelled wuntz and won). Merriam-Webster's Dictionary says that we can use an before an h- word that begins with an unstressed syllable. Thus, we might say an hisTORical moment, but we would say a HIStory book. Many writers would call that an affectation and prefer that we say a historical, but apparently, this choice is a matter of personal taste. For help on using articles with abbreviations and acronyms (a or an FBI agent?), see the section on Abbreviations. First and subsequent reference: When we first refer to something in written text, we often use an indefinite article to modify it. A newspaper has an obligation to seek out and tell the truth. In a subsequent reference to this newspaper, however, we will use the definite article: There are situations, however, when the newspaper must determine whether the public's safety is jeopardized by knowing the truth. Another example: "I'd like a glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put the glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Exception: When a modifier appears between the article and the noun, the subsequent article will continue to be indefinite: "I'd like a big glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put a big glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Generic reference: We can refer to something in a generic way by using any of the three articles. We can do the same thing by omitting the article altogether. A beagle makes a great hunting dog and family companion. An airedale is sometimes a rather skittish animal. The golden retriever is a marvelous pet for children. Irish setters are not the highly intelligent animals they used to be. The difference between the generic indefinite pronoun and the normal indefinite pronoun is that the latter refers to any of that class ("I want to buy a beagle, and any old beagle will do.") whereas the former (see beagle sentence) refers to all members of that class

#### 2] Government is an indefinite singular– the aff may not defend a specific set of governments

Nebel 20 [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs. He writes a lot of this stuff lol – duh.] “Indefinite Singular Generics in Debate” Victory Briefs, 19 Sept 2020. no url AG

I agree that if “a democracy” in the resolution just meant “one or more democracy,” then a country-specific affirmative could be topical. But, as I will explain in this topic analysis, that isn’t what “a democracy” means in the resolution. To see why, we first need to back up a bit and review (or learn) the idea of generic generalizations.

The most common way of expressing a generic in English is through a *bare plural*. A bare plural is a plural noun phrase, like “dogs” and “cats,” that lacks an overt determiner. (A determiner is a word that tells us which or how many: determiners include quantifier words like “all,” “some,” and “most,” demonstratives like “this” and “those,” posses- sives like “mine” and “its,” and so on.) LD resolutions often contain bare plurals, and that is the most common clue to their genericity.

We have already seen some examples of generics that are not bare plurals: “A whale is a mammal,” “A beaver builds dams,” and “The woolly mammoth is extinct.” The first two examples use indefinite singulars—singular nouns preceded by the indefinite article “a”—and the third is a *definite singular* since it is preceded by the definite article “the.” Generics can also be expressed with *bare singulars* (“Syrup is viscous”) and even verbs (as we’ll see later on). The resolution’s “a democracy” is an indefinite singular, and so it very well might be—and, as we’ll soon see, is—generic.

But it is also important to keep in mind that, just as not all generics are bare plurals, not all bare plurals are generic. “Dogs are barking” is true as long as some dogs are barking. Bare plurals can be used in particular ways to express existential statements. The key question for any given debate resolution that contains a bare plural is whether that occurrence of the bare plural is generic or existential.

The same is true of indefinite singulars. As debaters will be quick to point out, some uses of the indefinite singular really do mean “some” or “one or more”: “A cat is on the mat” is clearly not a generic generalization about cats; it’s true as long as some cat is on the mat. The question is whether the indefinite singular “a democracy” is existential or generic in the resolution.

Now, my own view is that, if we understand the difference between existential and generic statements, and if we approach the question impartially, without any invest- ment in one side of the debate, we can almost always just tell which reading is correct just by thinking about it. It is clear that “In a democracy, voting ought to be compul- sory” doesn’t mean “There is one or more democracy in which voting ought to be com- pulsory.” I don’t think a fancy argument should be required to show this any more than a fancy argument should be required to show that “A duck doesn’t lay eggs” is a generic—a false one because ducks do lay eggs, even though some ducks (namely males) don’t. And if a debater contests this by insisting that “a democracy” is existen- tial, the judge should be willing to resolve competing claims by, well, judging—that is, by using her judgment. Contesting a claim by insisting on its negation or demanding justification doesn’t put any obligation on the judge to be neutral about it. (Otherwise the negative could make every debate irresolvable by just insisting on the negation of every statement in the affirmative speeches.) Even if the insistence is backed by some sort of argument, we can reasonably reject an argument if we know its conclusion to be false, even if we are not in a position to know exactly where the argument goes wrong. Particularly in matters of logic and language, speakers have more direct knowledge of particular cases (e.g., that some specific inference is invalid or some specific sentence is infelicitious) than of the underlying explanations.

But that is just my view, and not every judge agrees with me, so it will be helpful to consider some arguments for the conclusion that we already know to be true: that, even if the United States is a democracy and ought to have compulsory voting, that doesn’t suffice to show that, in a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory—in other words, that “a democracy” in the resolution is generic, not existential.

Second, existential uses of the indefinite, such as “A cat is on the mat,” are upward- entailing.3 This means that if you replace the noun with a more general one, such as “An animal is on the mat,” the sentence will still be true. So let’s do that with “a democracy.” Does the resolution entail “In a society, voting ought to be compulsory”? Intuitively not, because you could think that voting ought to be compulsory in democracies but not in other sorts of societies. This suggests that “a democracy” in the resolution is not existential.

#### It applies to government:

#### Upward entailment test – spec fails the upward entailment test because saying that China ought to have the unconditional right to strike does not entail that those governments ought to have the unconditional right to strike.

#### Adverb test – adding “usually” to the res doesn’t substantially change its meaning because a recognition is universal and permanent

#### Violation – they only defend Egypt

#### Vote neg:

#### Semantics outweigh:

#### T is a constitutive rule of the activity and a basic aff burden – they agreed to debate the topic when they came here

#### Jurisdiction – you can’t vote aff if they haven’t affirmed the resolution

#### It’s the only stasis point we know before the round so it controls the internal link to engagement – there’s no way to use ground if debaters aren’t prepared to defend it

#### Standards:

#### Limits – there are 195 affs accounting for hundreds of governments— unlimited topics incentivize obscure affs that negs won’t have prep on – limits are key to reciprocal prep burden – potential abuse doesn’t justify foregoing the topic and 1AR theory checks PICs.

Banerjee 4/12 [(Vasabjit Banerjee, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Mississippi State University),”How many states and provinces are in the world?” , The Conversation, <https://theconversation.com/how-many-states-and-provinces-are-in-the-world-157847>, April 12, 2021] SS

There are 195 national governments recognized by the United Nations, but there are as many as nine other places with nationlike governments, including Taiwan and Kosovo, though they are not recognized by the U.N.

Most of these countries are divided into smaller sections, the way the U.S. is broken up into 50 states along with territories, like Puerto Rico and Guam, and a federal district, Washington, D.C.

They are not all called “states,” though: Switzerland has cantons, Bangladesh has divisions, Cameroon has regions, Germany has lander, Jordan has governorates, Montserrat has parishes, Zambia has provinces, and Japan has prefectures – among many other names.

#### Ground – spec guts core generics like the econ DA which rely on all governments having the unconditional right to strike because individual governments don’t have an impact on the global economy as a whole – also means there is no universal DA to spec affs

#### TVA solves – read as an advantage to whole rez

#### Paradigm issues:

#### Drop the debater – their abusive advocacy skewed the debate from the start

#### Comes before 1AR theory – NC abuse is responsive to them not being topical

#### Competing interps – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation

#### No RVIs – fairness and education are a priori burdens – and encourages baiting – outweighs because if T is frivolous, they can beat it quickly

#### Fairness is a voter ­– necessary to determine the better debater

#### Education is a voter – why schools fund debate

#### CP:

#### The Arab Republic of Egypt should recognize an unconditional right to strike for workers with the exception of law enforcement workers

#### The Arab Republic of Egypt should ban the right of law enforcement workers to strike

#### Resistance against police brutality depletes police influence.

Fadel 16 [(Leila Fadel is a national correspondent for NPR based in Los Angeles, covering issues of culture, diversity, and race.), “In Egypt, Growing Discontent Over Abuses By Police” , NPR, https://www.npr.org/sections/parallels/2016/03/02/468923828/in-egypt-growing-discontent-over-abuses-by-police, March 2, 2016] SS

In central Cairo, Ali Sayed Ismail Hussein sits on a wooden chair in the street in front of his dead son's apartment building. A recording of the Quran plays in the background as neighbors and friends pass by to pay condolences.

"The blood of my son, Mohammed Darbaka, is on the neck of the president of the republic," Hussein says, speaking of his son, Mohammed Ali, known to most by his nickname, Darbaka. "I am asking for the rights of my son from the president. My demand is justice for my son."

The shooting took place Feb. 18. A policeman had hired Darbaka to drive him around as he moved boxes of shoes and other goods. Hussein says witnesses told him his son and the policeman argued over payment. Then the policeman shot the young man in the head.

Hussein says the cop, who is now in jail, should be executed for killing his son for no reason, in the middle of the street in his own neighborhood. And the case has become a rallying crying far beyond this neighborhood. Thousands marched in the streets during his funeral. Men are getting the phrase "We are all Darbaka" shaved into their hairlines at barbershops.

Under President Abdel-Fattah el-Sissi, rights groups say cases of police abuse and state repression are on the rise. The El Nadeem Center for Rehabilitation of Victims of Violence says last year, nearly 500 people died in custody or were killed by security forces. More than 600 were tortured in detention, according to a report from the center last month.

These numbers are a rare glimpse into the scale of police abuse in Egypt. And now the Nadeem Center, which has documented cases of torture for more than two decades in Egypt, is itself under attack. The state is trying to shut it down.

Nineteen Egyptian rights groups wrote an open letter protesting the shutdown. They warn that it's part of a broad assault on independent rights groups in Egypt aimed at "silencing all voices critical of its appalling human rights record."

The Darbaka killing comes as discontent grows over police brutality and judicial misconduct. Egyptians were already shocked by the torture and killing of a young Italian Ph.D. student, who'd disappeared in Cairo in late January. Many blame the country's security forces for Giulio Regeni's death, though Egypt denies involvement.

Egypt's security forces are also blamed for a surge of disappearances. And a 4-year-old child was sentenced last month to life in prison — something the government later said was a "mistake."

Meanwhile, Darbaka's case seems to have rattled the government.

In a protest video posted online, demonstrators chant, "Oh, you dirty government, you sons of dirty people." They call the police "thugs."

On state television, Interior Minister Magdy Abdel Ghaffar was shown meeting with Ali Hussein, Darbaka's father, in what appeared to be an attempt to quell public discontent. Gripping Hussein's shoulders, he said, "He is our son and we will bring justice, that is on us."

Originally, the ministry said the policeman pulled out his gun to stop a fight and accidentally fired. But now, the policeman is behind bars. And the government says he will stand trial.

In a press conference a few days ago, Prime Minister Sherif Ismail promised reforms in how police are trained. "We should not hold the entire police authority accountable for misdeeds of a few individuals," he said.

Back in Darbaka's neighborhood, Ali Hussein looks at a picture of his son hanging on the wall. "He was 24 and engaged to be married," he says, someone who was loved by all. The government, he says, has promised to do the right thing. He will wait and see.

#### But the plan reverses that— giving them the right to collectively bargain.

Lopez 20 [(Laura Barrón-López, is a White House Correspondent for POLITICO.), “Democrats’ Coming Civil War Over Police Unions” , POLITICO , <https://www.politico.com/news/magazine/2020/10/14/police-reform-police-unions-qualified-immunity-democratic-party-420122>, 10/14/2020] SS

Earlier this year, House Democrats were close to pushing through a bill that would have cemented the power of police unions across the country. For a pro-labor party, the bill, which gave police officers the federal right to collectively bargain on working conditions, appeared to be a no-brainer. Nearly every Democrat in the House co-signed the legislation, including members of the Squad, a group of progressive superstars that includes Reps. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and Rashida Tlaib.

The Democrats have supported public-sector unions for generations — often fighting with Republican state officials who’ve worked to gut the memberships of public employee unions and limit bargaining abilities. The bill would have granted the right to form a union and bargain contracts to firefighters, emergency medical personnel and police, including in states that currently prohibit some in public safety from negotiating collectively for wages and working conditions.

As talk of moving the bill increased in March, Rep. Joaquin Castro of Texas was a rare voice raising alarms. He warned his colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee that the bill would formalize the authority of police unions to determine misconduct standards in their contracts, which are increasingly viewed as a barrier to holding police accountable for wrongdoing. Castro, a Democrat, fought it, asking racial justice groups like Campaign Zero and Color of Change to talk to his Democratic colleagues. He suggested new language limiting how much police could negotiate over accountability provisions with cities.

But labor organizations weren’t pleased with the idea of singling out police affiliates by restricting their ability to bargain over disciplinary standards in the bill. Then the coronavirus pandemic exploded, and negotiations stalled.

Two months later, a video of a white police officer using his knee to pin George Floyd’s neck to the pavement for nine minutes rocketed around the country. Hundreds of thousands took to the streets across the nation in response to Floyd’s killing, calling for a full re-imagining of policing and thrusting police unions into the center of the national argument. Activists, multiple legal experts and even some conservative think tanks, say police unions are one of the biggest impediments to reform, pushing hard to weaken accountability rules, and preventing new ones from being passed.

In the wake of Floyd’s killing, the bill expanding bargaining rights for police unions is all but dead as currently written, and not because of the pandemic. House Democrats rushed to pass a first of its kind police reform bill that would, among other measures, ban choke holds, establish a national database tracking misconduct and end the doctrine of qualified immunity, which shields police officers from civil lawsuits. More quietly, they quickly backed away from the collective-bargaining bill. In the span of three months, the party had changed its calculus, now viewing a labor bill that was endorsed by nearly every House Democrat as recently as March as untouchable in its current form.

Rep. Dan Kildee (D-Mich.), co-author of the measure, said in a statement that he asked House leadership to not move the bill unless the right for police to negotiate on accountability standards is addressed. Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez of New York, who also signed on to the bill, is “withdrawing her support” from it “as long as it remains in its current form,” said Lauren Hitt, a spokesperson for the New York Democrat. Rep. Matt Cartwright of Pennsylvania, author of a separate broader bill to expand collective bargaining rights of public-sector workers, is also deciding “whether any changes need to be made to [his] bill to hold officers with problematic records accountable” and will consider changes Kildee makes to his legislation, said Cartwright spokesman Matt Slavoski.

All Democrats POLITICO spoke to said they support police’s right to unionize and bargain over wages and working conditions; it’s police’s ability to negotiate misconduct standards through union contracts that some are now questioning or flat out opposing.

#### Police unions are the root cause of police brutality

Greenhouse 20 [(Steven Greenhouse, reporter at the New York Times for thirty-one years; he covered labor and workplace matters there for nineteen. He is the author of “Beaten Down, Worked Up: The Past, Present, and Future of American Labor”), “How Police Unions Enable and Conceal Abuses of Power”, The New Yorker , <https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/how-police-union-power-helped-increase-abuses>, June 18, 2020 ] SS

Police unions have long had a singular—and divisive—place in American labor. What is different at this fraught moment, however, is that these unions, long considered untouchable, due to their extraordinary power on the streets and among politicians, face a potential reckoning, as their conduct roils not just one city but the entire nation. Since the nineteen-sixties, when police unions first became like traditional unions and won the right to bargain collectively, they have had a controversial history. And recent studies suggest that their political and bargaining power has enabled them to win disciplinary systems so lax that they have helped increase police abuses in the United States.

A 2018 University of Oxford study of the hundred largest American cities found that the extent of protections in police contracts was directly and positively correlated with police violence and other abuses against citizens. A 2019 University of Chicago study found that extending collective-bargaining rights to Florida sheriffs’ deputies led to a forty per cent statewide increase in cases of violent misconduct—translating to nearly twelve additional such incidents annually.

In a forthcoming study, Rob Gillezeau, a professor and researcher, concluded that, from the nineteen-fifties to the nineteen-eighties, the ability of police to collectively bargain led to a substantial rise in police killings of civilians, with a greater impact on people of color. “With the caveat that this is very early work,” Gillezeau wrote on Twitter, on May 30th, “it looks like collective bargaining rights are being used to protect the ability of officers to discriminate in the disproportionate use of force against the non-white population.”

Other studies revealed that many existing mechanisms for disciplining police are toothless. WBEZ, a Chicago radio station, found that, between 2007 and 2015, Chicago’s Independent Police Review Authority investigated four hundred shootings by police and deemed the officers justified in all but two incidents. Since 2012, when Minneapolis replaced its civilian review board with an Office of Police Conduct Review, the public has filed more than twenty-six hundred misconduct complaints, yet only twelve resulted in a police officer being punished. The most severe penalty: a forty-hour suspension. When the St. Paul Pioneer Press reviewed appeals involving terminations from 2014 to 2019, it discovered that arbitrators ruled in favor of the discharged police and corrections officers and ordered them reinstated forty-six per cent of the time. (Non-law-enforcement workers were reinstated at a similar rate.) For those demanding more accountability, a large obstacle is that disciplinary actions are often overturned if an arbitrator finds that the penalty the department meted out is tougher than it was in a similar, previous case—no matter if the penalty in the previous case seemed far too lenient.

To critics, all of this highlights that the disciplinary process for law enforcement is woefully broken, and that police unions have far too much power. They contend that robust protections, including qualified immunity, give many police officers a sense of impunity—an attitude exemplified by Derek Chauvin keeping his knee on George Floyd’s neck for nearly nine minutes, even as onlookers pleaded with him to stop. “We’re at a place where something has to change, so that police collective bargaining no longer contributes to police violence,” Benjamin Sachs, a labor-law professor at Harvard, told me. Sachs said that bargaining on “matters of discipline, especially related to the use of force, has insulated police officers from accountability, and that predictably can increase the problem.”

#### Allows for some of the worst human right violations and endless suffering of its citizens

Farid 15 [(Farid Farid, Cairo), “Police brutality thrives in Egypt”, DW, https://www.dw.com/en/police-brutality-thrives-in-egypt/a-18663410, 21.08.2015] SS

Abdel Ghani's plight fits a larger pattern of police impunity and increased brutality in the past four years since the start of the Arab revolutions in 2011.

"It definitely has been the worst year in how authorities have abused citizens across the board," Day Rahmi, a senior researcher at the Nadeem Center for Rehabilitation of Victims of Violence and Torture, told DW.

The center compiled a report claiming that there were 289 cases of torture, 272 cases of death outside legal norms, 119 cases of disappearance, and 63 injuries due to reckless use of weaponry by authorities in the first year of president Abdel-Fattah el-Sissi's rule.

The regime has been highly criticized most recently for passing a stringent counter terrorism law that cracks down on freedom of expression for journalists and civil society activists as well as allowing security agencies the power to detain citizens suspected of terrorism without any due process.

"Torture is institutionalized in the authorities' politics. We are not dealing with single incidents of some rogue police officers. These deaths are happening across police stations all over Egypt, not just in major cities," Rahmi added.

In the past week, a video viral video emerged of a police officer in a metro station beating and swearing at a man after he had complained that his fiancée had been sexually harassed. The whistleblower who shot the footage claimed, via a well known activist on Facebook, that he had been personally threatened by unarmed informants associated with the Ministry of Interior patrolling his home. The ministry earlier this year had set up hotlines for citizens to report police abuse but have been the perpetrators of such abuse themselves.

Rahmi, questioning the seriousness of the ministry's efforts to combat police abuse, noted that "not one police officer has been convicted commensurately for a crime they had committed even when there's clear video evidence." DW contacted the Interior Ministry repeatedly to seek comment on this case and other abuses, but to no avail.

## Case

## 1NC- Solvency

#### The right to strike is already enshrined in Egypt’s constitution- proves Egypt circumvents the plan

Amnesty International 17 [(Amnesty International, Amnesty International is an international non-governmental organization focused on human rights, with its headquarters in the United Kingdom.), “Egypt: Relentless assault on rights of workers and trade unionists”, Amnesty International , https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/press-release/2017/04/egypt-relentless-assault-on-rights-of-workers-and-trade-unionists/, April 30, 2017] SS

Egypt: Relentless assault on rights of workers and trade unionists

Dozens of workers and trade unionists in Egypt have faced arrest, detention, dismissal from work or trials in military courts, merely for exercizing their freedom of expression, association and assembly, Amnesty International said in a statement published to mark Labour Day on 1 May.

Amid rising economic hardship in Egypt and a wave labour strikes in the private and public sector, as well as military-owned industries, the government is using a series of disciplinary measures and criminal sanctions to crack down on workers and trade unionists. It is also seeking to amend existing laws to further restrict labour rights.

“The Egyptian authorities have waged a punitive campaign against workers and trade unionists to deter and punish them from mobilizing or going on strike. Demanding your labour rights and expressing your grievances should not be a criminal offence. The right to strike and peaceful assembly are enshrined, both, in Egypt’s Constitution and international human rights law. Egyptian authorities must stop punishing people for exercising and demanding their rights,” said Najia Bounaim, Campaigns Director for North Africa at Amnesty International.

Many workers have been arrested simply for taking part in a strike or a peaceful protest. Some have been held in pre-trial detention for prolonged periods or subject to restrictive probation measures. Just last week, 16 workers from the Telecom Egypt Company in Cairo and Giza were arrested for participating in a peaceful demonstration under Egypt’s anti-protest law. They were released after solidarity protests.

In some cases disciplinary measures including pay cuts, suspension or dismissal from work are used to punish workers. At the state-run Zagazig University Hospital, 12 nurses were suspended after participating in a week-long strike in February 2017 during which the hospital provided only emergency services.

Workers in military-owned factories face additional risks as they can be subject to unfair trials at military courts,. Twenty five workers from the military-run Alexandria Shipyard Company are currently on trial before a military court. They have been charged with “inciting workers to strike”, and could face up to two years in prison.

The authorities have also interfered with the functioning of independent workers unions, by targeting members with disciplinary action and by hampering their activities. The government has also proposed amendments to the Labour Law and Trade Unions Law that will make organizing strikes even more difficult and will make it virtually impossible to establish or join an independent trade union.

## 1NC- Civil War

#### The first advantage makes no sense

#### The card about Egypt being key says does not say that the efficacy of negotiations hinges on whether internal politics in Egypt are stable

#### Galal ’15 goes neg- shows that no matter the laws Egypt will always circumvent the plan- turns the case means that the Egyptian strikers will always try to find endless ways to strike and Egypt will shoe more resistance and inequality to its people

#### No war—Iran and Israel are both risk averse, which limits likelihood of escalation

Miller, 15 – vice president for new initiatives and a distinguished scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (Aaron David, 7/24. “Why War Isn’t Inevitable If Congress Rejects the Iran Nuclear Deal.” http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2015/07/24/why-war-isnt-inevitable-if-congress-rejects-iran-nuclear-deal/

Why go to war? The theory that conflict with Iran is inevitable rests on several highly arguable contentions. First is the assumption that Iran is willing to accelerate its nuclear program and to either break out or sneak out to a weapon and thus court a military response from Israel or the United States. The second big assumption is that Israel is just itching for an opportunity to unilaterally strike Iran with or without Washington’s approval. In the wake of a no vote by Congress, neither of these developments are certainties. Israel is implacably opposed to the deal, but Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu is pretty risk-averse; he would have to think long and hard about launching strike in which Israel is operating at the margins of its capacity, particularly without a reason that would justify the severe international consequences.

And why would Iran want to provide such a reason as long as it could play the Security Council card and pocket the political and economic benefits that would flow from being cooperative? For Tehran, the smarter option in the wake of Congress blocking the accord would be to exploit the appetite for international investment and pick up as many chits as possible on the global stage by blaming the failure and missed opportunity on Washington. This isn’t a perfect outcome, but it’s a more compelling choice for Iran’s leadership than a headlong plunge into war. That cou

rse stands to bring Iran few benefits and many risks. Tehran is also aware that its ally Hezbollah is bogged down in Syria as part of Iran’s campaign to support Bashar al-Assad, which limits Tehran’s regional assets to use against Israel in the event of a military strike. If Congress blocks the nuclear agreement, the mullahs will take their time and consider all of Iran’s options. Courting a major strike from Israel and the U.S. isn’t necessarily one of them.

#### Middle East war won’t escalate—regional militaries are too weak

Rovner 14 -- \*John Goodwin Tower Distinguished Chair of International Politics and National Security, Associate Professor of Political Science, and Director of Studies at the Tower Center for Political Studies @ Southern Methodist University, \*\*Assistant Professor of Political Science and International Affairs at the George Washington University

(\*Joshua, \*\*Caitlin Talmadge, Less is More: The Future of the U.S. Military in the Persian Gulf, The George Washington University, <http://twq.elliott.gwu.edu/less-more-future-us-military-persian-gulf>)

Happily, however, the situation for the United States today is more like the 1950s than the 1970s. The major regional powers all suffer from serious shortcomings in conventional military power, meaning that none of them will be able to seriously threaten the balance for the foreseeable future. Iran’s military has suffered greatly from decades of war and sanctions. Iraq’s fledgling security services are almost exclusively focused on internal problems. And Saudi Arabia, the richest country in the region, seems content to rely on a dense network of defenses and proxies rather than pursue any real power projection capabilities. While there are reasons to worry about internal stability, especially given the ongoing fight against ISIS (the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria), there is very little chance of a major interstate war. Moreover, threats to oil shipping in the Gulf are real but not overwhelming. All of this points to a simple and optimistic conclusion: the United States can protect its core interest in the free flow of oil without having to commit to a large and enduring naval or ground presence to the Gulf.

### 1NC –US Aid

#### If Russia influence was actually a threat their impact would’ve happened their cards are from over four years ago

#### No Russia war

Polikanov 16 ([Dmitry,](http://www.russia-direct.org/profile/dmitry-polikanov) Vice President of The PIR-Center and Chairman of Trialogue International Club. Author of more than 100 publications on conflict management, peacekeeping, arms control, international relations and foreign policy. Member of the International Institute for Strategic Studies, the International Sociological Association, the All-Russian Public Opinion Research Center Research Council. “Why a military conflict between Russia and the US is unlikely” http://www.russia-direct.org/opinion/why-military-conflict-between-russia-and-us-unlikely)

The expert community has been crying wolf for a long time now: “War is at the doorstep!” The gloomy predictions indicate that Russia and the United States are at the brink of direct military clashes, as if they were trying to celebrate the 54th anniversary of the Cuban Missile Crisis in some perverse way. However, any conflict, if it happens, will most probably be accidental – the parties are not yet ready for full-scale military confrontation. In the last few years, Russia has been modernizing its armed forces to replace the outdated Soviet-era materiel and structure. Numerous exercises, trillions of rubles spent, new equipment and combat vehicles emerging out of the blue, and a charismatic defense minister who changed the entire image of the Russian Army and brought back its popularity with society – all these steps provided for the fast (and real) growth of national military might. However, it remains rather limited in comparison with the overall total potential of the [NATO](http://www.russia-direct.org/tags/nato) states. Some would say that the alliance is reluctant to take any serious decisions and is nothing more than a paper tiger. Nonetheless, the brainwashing of the last two years has significantly improved the decision-making capacity of NATO and the chances for achieving consensus over the “Russian threat.” The ability to mobilize quickly strong conventional forces is still low, as NATO generals admit themselves. However, active recent revival of the nuclear sharing arrangements and the consolidation of U.S. troops in various countries of Central and Eastern Europe present enough deterrence against any light-minded action. It is clear that the war will not happen in Europe (and not even in [Ukraine](http://www.russia-direct.org/tags/ukraine) with its unpredictable leadership). However, wherever it occurs, NATO forces can eventually be mobilized to help their allies. Moreover, Moscow has largely been pursuing a defensive policy over the past 16 years. Even now, when “the Russians are (seemingly) coming,” an independent observer would probably notice that the lion’s share of the activities of Moscow are reactive rather than proactive. The Kremlin enjoys petty provocations from time to time (like ongoing incidents in the air over the [Baltic Sea](http://www.russia-direct.org/opinion/does-russia-really-pose-threat-baltic-states)), but is quite cautious in undertaking any serious action, which would require the use of force and lead to tangible casualties. Even when [Turkey shot down the Russian plane](http://www.russia-direct.org/opinion/russian-jet-shot-down-turkey-what-lies-behind-action) along the Syrian border, there was practically no military response and, on the contrary, it all ended up with a new friendship with Ankara. Moscow is now fond of “asymmetric measures” and they do not leave any room for substantial armed clashes. Russian President Vladimir Putin is fond of his status as the victim of Western pressure and the image of the global peace supporter. It is not in his interests to start a war – he would rather wait for the Western “attack” and would not necessarily give it an immediate response, in order to get the proper media effect. The U.S. side is passive as well. Many analysts assume that both of the presidential candidates would support a war – the difference is only in the scale. Republican candidate Donald Trump, despite his extravagant nature, sounds more like an isolationist and would likely mean a “small war.” Democrat Hillary [Clinton](http://www.russia-direct.org/opinion/why-hillary-clinton-better-russia-donald-trump), given her recent anti-Putin rhetoric, may be more willing to launch a “big war.”

#### US and Russia War good– they could eliminate their nuclear arsenal with a conventional strike

Plesch 18 [(Dan, Director of the Centre for International Studies and Diplomacy, SOAS, University of London) “Could the US win World War III without using nuclear weapons?” The Conversation, 4/19/2018] BC

As the US, Russia and China test each other’s patience and strategic focus, speculation about the chances of a world war has hit a new high. But many of the people seriously engaged in this weighty discussion often get it wrong.

When it comes to estimating military capability, the Western media is principally concerned with the weapons capabilities of weaker states – and it rarely pays much attention to the colossal capability of the US, which still accounts for most of the world’s defence spending.

Any sensible discussion of what a hypothetical World War III might look like needs to begin with the sheer size and force of America’s military assets. For all that China and Russia are arming up on various measures, US commanders have the power to dominate escalating crises and counter opposing forces before they can be used.

Take missile warfare alone. The US Navy already has 4,000 Tomahawk cruise missiles, and the Navy and Air Force are currently taking delivery of 5,000 JASSM conventional cruise missiles with ranges from 200-600 miles. Barely visible to radar, these are designed to destroy “hardened” targets such as nuclear missile silos. Russia and China, by contrast, have nothing of equivalent quantity or quality with which to threaten the US mainland.

The same holds true when it comes to maritime forces. While much is made of Russia’s two frigates and smaller vessels stationed off the Syrian coast, France alone has 20 warships and an aircraft carrier in the Mediterranean – and US standing forces in the area include six destroyers equipped with scores of cruise missiles and anti-missile systems. At the other end of Europe, the Russian military is threatening the small Baltic states, but it is rarely noted that the Russian Baltic fleet is the same size as Denmark’s and half the size of Germany’s.

Meanwhile, China’s aggressively expansionist behaviour in the South China Sea is reported alongside stories of its first aircraft carrier and long-range ballistic missiles. But for all that the Chinese navy is large and growing, according to the International Institute for Strategic Studies, it’s still only numerically equivalent to the combined fleets of Japan and Taiwan, while the US boasts 19 aircraft carriers worldwide if its marine assault ships are included.

But overhanging all this, of course, is the nuclear factor.

Out of the sky

The US, Russia and China are all nuclear-armed; Vladimir Putin recently unveiled a new fleet of nuclear-capable missiles which he described as “invincible in the face of all existing and future systems”, and some have suggested that China may be moving away from its no-first-use policy. This is all undeniably disturbing. While it has long been assumed that the threat of nuclear weapons acts as a deterrent to any war between the major powers, it’s also possible that the world may simply have been riding its luck. But once again, the US’s non-nuclear capabilities are all too often overlooked.

US leaders may in fact believe they can remove Russia’s nuclear deterrent with an overwhelming conventional attack backed up by missile defences. This ability was cultivated under the Prompt Global Strike programme, which was initiated before 9/11 and continued during the Obama years. Organised through the US Air Force’s Global Strike Command, it is to use conventional weapons to attack anywhere on Earth in under 60 minutes.

This is not to say the task would be small. In order to destroy Russia’s nuclear missiles before they can be launched, the US military would need to first blind Russian radar and command and communications to incoming attack, probably using both physical and cyber attacks. It would then have to destroy some 200 fixed and 200 mobile missiles on land, a dozen Russian missile submarines, and Russian bombers. It would then need to shoot down any missiles that could still be fired.

Russia is not well positioned to survive such an attack. Its early warning radars, both satellite and land-based, are decaying and will be hard to replace. At the same time, the US has and is developing a range of technologies to carry out anti-satellite and radar missions, and it has been using them for years. (All the way back in 1985, it shot down a satellite with an F15 jet fighter.) That said, the West is very dependent on satellites too, and Russia and China continue to develop their own anti-satellite systems.

**Successful preemptive strike forces a surrender – solves further escalation**

Sarah **Johnson 17**, "U.S. Nuclear First Strike Policy; Be Afraid", Bill Track 50, https://www.billtrack50.com/blog/in-the-news/u-s-nuclear-first-strike-policy-be-afraid/

The second situation is a [preemptive strike](http://www.dictionary.com/browse/preemptive-strike) — a first-strike attack with nuclear weapons carried out to destroy an enemy’s capacity to respond. Preemptive strikes can be based on the assumption that the enemy is planning an **imminent attack**, but don’t have to be. The methodology behind a preemptive nuclear strike is to attack the enemy’s **strategic nuclear weapon facilities** (missile silos, submarine bases, bomber airfields), command and control sites and storage depots first. By hitting these targets first the enemy will be **so wounded** with **so little of their resources left** that they will be **forced to surrender** with minimal damage to the attacking party.

**Otherwise, Russia will broadly scale up military AI – extinction**

Mike **Rogers 17**, former US Representative from Michigan, chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, "Artificial intelligence — the arms race we may not be able to control", TheHill, https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/351725-artificial-intelligence-is-the-new-arms-race-we-may-not-be-able-to-control

“Whoever becomes the leader in this sphere will **become ruler of the world**,” [said](https://www.theverge.com/2017/9/4/16251226/russia-ai-putin-rule-the-world) Vladimir Putin. The sphere the President of Russia is referring to is **artificial intelligence** (AI) and his comments should give you a moment of pause. Addressing students at the beginning of our Labor Day weekend, Putin remarked “Artificial intelligence is the future, not only for Russia, but for all humankind,” adding, “It comes with colossal opportunities, but also threats that are difficult to predict.” For once, I find myself in agreement with the President of Russia, but just this once. Artificial Intelligence offers **incredible** promise and **peril**. **Nowhere is this clearer than in the realm of national security**. Today un-crewed systems are a fact of modern warfare. Nearly every country is adopting systems where personnel are far removed from the conflict and wage war by remote control. AI [stands](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/26/us/pentagon-artificial-intelligence-terminator.html) to sever that ground connection. Imagine a **fully autonomous Predator or Reaper drone**. Managed by an AI system, the drone could **identify targets**, **determine their legitimacy**, and **conduct a strike** all **without human intervention.** Indeed, the Ministry of Defence of the United Kingdom issued a press [statement](https://www.theverge.com/2017/9/12/16286580/uk-government-killer-robots-drones-weapons) in September that the country “does not possess fully autonomous weapon systems and has no intention of developing them,” and that its weapons systems “will always be under control as an absolute guarantee of human oversight and authority and accountability.” Let’s think smaller. Imagine a tiny insect-sized drone loaded with explosive. Guided by a [pre-programmed AI](https://www.amazon.com/Life-3-0-Being-Artificial-Intelligence/dp/1101946598), it could hunt down a specific target — a politician, a general, or an opposition figure — determine when to strike, how to strike, and if to strike based on its own learning. Howard Hughes Medical Center [recently](https://qz.com/1000011/scientists-attached-an-electronic-backpack-to-a-genetically-modified-dragonfly-and-turned-it-into-a-drone/) attached a backpack to a genetically modified dragonfly and flew it remotely. These examples are, however, where humans are involved and largely control the left and right limits of AI. **Yet, there are examples of AI purposely and independently going beyond programed parameters.** Rogue algorithms led to a [flash crash](http://gizmodo.com/rogue-algorithm-blamed-for-historic-crash-of-the-britis-1787523587) of the British Pound. In 2016, in-game AIs **created super AIs weapons** and [**hunted down**](http://www.kotaku.co.uk/2016/06/03/elites-ai-created-super-weapons-and-started-hunting-players-skynet-is-here) **human players**, and AIs have [**created**](https://www.forbes.com/sites/tonybradley/2017/07/31/facebook-ai-creates-its-own-language-in-creepy-preview-of-our-potential-future/#1cf69787292c) **their own languages** that were **indecipherable to humans**. AIs proved more effective than their human counterparts in producing and catching users in **spear phishing programs**. Not only did the AIs create more content, they successfully [captured](https://www.blackhat.com/docs/us-16/materials/us-16-Seymour-Tully-Weaponizing-Data-Science-For-Social-Engineering-Automated-E2E-Spear-Phishing-On-Twitter.pdf) more users with their deception. While seemingly simple and low stakes in nature, **extrapolate these scenarios into more significant and risky areas and the consequences become much greater.** Cybersecurity is no different. Today we are focused on the hackers, trolls, and cyber criminals (officially sanctioned and otherwise) who seek to penetrate our networks, steal our intellectual property, and leave behind malicious code for activation in the event of a conflict. Replace the individual with an AI and imagine how fast hacking takes place; networks against networks, at machine speed all without a human in the loop. Sound far-fetched? **It’s not**. In 2016, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency held an AI on AI capture the flag contest called the [Cyber Grand Challenge](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qSgYu3w3DMM) at the DEF CON event. AI networks against AI networks. In August of this year the founders of 116 AI and robotics companies signed a letter petitioning the United Nations [to ban](https://www.theverge.com/2017/8/21/16177828/killer-robots-ban-elon-musk-un-petition) lethal autonomous systems. Signatories to this letter included Google DeepMind’s co-founder Mustafa Suleyman and Elon Musk who, in response to Putin’s quote [tweeted](https://twitter.com/elonmusk/status/904638455761612800), “Competition for AI superiority at national level most likely cause of WW3 imo (sic)”. AI is not some far off future challenge. It is a challenge today and one with which we must grapple. I am in favor of fielding any system that enhances our national security, but we must have an open and honest conversation about the implications of AI, the consequ

ences of which **we do not**, **and may not**, **fully understand**. This is not a new type of bullet or missile. This is a potentially **fully autonomous system** that even with human oversight and guidance will make its own decisions on the battlefield and in cyberspace. How can we ensure that the system does not **escape our control?** How can we prevent such systems from falling into the hands of terrorists or insurgents? Who controls the source code? How and can we build in so-called impenetrable kill switches? AI and AI-like systems are slowly being introduced into our arsenal. Our adversaries, China, Russia, and others are also introducing AI systems into their arsenals as well. Implementation is happening faster than our ability to fully **comprehend the consequences.** Putin’s new call spells out a new arms race. **Rushing to AI weapon systems without guiding principles is a dangerous**. It risks an **escalation** that we do not fully understand and may not be able to control. The cost of limiting AI intelligence being weaponized [**could vastly exceed**](https://www.belfercenter.org/sites/default/files/files/publication/AI%20NatSec%20-%20final.pdf) **all of our nuclear proliferation efforts to date**. More troubling, the **consequences of failure are equally existential.**