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## 1

#### Interp - 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 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

#### Violation – They spec \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ country

#### Standards:

#### 1] Limits – they can spec 123 different governments - that’s supercharged by the ability to spec combinations of types of strikes. This takes out functional limits – it’s impossible for me to research every possible combination of the 195 countries and worker types

ITUC 20**,** (International Trade Union Confederation, “World’s Worst Countries for Workers”), ITUC, 2020, https://www.ituc-csi.org/IMG/pdf/ituc\_globalrightsindex\_2020\_en.pdf // MNHS NL recut DD AG

In 2020, strikes have been severely restricted or banned in 123 out of 144 countries. In a significant number of these countries, industrial actions were brutally repressed by the authorities and workers exercising their right to strike often faced criminal prosecution and summary dismissals.

#### 2] TVA solves – just read your aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff – we don’t stop them from reading new FWs, mechanisms or advantages. PICs aren’t aff offense – a] it’s ridiculous to say that neg potential abuse justifies the aff being non-T b] There’s only a small number of pics on this topic c] PICs incentivize them to write better affs that can generate solvency deficits to PICs

#### Use competing interps – it tells the negative what they do and do not have to prepare for

#### No RVIs—it’s your burden to be topical. Anything else chills real abuse

#### No 1ar theory – they’re always going to create late breaking debates bc the 2ar’s responses to my counterinterp will always be new and destroys the point of debate

## **2**

#### Interpretation: All just governments must have the consent of the governed. For the United States to be a just government it must maintain that consent.

**Bill of Rights Institute**, last accessed 2021, civic education organization with over 50,000 educators involved. <https://billofrightsinstitute.org/essays/popular-sovereignty-and-the-consent-of-the-governed> TK

The competing belief—that rulers could run a country because they had been born to a family of kings, or because the head of a church approved them—was fading. Philosophers had begun to ask what makes a government good and just. They wrote that governments come into being because people are willing to give up some of their natural freedom in exchange for the protection that comes from being citizens of a nation powerful enough to defend their rights.

They called this a “social contract.” It was based on a belief that the purpose of government is to guard against murder, coercion, and robbery.

These were revolutionary ideas. They meant that the job of a just ruler was to protect the inalienable rights of citizens. The American Founders believed there was an unwritten contract between rulers and the people. If a ruler violates this contract by taking more freedom from people than is necessary to protect their rights, then the citizens are justified in seeking to overthrow such a ruler. This was why, the Founders explained in the Declaration of Independence, they were ending their allegiance to Great Britain and King George III.

Benjamin Franklin explained it like this: “In free governments, the rulers are the servants and the people their superiors and sovereigns.”

Thinkers who believed this used the term “popular sovereignty” (meaning not that the most popular people are in charge, but that the authority to rule people is based on their consent to be ruled).

#### Violation: The United States does not have the consent of the governed.

**Somin 19,** Ilya Somin is a law prof. at George Mason University. Coauthored an amicus bried in California v. Texas. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2016/01/27/why-real-world-governments-dont-have-the-consent-of-the-governed-and-why-it-matters/> TK

*Note: This card is applicable to all democracies, will have a ctrl c ctrl v in the 1nc for all democracies further down. Just change out the “United States” with whatever democracy that the Aff is running.*

I made some related points about government and consent [here](http://www.cato-unbound.org/2010/12/13/ilya-somin/creation-consent-government-power-over-property-rights), including explaining why the **majoritarian nature of democratic government doesn’t necessarily make it consensual, especially with** respect to **minorities**, and anyone who did not have a meaningful opportunity to consent to the basic underlying structure of the system. I also explain why living in the territory ruled by a given government does not by itself qualify as meaningful consent.

The nonconsensual nature of democracy is **exacerbated by the fact that**[**it cannot be democratic all the way down**](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2015/08/12/why-democracy-cant-be-democratic-all-the-way-down-and-why-it-matters/?itid=lk_inline_manual_9)**. Many people who vote in elections do so not because they genuinely consent to all of the policies of their preferred candidate, but merely because they chose him as the lesser of the evils** put forward by a political system that **they have little if any leverage over.**Even many of those who both voted for the winning party and genuinely support all or most of its policies may not have exercised genuine consent, at least not if genuine consent must be informed. The structure of **democracy**[**creates strong incentives for voters to be rationally ignorant**](http://balkin.blogspot.com/2013/10/why-political-ignorance-is-serious.html)**about the issues at stake in an election, and**[**most indeed know very little about them**](http://www.amazon.com/Democracy-Political-Ignorance-Smaller-Government/dp/0804799318/)**.** We usually assume that genuine consent to potentially dangerous medical procedures must be informed. As [the American Medical Association puts it](http://www.ama-assn.org/ama/pub/physician-resources/medical-ethics/code-medical-ethics/opinion808.page?), “[t]he patient’s right of self-decision can be effectively exercised only if the patient possesses enough information to enable an informed choice.” The same point applies to exercises of government power that often literally involve matters of life and death, no less than medical operations do. In many ways, **we are all the government’s unwilling, poorly informed patients.** Some degree of consensuality arises at the state and local level[where citizens can “vote with their feet” to escape policies they oppose](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2160388). But much modern government policy is made either at the national level, or by subnational entities that are difficult to escape, as when they target immobile assets, [such as property rights in land.](http://ssrn.com/abstract=1907357)

#### Standards:

#### Limits – the United States is straight up just not a Just Government. Their interp can allow anything tangentially related to governments (like authoritarian governments) which explodes the topic. This is a slippery slope we should not cross

1. **TVA solves – just read the aff as whole rez without specifying the United States. We aren’t stopping them from reading new FWs, mechanisms, or advantages. PICs don’t solve – it’s ridiculous to say that neg potential abuse (which may not even be enacted on) justifies the aff.**

## 3

#### Presumption and permissibility negate – a) more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways which outweighs on probability b) real world policies require positive justification before being adopted which outweighs on empirics c) ought means the aff has to prove an obligation if that definition is legitimate which means lack of that obligation negates. Even under their role of the ballot these arguments negate since it requires them to prove the statement that “the aff world is more desirable than the neg world” true. However, my args deny their ability to prove statements true so you presume neg. Also, I don’t need to win presumption to win, I just need to win any of the arguments below because the aff is false.

#### A] Ought is “used to express logical consequence” as defined by Merriam-Webster

(<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought>) //Massa

#### B] Oxford Dictionary defines ought as “used to indicate something that is probable.”

<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought> //Massa

#### Prefer on neg definition choice – the aff should have defined ought in the 1ac because it was in the rez so it’s predictable contestation, by not doing so they have forfeited their right to read a new definition – kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement on a lack of your definition. Also, better since it focuses on real world instances rather than recycling old frameworks.

#### Negate:

#### [1] Strike means “hit forcibly and deliberately with one's hand or a weapon or other implement.” (Oxford Languages) which means the res is the Government ought to guarantee an unconditional right to stab people which causes anarchy.

#### [2] you can’t be sure anything besides yourself exists – we could be deceived by a demon, dreaming, or in a simulation so the whole world could be nonexistent

#### [3] Guarantee means “a formal pledge to pay another person's debt or to perform another person's obligation in the case of default.” (Oxford Languages) which means they have to pledge to pay another person’s debt right to strike which is incoherent.

#### [5] Interpreting speech is impossible since it relies on a subjective frame of reference which causes regress.

**Harman** Gilbert “Quine’s Semantic Relativity” June 30, 2009 SJCP//JG

Philosophers sometimes approach meaning metaphorically, for example, by speaking of “grasping” meanings, as if understanding consists in getting mental hands around something.1 Philosophers say that a theory of meaning should be a theory about the meanings that people assign to expressions in their language, that to understand other people requires identifying the meanings they associate with what they are saying, and that to translate an expression of another language into your own is to find an expression in your language with the same meaning as the expression in the other language. One difficulty with taking seriously such metaphors of grasping, assigning, and attaching meanings is that people are not aware of doing these things in the way that they are aware of grasping doorknobs, attaching post-it notes, and assigning tasks to employees. In any event, Quine did not find such metaphors to be useful. In his view, to understand someone else is to interpret them—that is, to find a way to translate from their outlook into one’s own. Interpretation is translation. And translation is indeterminate. Part of Quine’s argument for indeterminacy of translation involves an appeal to ontological relativity.2 He argues that there is no fact of the matter as to whether another person’s word ‘gavagai’ refers to rabbits, rabbit-stages, undetached rabbit parts, rabbithood, or various other possibilities. Given any reasonable interpretation of a language, consider the total universe of entities in the extension of predicates or referred to by singular terms in that language so interpreted, and then consider any one-one mapping of that universe onto itself. Then define new relations of reference and extension, using this mapping, so that a term that originally referred to something now refers to what that thing is mapped to and a predicate with an extension originally containing various things now has an extension containing what those things are mapped to. Since, the sentences that are true with respect to the original interpretation are also true with respect to the new one, it would seem that the new interpretation satisfies the same reasonable constraints as the original. Quine argues that reference is a relative matter, like position and velocity. Non-relative absolute reference is, he says, like “absolute position, or absolute velocity, rather than position or velocity relative to a given frame of reference” (201). Furthermore in Quine’s view, radical translation begins at home . . . It is meaningless to ask whether, in general, our terms ‘rabbit’, ‘rabbit part’, ‘number’, etc., really refer respectively to rabbits, rabbit parts, numbers, etc., rather than to some ingeniously permuted denotations. It is meaningless to ask this absolutely; we can meaningfully ask it only relative to some background language. . . . Querying reference in any more absolute way would be like asking about absolute position, or absolute velocity, rather than position or velocity relative to a given frame of reference. When we ask, “Does ‘rabbit’ really refer to rabbits?” someone can counter with the question: “Refer to rabbits in what sense of ‘rabbits’?” thus launching a regress; and we need the background language to regress into. The background language gives the query sense, if only relative sense; sense relative in turn to it, this background language (200-201).

#### [6] To go anywhere, you must go halfway first, and then you must go half of the remaining distance ad infinitum – thus, motion is impossible because it necessitates traversing an infinite number of spaces in finite time.

#### [7] Government means “the relation between a governed and a governing word.” (Oxford Dictionary). A relation can’t pass a plan, so the res is incoherent.

#### [8] In order to say I want to fix x problem, you must say that you want x problem to exist, since it requires the problem exist to solve, which makes any moral attempt inherently immoral and fairness is impossible since it would require giving each debater the same amount of speeches and time.

#### [9] Rule following fails a) We can infinitely question why to follow that rule, as all rules will terminate at the assertion of some principle with no further justification b) Rule are arbitrary since the agent has the ability to formulate a unique understanding of them. It becomes impossible to say someone is violating a rule, since they can always perceive their actions as a non-violation.

## 4

### CP TEXT:  The U.S ought to recognize the right of workers to strike in accordance with the National Labor Relations Act with the exception of healthcare workers.

#### A skeleton staff must be established in any circumstance for any strike.

Mfutso-Bengu and Muula 02 (Mfutso-Bengu, Joseph, and Adamson S Muula. “Is It Ethical for Health Workers to Strike? Issues from the 2001 Qech General Hospital Strike.” Malawi Medical Journal : the Journal of Medical Association of Malawi, Malawi Medical Journal, Sept. 2002, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3346014/)

In the context of a strike, one should ensure not undertake anything that could result in causing harm directly or indirectly to the patient. Any struggle undertaken by medical personnel that violates patient right to health is unethical. The struggle should be centered at improving overall working conditions and environment in the hospital. The problem with this understanding is that it is almost impossible to stage a strike which is not painful and does not hurt the patient as such would in essence defeat the whole effect of the strike. One could rightly argue that, the only ones who could better defend the plight of the patient are the health workers. If they forsake their patient who can then defend them? Therefore if the health workers want to improve their working conditions let them also fight for the living and care conditions of their patients. For the working condition of a health worker is the living condition of the patient, both are two sides of one coin. A health worker and a patient are not the same and yet they cannot be separated; one cannot be, without the other. Therefore government cannot improve the living conditions of patients without improving the working conditions of the health personnel. The duty and responsibility to protect life is among the first in hierarchy of values. Hence in a strike an attempt should be made to leave a skeleton staff. Some might say this could undermine the effectiveness of the strike. Others might argue that the absence of a skeleton staff could undermine the integrity of the health workers involved in the strike. It might also be argued that to put in place a skeleton staff could do more harm to the patients than good, because the small and less motivated staff could exhibit negligent behaviour being induced by over work, fatigue and stress but also carelessness.

#### Healthcare worker strikes cause deaths of innocent people.

Dixon 17 (Dixon, Robyn, and Reuben Kyama. “As Striking Kenyan Doctors Dig in, Patients Are Forgotten and a Baby Dies.” Los Angeles Times, Los Angeles Times, 13 Jan. 2017, https://www.latimes.com/world/africa/la-fg-kenya-doctors-strike-20170113-story.html)

Reporting from NAIROBI, KENYA — No one can be sure how many people may have died because of Kenya’s five-week doctors strike, but Dismas Bikundo is sure his baby girl was one of them. She would have been his firstborn child. When his wife, Edna, went into labor on Dec. 27, the couple was turned away from two hospitals. A private hospital sent him to the nearest government facility, Mbagathi Hospital in central Nairobi, but there was no doctor available there because of the strike at public hospitals. Bikundo rushed his wife to a third hospital run by a Catholic mission. “By the time we arrived at the hospital it was too late. We lost the baby,” said Bikundo, 24, a casual laborer. “I am still traumatized.” **Medical union leaders** face jail **and 5,000 Kenyan doctors** face the sack after **defy**ing a court order Thursday to **return to work** — but the **long-term casualty could be Kenya’s dilapidated health system.** The strike will likely trigger a new flood of medical staff leaving Kenya for other countries, such as the United States, Britain, Canada and Australia, where they can easily better the basic pay rate of $1,350 a month and tough working conditions. **Because of the dismal pay, thousands of Kenyan doctors and other medical workers have emigrated** from a country where, in contrast, legislators are some of the highest paid on Earth, earning around $20,000 a month, taking into account their generous travel allowances and other perks. Doctors walked off the job in December over the government’s refusal to implement a 3-year-old collective bargaining agreement, or CBA. The deal would have more than doubled doctors’ pay and increased the number of doctors in public hospitals. Other medical professionals at government-run hospitals also are on strike; nurses went back to work in December. Public anger over the government’s failure to resolve the strike has been deepened by a corruption scandal in the Ministry of Health exposed late last year. Senior health officials stole or fraudulently diverted around $55 million from the 2015-16 health budget, according to an internal audit. Implementing the pay deal would cost $126 million annually, a bill that the treasury secretary, Henry Rotich, says the government cannot afford. He claims the 2013 pay deal was rushed into and agreed without adequate consultation. Kenya may have the largest economy in East Africa but it relies on donor nations such as the U.S., European Union and China to cover more than a quarter of its health budget. Longtime Kenyan anti-corruption campaigner and activist John Githongo has been seething over the failure of the scandal-plagued government to improve doctors’ pay. At Nairobi’s main hospital, Kenyatta National Hospital, on Friday, Rachel Nduta wondered if her **2-year-old** daughter might be a **casualty of the strike**. The child, **Megan, was recently diagnosed with a hole in her heart.** Nduta said she arrived early Friday morning and **waited hours for an appointment** with a cardiologist. “There’s nothing going on here,” Nduta said in a low, sad voice. She had wandered the cardiology wing looking for help. “**But none of the offices in the entire wing is open**,” she said. **The government deployed military doctors to work in the hospital to deal with emergency cases, but the emergency wing was silent and deserted** Friday. **Private hospitals have been overwhelmed by the flood of patients who would normally rely on the public system.** Distraught relatives of sick people streamed in and out of Kenyatta National Hospital on Friday. Some complained that **family members were lying in the hospital unattended**. Patients and their family members huddled in the shade of a large tree outside the hospital entrance. The mood was one of despair. **Simon** Kinywa, 60, a farmer, **watched his youngest son**, who has cancer, **writhing in pain**. Eventually he **gave up and took his son home.** Martin Amukowa, 18, said his father, a diabetic who suffered a stroke last year, could not get the medical attention he needed. “This **strike has affected so many people**,” he sighed, as he too gave up, and pushed his father in a wheelchair to a waiting car. Kenya has one doctor for every 5,000 people, according to the World Health Organization, compared to 2.5 per 1,000 in the U.S. and around 3.5 per 1,000 in Europe. Many Kenyan citizens live hand-to-mouth each month covering basic expenses such as school costs, transportation, and food, and any sudden family illness can be a crippling event. Few people have medical insurance but many do not trust the rundown public system.

#### Healthcare workers such as nurses in hospitals are the critical link for pandemic readiness and safety.

Al Thobaity 20 (Al Thobaity 20, Abdullelah, and Farhan Alshammari. "Nurses on the frontline against the COVID-19 pandemic: an Integrative review." Dubai Medical Journal 3.3 (2020): 87-92. (Associate Professor of Nursing at Taif University)

The majority of **infected** or symptomatic **people seek medical treatment in** medical facilities, particularly **hospitals,** as a high number of cases, especially those in critical condition, will have an impact on hospitals [4]. The concept of **hospital resilience** in disaster situations **is defined as** the **ability to recover from** the **damage** caused by **huge disturbances quickly** [2]. The resilience of hospitals to pandemic cases depends on the preparedness of the institutions, and not all hospitals have the same resilience. **A lower resilience will affect** the **sustainability of the health services**. This also affects healthcare providers such as doctors, nurses, and allied health professionals [5, 6]. Despite the impact on healthcare providers, excellent **management of a pandemic depends on** the level of **preparedness of healthcare providers**, including nurses. This means that if it was impossible to be ready before a crisis or disaster, responsible people will do all but the impossible to save lives. Be it in daily routine or disasters, **nurses are on the frontline** and are responsible for providing holistic care for all types of patients. Considering the fact that **nurses constitute the majority of healthcare providers**, they have a critical function in healthcare systems [2, 5]. Their roles in treating patients with COVID-19 involve triaging patients and detecting suspected cases with infections; providing essential treatment in an emergency and dealing with suspected patients with precautions; helping in decontamination and coordination with other healthcare providers; supplying holistic nursing practices in managing multiple infections simultaneously; playing critical roles in expanding care services; and dealing with relatives [7]. In crises, they have more tasks to satisfy patients and their families; therefore, nurses must be well equipped with essential knowledge and skills in managing crises involving clinical treatment, decontamination, isolation, communication, triaging, psychological support, and palliative care if necessary [8-11]. However, when they respond to a crisis such as COVID-19, they face problems that hinder them from caring for the infected patients.

#### Staffing shortages in the health industry are present right now and will cause more death as the delta variant continues. Allowing essential workers to unconditionally strike destroys the health care system in the long run as it’s already understaffed.

Galvin 21(Galvin, Gaby. “Nearly 1 in 5 Health Care Workers Have Quit Their Jobs during the Pandemic.” Morning Consult, Morning Consult, 4 Oct. 2021, https://morningconsult.com/2021/10/04/health-care-workers-series-part-2-workforce/)

U.S. hospitals are filled with COVID-19 patients as **the delta variant continues to ravage the country**. Yet a year and a half into the pandemic, many **health care providers are facing severe staffing shortages**, and a new Morning Consult survey suggests more could be on the horizon. In California, for example, thousands of Kaiser Permanente nurses said [they’re planning a strike](https://www.unacuhcp.org/press_release/rns-put-the-brakes-on-20-year-labor-management-partnership-say-kaiser-permanente-walked-away-first/) because of planned “hefty cuts” to their pay and benefits. In Michigan, [Henry Ford Health System](https://www.modernhealthcare.com/labor/henry-ford-health-system-recruit-500-nurses-philippines) is turning to recruiting firms to bring 500 nurses from the Philippines to its hospitals over the next few years. And in upstate New York, a [local hospital announced](https://www.npr.org/2021/09/13/1036521499/covid-workers-resign-new-york-hospital-stops-baby-delivery) it would pause maternity services after dozens of staffers quit rather than get the COVID-19 vaccine. The survey indicates the **medical staffing problems are widespread**. It found that since February 2020, 30 percent of U.S. health care workers have either lost their jobs (12 percent) or quit (18 percent), while 31 percent of those who kept them have considered leaving their employers during the pandemic. That includes 19 percent who have thought about leaving the health care field entirely. That **exodus** — driven largely by the pandemic, insufficient pay or opportunities and burnout, according to the survey — **has implications for the entire health care system**, both in the short term as the country struggles to overcome the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond as the country continues to age. “You have **physicians**, you have **nurses**, dropping out, retiring early, **leaving** practice, changing jobs,” said Dr. Dharam Kaushik, a urologist at the University of Texas Health, San Antonio. “You’re experiencing **loss of manpower in a field that was already short on manpower before the pandemic hit**.” In August, private health care employment was down by more than half a million jobs from February 2020, according to an analysis from Altarum. The job growth recovery has been slower for women than for men in 2021, as of May. **Hospitals** and other providers have been “**trying to stay afloat and care for patients**” and leaning heavily on their clinicians and other staff to work overtime in taxing jobs, said April Kapu, associate dean for community and clinical partnerships at the Vanderbilt University School of Nursing and president of the American Association of Nurse Practitioners. “That hasn’t diminished,” she added, and “there are huge environmental support factors that need to be in place in the hospital.” Indeed, **79 percent of health care workers said the national shortage of medical professionals has impacted them and their place of work.** When asked to describe in an open-ended survey how they’d been affected by the shortages, many said their workloads had increased, sometimes leading to rushed or subpar care for patients, while others said their colleagues had left because of COVID-19 vaccination requirements.

#### COVID-19 is just the beginning. Future pandemics cause extinction.

Diamandis 21 (Diamandis, E. The Mother of All Battles: Viruses vs. Humans. Can Humans Avoid Extinction in 50-100 Years?. Preprints 2021, 2021040397)

The recent SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, which is causing **COVID 19** disease, **has taught** us unexpected lessons about **the dangers of human extinction through** highly contagious and lethal diseases. As the COVID 19 pandemic is now being controlled by various isolation measures, therapeutics and vaccines, it became clear that **our current lifestyle and societal functions may not be sustainable in the long term. We now have to start thinking and planning on** how to face **the next dangerous pandemic**, not just overcoming the one that is upon us now. **Is there any evidence that even worse pandemics could** strike us in the near future and **threaten the existence of the human race?** The answer is **unequivocally yes.** It is not necessary to get infected by viruses of bats, pangolins and other exotic animals that live in remote forests in order to be in danger. Creditable scientific evidence indicates that the human gut microbiota harbor billions of viruses which are capable of affecting the function of vital human organs such as the immune system, lung, brain, liver, kidney, heart etc. It is possible that the development of pathogenic variants in the gut can lead to contagious viruses which can cause pandemics, leading to destruction of vital organs, causing death or various debilitating diseases such as blindness, respiratory, liver, heart and kidney failures. These **diseases could result in the complete shutdown of our civilization and** probably **the extinction of human race.** In this essay, I will first provide a few independent pieces of scientific facts and then combine this information to come up with some (but certainly not all) hypothetical scenarios that could cause human race misery, even extinction. I hope that these scary scenarios will trigger.

## Case

#### Lack of Sustainability Development doesn’t cause extinction

Bjørn Lomborg, an adjunct professor at the Copenhagen Business School, founded and directs the Copenhagen Consensus Center, Project Syndicate, February 14, 2014, "The Davos Apocalypse", http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/bj-rn-lomborg-criticizes-global-leaders-for-creating-an-atmosphere-of-panic-about-climate-change

The apocalyptic bombast is even more disturbing. According to Angel Gurría, Secretary-General of the OECD, “our planet is warming dangerously,” and we need to act now “to avoid catastrophe”; the United Nations climate chief, Christiana Figueres, maintains that global warming means that “the world economy is at risk.”

Former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan takes the prize for the **most extreme rhetoric**, claiming that not curbing global warming is “a terrible gamble with the future of the planet and with life itself.”

Yet, the rhetoric is unconvincing. Yes, global warming is real and man-made. But creating panic and proposing unrealistic policies **will not help in tackling the problem.**

Both Annan and Gurría cited Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines last November as evidence of increased climate-change-related damage. Never mind that the latest report by the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) found that “current datasets indicate no significant observed trends in global tropical cyclone frequency over the past century” and reported “low confidence” that any changes in hurricanes in recent (or future) decades had anything to do with global warming.

Annan and Gurría also neglected to note that global Accumulated Cyclone Energy, an index for total hurricane activity, is hovering at the lowest values seen since the 1970’s. Indeed, the trend for strong hurricanes around the Philippines has declined since 1951.

Similarly, Gurría tells us that Hurricane Sandy, which slammed into New York City in 2012, is an example of inaction on climate change, costing the United States “the equivalent of 0.5% of its GDP” each year. In fact, the US currently is experiencing the longest absence of intense landfall hurricanes **since records began** in 1900, while the adjusted damage cost for the US during this period, including Hurricane Sandy, has fallen slightly.

Figueres claims “that current annual losses worldwide due to extreme weather and disasters could be a staggering 12% of annual global GDP.” But the study she cites shows only a possible loss of 1-12% of GDP in the future, and this is estimated not globally but within just eight carefully selected, climate-vulnerable regions or cities. By contrast, according to the IPCC, “long-term trends in economic disaster losses adjusted for wealth and population increases **have not been attributed to climate change**.”

On the contrary, the bulk of peer-reviewed economic evidence indicates that, up to around 2050-2070, the net global economic impact of rising temperatures is likely to be positive. Although global warming will create costs stemming from more heat-related deaths and water stress, they will be **outweighed by the benefits** from many fewer cold-related deaths and higher agricultural productivity from higher levels of CO2.

Global warming is a long-term problem. Most models indicate that the cost toward the end of the century will be 1-5% of world GDP. This is not a trivial loss; but nor does it put “the world economy at risk.” For comparison, the IPCC expects that by the end of the century, the average person in the developing world will be 1,400-1,800% richer than today.

Such incorrect statements by leading officials reinforce **wasteful policies** based on **wishful thinking**. Figueres sees “momentum growing toward” climate policies as countries like China “reduce coal use.” In the real world, China accounts for almost 60% of the global increase in coal consumption from 2012 to 2014, according to the International Energy Agency. While Figueres lauds China for dramatically increasing its solar-power capacity in 2013, the increase in China’s reliance on coal power was 27 times greater.

Figueres’s weak grasp on the facts has led her not only to conclude that China is “doing it right” on climate change, but also to speculate that China has succeeded because its “political system avoids some of the legislative hurdles seen in countries including the US.” In other words, the UN’s top climate official seems to be suggesting that an authoritarian political system is better for the planet.

The fact remains that global wind and solar power usage in 2012 cut, at most, 275 million tons of CO2, while soaking up $60 billion in subsidies. With the electricity worth possibly $10 billion, the average cost of cutting a ton of CO2 is about $180. The biggest peer-reviewed estimate of the damage cost of CO2 is about $5 per ton. This means that solar and wind power avoid about $0.03 of climate damage for every dollar spent.

Compare this to smarter technological solutions. In the short run, the US shale-energy revolution has replaced high-polluting coal with cheaper, cleaner natural gas. This has cut about 300 million tons of US emissions – more than all the world’s solar and wind power combined – and at the same time has profited Americans by saving them $100 billion in energy costs.

In the long run, current investment in green research and development will help drive the price of future renewable energy below that of fossil fuels, enabling a choice that is both environmentally and economically sound. In the meantime, even dramatic cuts in CO2 emissions will have very little impact on hurricanes 50-100 years from now. Lifting billions of people out of poverty, however, would not only be intrinsically good; it would also make societies much more resilient in the face of extreme weather, whether caused by global warming or not.

#### I can respond to new 1AR positions only once with the 2N, encouraging aff to always introduce new 1AR layers. This causes judge intervention – difficult to evaluate positions responded by only once. Biggest link to fairness because debaters can win rounds skewed against them, but not when the judge is out to get them. Also hurts clash – 1AR is incentivized to restart the debate and avoid the 1N. Key to education because clash allows us to explain and respond to arguments in-depth. Also causes strat skew. The little a) is the number of speeches – 2 to 1 skew and the little b) is distorting the previous speeches – I have no access to the NC. Key to fairness because developing a coherent strategy is key to winning.
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