Plan Text: The United States courts will grant all adolescents the right to consent to receiving contraceptive services without first consulting a parent, and will forbid doctors from notifying their parent. I reserve the right to clarify.

#### Advantage one is overpopulation. US cred on global family planning is collapsing---the only way to successfully implement UN goals is for the US to revitalize its commitment to women’s reproductive health. Barot 9[[1]](#footnote--1)

The world has changed markedly since 1994, when U.S. leadership in global sexual and reproductive health policy was on full display at the historic International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) in Cairo. The **agreements reached** at this landmark event—actively supported **by the U**nited **S**tates—**have been** largely **responsible for shifting the** **global discourse on population issues** from one focusing on meeting macro-demographic targets for “population control” to a framework defined **by recognizing** the **reproductive** **health and rights of women** **as the** **best way to promote development**.¶ **In the 15 years since** the ICPD, even as **U.S. policy regressed**, the international community continued to move forward, embarking on a new development agenda outlined in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Embraced by donor and developing nations alike (but largely ignored by the Bush administration), the MDGs established ambitious targets and goals related to reducing poverty and furthering development, including addressing women’s health and equality.¶ From its first week in office, the Obama administration has strongly signaled its intent to restore the country’s reputation and its commitment to a progressive foreign policy that prioritizes development assistance and embraces the MDGs. As expected, President Obama moved quickly to overturn some of the most heinous policies of the previous administration affecting U.S. international family planning and reproductive health assistance. But **to truly demonstrate seriousness** and significance **when it comes to** sexual and **reproductive** health and **rights,** **more must be done*.*** **The U**nited **S**tates **must reclaim** its **leadership** role in the international arena by fulfilling its commitments to Cairo and the MDGs, and **by** forthrightly **promoting** a global agenda on **women’s** sexual and reproductive **health**. It can take the first steps by reprioritizing women’s health in its own foreign assistance policy and by negotiating strongly on these issues at a series of upcoming international conferences.¶ The Legacy of the ICPD and MDGs¶ The “Programme of Action” that emerged from Cairo endorsed by 179 countries represented major strides in the area of women’s health and rights—gains strongly supported and negotiated by the U.S. delegation, under the chairmanship of Undersecretary of State for Global Affairs Timothy Wirth. At its heart, the ICPD embodied a breakthrough acknowledgment of the critical role of women—including the achievement of their legal rights and the elevation of their social status—as necessary and integral to “sustainable development” at the family, community and country level. **Meeting women’s needs was** officially **recognized** at the global level **as the** appropriate, **fundamental goal** **guiding** the formation and implementation of development and **population policy**.¶ Thus, after Cairo, it was unacceptable to promote population control as the raison d’etre for environmental sustainability, economic development or family planning programs. Instead, the ICPD affirmed the basic reproductive right of “all couples and individuals to decide freely and responsibly the number, spacing and timing of their children and to have the information and means to do so, and the right to attain the highest standard of sexual and reproductive health.” To that end, countries committed to achieving universal access to reproductive health care by 2015.The following year, at the 1995 Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, the Cairo principles were reaffirmed.¶ Although the Cairo agreement signified important steps forward, the outcomes were by no means perfect. Political compromises over contentious issues such as abortion were necessary. Nonetheless, the consensus reached around even this controversial issue still represented progress. For example, while access to abortion was not recognized as a reproductive right per se, Cairo moved the discussion of abortion to the health impacts of unsafe abortion, which the final document recognizes as a major public health issue. ¶ Six years later, the world’s leaders converged again to craft an agenda to end extreme poverty by 2015 outlined in the Millennium Declaration. At the New York headquarters of the United Nations (UN) in 2000, 189 countries pledged to meet eight development goals related to poverty, education, gender equality, maternal and child health, HIV/AIDS and the environment (see box). Attempts to promote an explicit reproductive health and rights agenda within the MDGs, however, were vigorously undercut during negotiations by the Bush administration and its allies within the so-called G77, a coalition of developing countries seeking to enhance their negotiating power within the UN by acting jointly. These deficiencies have been at least partly remedied over time. In the 2005 World Summit Outcome document, world leaders agreed to integrate the ICPD goal of universal access to reproductive health by 2015 into the strategies aimed at achieving the MDGs on maternal and child health, HIV/AIDS, gender equality and poverty. The UN Millennium Project, an independent advisory board commissioned by the UN to develop concrete plans to implement the MDGs, subsequently produced a blueprint endorsing the necessity of sexual and reproductive health to attaining the MDGs and describing interventions to that effect. Now, universal access to reproductive health is listed as a target for the MDG on maternal health, and fulfilling the unmet need for family planning is identified as a strategy for achieving this target.¶ The United States Retreats…¶ Although the ICPD marked the jumping off point for the world to move forward, U.S. policy regressed in the years immediately following. With the takeover of the House of Representatives by a conservative Republican leadership hostile not only to abortion rights but also to family planning programs, U.S. funding levels for international family planning assistance declined from their high-water mark in FY 1995, and by FY 2008, funding had dropped by nearly 40% when accounting for inflation. Policy restrictions subsequently imposed by the Bush administration further undermined U.S. credibility and leadership. From 2001 until President Obama rescinded it in January, the Mexico City policy (otherwise known as the global gag rule) prohibited U.S. funding for family planning to indigenous groups overseas that engaged in any services, dissemination of information or advocacy activities on abortion with other funds. And every year since 2002, President Bush blocked congressionally appropriated funding for the United Nations Population Fund on the basis of unfounded allegations of its complicity with coercive abortion practices in China. ¶ These policies have had repercussions beyond access to sexual and reproductive health services. Because the sexual and reproductive health of a country’s women and their partners is so integral to its ability to achieve other development targets, the larger objectives of social and economic development as espoused by the ICPD and the MDGs have also been crippled. Developing countries that do not provide or are impeded from providing adequate access to sexual and reproductive health care can only attain limited economic and social progress. Moreover, the global gag rule obstructed human rights and democratic values that the United States ostensibly cares about, such as civil and political rights related to speech and assembly, which are constitutionally protected for its own citizens and recognized in international treaties.¶ …But the World Moves Ahead¶ While U.S. policy has been lagging, other countries and regions have been forging ahead in their efforts to promote the sexual and reproductive health and rights of women across the developing world. Countries in Europe especially have moved in to fill the leadership void. Initiatives such as the Safe Abortion Action Fund, established in 2006 by the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development, were specifically developed to ameliorate the harmful effects of the global gag rule. European donor countries have also been proactively engaged in pushing progress on more politically sensitive sexual and reproductive health concerns. Indeed, countries such as Norway, Sweden, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Denmark have been at the forefront in funding programs in areas such as adolescent reproductive health, safe abortion services, and sexual health and rights. European countries have also been much more eager than the United States to adopt and encourage the language and policy framework of international human rights, as formally delineated by the UN system, in their own programs and policies. ¶ European donor countries are ahead of the United States not only philosophically, but also financially. Although the United States remains the leading donor country in overall amounts for foreign aid, European and other developed countries contribute far more of their gross national income (GNI). (GNI comprises gross domestic product plus net income from abroad.) In 2007, according to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the United States spent less than two-tenths of one percent (0.16%) of its GNI toward official development assistance, placing it last among members of OECD’s Development Assistance Committee (see table). Among committee members, only European countries have met the UN target of allocating 0.70% of GNI toward official development assistance.¶ Meanwhile, other progress in promoting a sexual and reproductive health agenda has been occurring at the global, regional and country levels. Although thwarted during high-level international conferences by the United States and other conservative countries, UN bodies and agencies have nonetheless made key advances in securing reproductive rights.The UN treaty monitoring system has developed a body of important jurisprudence through the committees that evaluate countries’ compliance with the six major international human rights treaties. For example, the Committee on the Rights of the Child, which monitors compliance with the Convention on the Rights of the Child, has interpreted the treaty to require governments that are a party to the convention to provide adolescents (defined by the UN as 10–19-year-olds) with access to comprehensive sexual and reproductive health information, “including on family planning and contraceptives, the dangers of early pregnancy, the prevention of HIV/AIDS and the prevention and treatment of sexually transmitted diseases,” ensuring such access “regardless of their marital status and whether their parents or guardians consent.” ¶ Similarly, regional-level bodies have carved out important victories for reproductive rights. Again, Europe is at the forefront, as evidenced by the actions of the Council of Europe and of the European Court of Human Rights. For example, in 2008, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe issued a resolution recognizing that the “lawfulness of abortion does not have an effect on a woman’s need for an abortion, but only on her access to a safe abortion” and urged restrictive member states to decriminalize abortion within reasonable gestational limits. The European court has also built important precedent for women’s reproductive rights. In a historic case against Poland in 2007, the court found that once governments decide to legalize abortion, they must ensure that obstacles do not impede access to the procedure.The African Union has also made progress through its Protocol on the Rights of Women in Africa, which requires states to “ensure that the right to health of women, including sexual and reproductive health, is respected and promoted.” It goes even further by being the first international treaty to articulate a woman’s right to medical abortion on a number of grounds, including cases of rape, incest, endangerment to the physical or mental health of the mother or when the life of the mother or fetus is threatened.¶ Finally, at the country level, the trend toward recognizing the full range of women’s reproductive rights has continued.While the United States has been pushing for greater restrictions on women’s reproductive autonomy at the domestic and international levels through all branches of the government, 16 nations have liberalized their abortion laws over the last 10 years, and an additional two have expanded abortion access in certain jurisdictions. Only two countries have moved against the tide by removing all grounds for abortion access (see chart).¶ Forging a New Agenda¶ Repairing, rethinking and **realigning U.S.** foreign **policies on** sexual and **reproductive health** **will be** a **formidable** task, **but** President **Obama** has **laid the groundwork**. The Obama campaign formally expressed its commitment to the current global development agenda by incorporating the language of the MDGs into its campaign platform and promising to support and achieve the MDGs. With respect to foreign aid, the president has conveyed a willingness to ameliorate the low funding situation for family planning programs; as a senator, Obama endorsed increasing funding for international family planning programs to $1 billion. ¶ **However, it is one thing to rejoin the mainstream, but** quite **another to be a recognized leader**. There is no doubt that President Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton are committed to sexual and reproductive health and rights, and to placing a high priority on development assistance within U.S. foreign policy. Indeed, Clinton has been a long-standing champion of women’s rights in general and of reproductive rights specifically. At the 1995 Beijing conference, as head of the U.S. delegation, she forthrightly proclaimed that women’s rights are human rights—a sentiment she reiterated during her Senate confirmation hearing. And she endorsed development assistance—one of the “three legs of American foreign policy”—as “an equal partner, along with defense and diplomacy, in the furtherance of America’s national security.” The challenge confronting the administration, then, is not one of philosophy, but one of priority. ¶ There are several ways that the administration, assisted by a supportive congressional leadership, can begin to reestablish the country’s global leadership. The obvious first step would be to increase foreign aid to international family planning programs. As a donor nation, the United States, along with other donor countries, promised to provide one-third of the total funds needed to meet the ICPD benchmarks (with developing countries themselves supplying the rest); however, the United States has not carried its fair share. Accordingly, U.S. advocates are waging a concerted effort to more than double U.S. family planning assistance to at least $1 billion, based on the targets set at Cairo. Indeed, a recently released report by five former directors of the Population and Reproductive Health Program of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) recommends that FY 2010 funding for USAID’s population budget be set at $1.2 billion and raised to $1.5 billion by FY 2014. ¶ Along with bolstering the budget for family planning, and in keeping with the integrated goals of the ICPD and the MDGs, policymakers will need to robustly support other development programs that are crucial to ensuring the promotion of sexual and reproductive health, and vice-versa, such as those addressing girls’ and adult women’s education, and women’s access to vocational training and financial credit.¶ As Congress embarks on a long-term effort to reform and restructure U.S. foreign aid more broadly, policymakers must look comprehensively at the U.S. global health effort, and confront the reality that HIV/AIDS programs currently claim an extremely high proportion of the total resources allocated. Particularly in difficult economic times, it will be a challenge to “gross up” authorization levels for other critical global health portfolios, including but not limited to family planning and reproductive health. That, however, is what will be necessary to ensure that the country has an effective, global health strategy that in turn feeds into a comprehensive effort to combat poverty and promote sustainable development worldwide. ¶ Although the administration has already dealt with some policy modifications such as rescinding the global gag rule, there are long-term restrictions within the 1961 Foreign Assistance Act that prohibit the United States from funding the full range of reproductive health services in its foreign aid. In particular, the 1973 Helms Amendment bans U.S. funding for most abortion services abroad. In fact, given the high toll paid by women in the developing world who obtain unsafe abortions, there is little reason other than politics that the United States should not join other donor countries in supporting the provision of safe abortion services abroad. Yet, even a more progressive Congress is unlikely to repeal the Helms Amendment anytime soon. Meanwhile, however, at least some of its harmful—and unnecessary, if long-standing—effects could be mitigated administratively through revised field guidance highlighting activities that are, in fact, permissible under the law. Such activities would include USAID support for clinical training under certain conditions; provision of neutral, abortion-related information; and funding of abortion services in cases of rape and incest or where the life of the woman is in danger. ¶ Finally, while the administration works with Congress to ensure the appropriate role of sexual and reproductive health within overall U.S. global health and development efforts, it must not neglect the same advocacy at the international level, where issues of sexual and reproductive health are at risk of being lost among concerns of financial crisis and worsening poverty among both developing and developed countries. It is imperative that the United States reminds others of the integral role of reproductive health in economic development and fights to keep these issues on the world’s agenda.¶ The Obama administration will have plenty of opportunities in the coming months and years to demonstrate renewed leadership on the global stage, beginning with the ICPD+15 commemoration this year and the 10-year follow-up to the MDGs in 2010. At a range of important conferences, **advocates will** be **look**ing **to the U**nited **S**tates **to take** a strong **leadership** role in negotiating progressive outcomes for consensus documents, so as **to further a progressive** and effective policy **agenda for population** and development. In particular, **the world will be watching as the U.S.** delegation **negotiates a** likely **MDG**+10 outcome **document, with advocates** **monitoring its commitment to tearing down barriers to the vindication of** the sexual and **reproductive health and rights** of millions of individuals across this planet.

#### Meeting family planning needs solves overpopulation—it ensures a sustainable population by 2050, and expanding female contraceptive services strengthens the internal link. This evidence is stupid good. White 14[[2]](#footnote-0)

Successful navigation of the demographic transition and **avoidance of the demographic trap depend on timely reduction in fertility**. Three factors play key roles here: awareness of women that fertility reduction is a choice; objective advantages to smaller family size; and availability of acceptable means of fertility reduction.64 The first factor depends largely on women’s educational status; the second on economic variables, including empowerment of women; and the third on access to reproductive health services.¶ A powerful comparison of two progressive states in India (Kerala and Tamil Nadu) shows that education and empowerment of women there have led to even larger fertility reductions than the coercive measures adopted in China.9(Chapter9) Furthermore, comparisons between these two states and other Indian states where birth rates remain high reveal that education of women and their participation in the work force are the only two elements that have significantly impacted birth rates. Multivariate analysis of a global data set confirms that literacy rate for women aged 15 and older has the strongest influence on reductions in total fertility rates.64 Others have also documented the importance of women’s education in decreasing birth rates.65(p376),66(p241)¶ **Improved access to contraception** has **led to avoidance of** an estimated **230 million births per year**, and an additional avoidance of some 270,000 annual maternal deaths.67 These results suggest that **extending modern reproductive health services—in particular, meeting the** unfulfilled **need for contraception** of an estimated 222 million women worldwide—**is likely to accelerate reductions in** both **fertility** and maternal mortality. Yet extending contraception services to these women would still leave millions more women without access to family planning.67 Even so, gradual **fulfillment of** the unmet need for **family planning would reduce total fertility rates below the replacement level after 2030 and approach** the levels of **the UN’s low population estimate for 2050**.68¶ Even where food security prevails, particularly in industrialized countries, ongoing **population growth imposes** growing **environmental impacts, such as climate** change **and biodiversity** loss. **Population stabilization,** therefore, **is** a **necessary** goal **for** achievement of global **sustainability**. Although poverty reduction and improved food access could greatly reduce food insecurity in the world today, long-term stability of food security requires cessation of population growth. Efforts in this direction require engagement of the world’s women.

#### Overpopulation leads to soil erosion. Phares 11[[3]](#footnote-1)

**Stresses on global food and water** supply **will only increase with an added 2 billion mouths** to feed. Marine biologists at the Food and Agriculture Organization report that “all 17 of the planet’s major oceanic fisheries are being fished at or beyond capacity, with 9 in a state of collapse”. 61 There are more than 430 million people today living in countries considered to be “water stressed,” meaning there is not enough clean water to supply inhabitants with. Because the vast majority of clean water shortages occur in developing countries with largely growing populations, the percentage of the world’s population living in water stressed countries could increase by over 300 percent.¶ Using global food supply, distribution, and consumption data, a 1994 report estimated that over 1 billion of the planet’s residents lived, at the time, in “utter poverty,” a condition that “implies hunger among those persons.”63 That number has increased since then. Roughly 800 million people today, over three times the population of the United States, are “chronically undernourished.”64 Many of the **ag**ricultural **practices** developed in order **to produce** much **larger and more productive crops** per area **have resulted in** **increased soil erosion**, **polluted ground and surface water**; and increased pesticide use has caused serious public health and environmental problems.¶ Many countries experiencing large population growth already do not produce adequate amounts of food for their people and, therefore, rely heavily on foreign imports. The cost of transport alone in the global food distribution picture is huge. Significantly larger amounts of aid will need to be provided to developing regions unable to provide for their own residents.¶ To eradicate poverty and provide adequate food to all people in 2050, **world food production will have to double** from what it was in 2010.67 A report from the United Nation’s Food and Agriculture Organization states that “According to the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 15 out of 24 ecosystem services examined are already being degraded or used unsustainably. These include capture fisheries and water supply.”68 Increasing pressure to produce more food and extract more from Earth systems will only intensify stress and damage.

#### Soil erosion causes extinction---resilience fails, also it outweighs war and disease. Monibiot 15[[4]](#footnote-2)

Imagine a wonderful world, a planet on which there was no threat of climate breakdown, no loss of freshwater, no antibiotic resistance, no obesity crisis, no terrorism, no war. Surely, then, we would be out of major danger? Sorry. **Even if everything else were miraculously fixed*,* we’re finished** if we don’t address an issue considered so marginal and irrelevant that you can go for months without seeing it in a newspaper.¶ It’s literally and – it seems – metaphorically, beneath us. To judge by its absence from the media, most journalists consider it unworthy of consideration. But all human life depends on it. We knew this long ago, but somehow it has been forgotten. As a Sanskrit text written in about 1500BC noted: “Upon this handful of soil our survival depends. Husband it and it will grow our food, our fuel and our shelter and surround us with beauty. Abuse it and the soil will collapse and die, taking humanity with it.”¶ The issue hasn’t changed, but we have. **Landowners** around the world **are now engaged in an orgy of soil destruction** so intense that, according to the UN’s Food and Agriculture Organisation, **the world** on average **has** just **60 more years of growing crops**. Even in Britain, which is spared the tropical downpours that so quickly strip exposed soil from the land, Farmers Weekly reports, we have “only 100 harvests left”.¶ To keep up with global food demand, the UN estimates, 6m hectares (14.8m acres) of new farmland will be needed every year. Instead, 12m hectares a year are lost through soil degradation. **We wreck it, then move on**, trashing rainforests and other precious habitats as we go. Soil is an almost magical substance, a living system that transforms the materials it encounters, making them available to plants. That handful the Vedic master showed his disciples contains more micro-organisms than all the people who have ever lived on Earth. Yet we treat it like, well, dirt.¶ The techniques that were supposed to feed the world threaten us with starvation. A paper just published in the journal Anthropocene analyses the undisturbed sediments in an 11th-century French lake. It reveals that **the intensification of farming** over the past century **has increased** the rate of **soil erosion sixtyfold**.¶ Another paper, by researchers in the UK, shows that soil in allotments – the small patches in towns and cities that people cultivate by hand – contains a third more organic carbon than agricultural soil and 25% more nitrogen. This is one of the reasons why allotment holders produce between four and 11 times more food per hectare than do farmers.¶ Whenever I mention this issue, people ask: “But surely farmers have an interest in looking after their soil?” They do, and there are many excellent cultivators who seek to keep their soil on the land. There are also some terrible farmers, often absentees, who allow contractors to rip their fields to shreds for the sake of a quick profit. Even the good ones are hampered by an economic and political system that could scarcely be better designed to frustrate them.¶ This is the International Year of Soils, but you wouldn’t know it. In January, the Westminster government published a new set of soil standards, marginally better than those they replaced, but wholly unmatched to the scale of the problem. There are no penalities for compromising our survival except a partial withholding of public subsidies. Yet even this pathetic guidance is considered intolerable by the National Farmers’ Union, which greeted them with bitter complaints. Sometimes the NFU seems to me to exist to champion bad practice and block any possibility of positive change.¶ Few sights are as gruesome as the glee with which the NFU celebrated the death last year of the European soil framework directive, the only measure with the potential to arrest our soil-erosion crisis. The NFU, supported by successive British governments, fought for eight years to destroy it, then crowed like a shedful of cockerels when it won. Looking back on this episode, we will see it as a parable of our times.¶ Soon after that, the business minister, Matthew Hancock, announced that he was putting “business in charge of driving reform”: trade associations would be able “to review enforcement of regulation in their sectors.” The NFU was one the first two bodies granted this privilege. Hancock explained that this “is all part of our unambiguously pro-business agenda to increase the financial security of the British people.” But it doesn’t increase our security, financial or otherwise. It undermines it.¶ The government’s deregulation bill, which has now almost completed its passage through parliament, will force regulators – including those charged with protecting the fabric of the land – to “have regard to the desirability of promoting economic growth”. But short-term growth at the expense of public protection compromises long-term survival. This “unambiguously pro-business agenda” is deregulating us to death.¶ There’s no longer even an appetite for studying the problem. Just one university – Aberdeen – now offers a degree in soil science. All the rest have been closed down.¶ **This is what topples civilisations**. **War and pestilence might kill large numbers** of people, **but** in most cases **the population recovers**. But **lose the soil and everything goes with it**.¶ Now, globalisation ensures that this disaster is reproduced everywhere. In its early stages, globalisation enhances resilience: people are no longer dependent on the vagaries of local production. But as it proceeds, spreading the same destructive processes to all corners of the Earth, it undermines resilience, as it threatens to bring down systems everywhere.¶ Almost all other issues are superficial by comparison. What appear to be great crises are slight and evanescent when held up against the steady trickling away of our subsistence.

#### Err aff---overpopulation is systemically underestimated Mora 14[[5]](#footnote-3)

Unfortunately, reversing ongoing deleterious trends in human welfare and biodiversity remains challenging despite international initiatives such as the Millennium Development Goals and numerous international venues such as The World Conference on Human Rights, The Convention on Biological Diversity, Agenda 21, and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (which led to the Kyoto Protocol), among others. It has been already noted that part of the failure to reverse trends in human welfare and biodiversity loss stems from the paucity of international institutions that address the problems conjointly (Walker et al. 2009). The reasoning is that **there aresignificant feedbacks loopsbetween** **biod**iversity **loss and** human **welfare and** several other issues such as **climate change**, overexploitation, habitat loss, **violence, and so forth** and that we lack institutions that can track all issues simultaneously, especially at transnational scales (Walker et al. 2009). I argue that another, and perhaps even more critical, reason for failure is the reluctance of many of these initiatives and institutions to call for specific actions on the issue of population growth. I reviewed recent literature (> 70% of the papers cited were from the last decade) to highlight the key role of overpopulation in several pressing social and environmental issues. This review of recent case studies suggest that the issue of **overpopulation is being** critically **underplayed** and fails to influence decisions in which **millions of people and species could be** negatively **affected** by a situation that might have been otherwise avoided.¶ SCIENTIFIC, PUBLIC, AND POLITICAL CONSIDERATION OF POPULATION GROWTH¶ The issue of overpopulation is fading in importance throughout most endeavors and sectors of society. For example, **overpopulation**, despite being directly or indirectly linked to the deterioration of ecological systems (Mora and Sale 2011) and a key factor for the success of conserving species and ecosystems (Mora and Sale 2011), **has been** rarely considered and in fact “trivialized or **ignored**” by much of the conservation biology community (Meffe et al. 1993). For example, it is often argued that increasing greenhouse gas emissions are caused by a combination of excessive consumption and increasing population. In fact, projections on human population suggest that the net production of greenhouse gases could be equivalent between developed and developing countries due to the large consumption of the former and the large population growth of the later (Bongaarts 1992). Yet the most authoritative report on climate change [i.e. the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (Pachauri and Reisinger 2007)] makes little to no reference to the issue of population growth or family planning, or any related matter. Similarly, one could argue that food security will depend not only on our capability to produce more food but on how much food our population will continue to demand; yet some of the most seminal recent reports on food security lacked any reference to the role of or need to address population growth in ensuring current and future food security (Clay 2011, Foley et al. 2011). Finally, overpopulation is known to affect key aspects of human welfare (reviewed in Window of opportunity for tackling overpopulation: Welfare; APPGPDRH 2007, Campbell et al. 2007). However, the topics of overpopulation and family planning are rarely considered by leaders in different endeavors as mitigation solutions to improve the health of impoverished people (Poma et al. 2007), and population growth is “marginalized” in key recent reports about improving human welfare (Cleland et al. 2006). ¶ It is very likely that population growth as a missing scientific agenda accounts in part for the reduced public knowledge and interest in this issue. Meffe (1994) introduced the concept of “missing awareness” to explain a current lack of understanding of the magnitude of our population even among portions of our society with higher education. In the United States, public opinion on population growth as a pressing problem declined from 68% in 1992 to 8% in 2000 (Schindlmayr 2001) and does not appear in recent opinion polls (PollingReport.com, http://www.pollingreport.com/prioriti.htm). Despite the significance of the recent milestone that our global population reached seven billion people, the press coverage faded quickly, particularly when compared to more trivial news at the time (e.g., the possible love affairs of Herman Cain, which lasted for weeks). Unfortunately, the limited public consideration of the issue translates into limited policy action. As an example, the share of international funding on family planning has dropped to ˜5% in 2007 from ˜55% in 1995 (Bongaarts and Sinding 2009). This collision between lack of interest in the topic of population growth (by scientists and the public) and the declining support for family planning programs and addressing population growth among developed countries (Myrskylä et al. 2009) generates a worrisome situation for the spontaneous stabilization of the world’s human population. Although the relevance of population growth can vary by country, especially among developed and developing countries (Lee 2011), **interest in the topic should be a global concern** as even developed countries appear to be reversing their negative population birth rates (Myrskylä et al. 2009) and because interest in the topic among developed countries greatly determines the success of education and family planning programs in developing nations (Schindlmayr 2001).

**Advantage two is poverty** access to contraceptives solves teen pregnancy**,** having to tell a parent is a key barrier to teenage girls seeking contraceptives, **ACLU 03**.[[6]](#footnote-4)

**47 percent of sexually active teenage girls said** that **they would stop** **accessing *all* reproductive health care services** from the clinic **if they couldn't get contraceptives without** first **telling their parents**.  Not only would these teenagers stop getting contraceptive services, they would also stop getting testing and treatment for STDs, including HIV Another 12 percent would stop using some reproductive health care services or would delay testing or treatment for HIV or other STDs; This means that altogether 59 percent of sexually active teenage girls would stop or delay getting critical health care services; yet **99 percent of these teens** the ones who would stop or delay getting contraceptive services or STD testing and treatment **said they** **would continue having sex**.

Teenage girls using contraceptives massively reduces the number of unwanted pregnancies. **Kaplan 14.**

**Birth control prevents** teenage **pregnancies** and abortions -- when teens know about it and are able to use it. **Of 560 young women deemed at high risk for pregnancy** who **were given** free access to hormonal implants and copper **IUDs** as part of a study, **not a single one became pregnant** during the years they were tracked, according to a [report](http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa1400506?query=featured_home" \t "_blank) that appears in Thursday’s edition of the New England Journal of Medicine. **Among all 1,404 teens who took part in the [Contraceptive CHOICE Project](http://www.choiceproject.wustl.edu/" \t "_blank) between** 20**08** **and 2013,** the **average** annual **pregnancy rate was** 34 per 1,000 teens. That **was 41% lower than the pregnancy rate for all** American **teens**, which was 57.4 per 1,000 in 2010. Nearly all of the St. Louis-area teens who took part in CHOICE were sexually active (97% of them had already lost their virginity when they enrolled in the program, and 99% had done so by the end of their first year in the program). When compared only with American teens who were sexually experienced, the young women in the program looked even better -- their pregnancy rate was 79% lower than that of their counterparts, who had 158.5 pregnancies per 1,000 teens. The results were similar for abortions and births, according to the journal report. The average annual abortion rate for CHOICE participants was 9.7 per 1,000, compared with 14.7 per 1,000 for all U.S. teens and 41.5 per 1,000 sexually active teens. **In addition, the** average annual **birth rate** for teens in CHOICE **was 19.4 per 1,000, compared with 34.4** **per** 1,000 American **teens and 94** **per** 1,000 **sexually active teens**. The Contraceptive CHOICE Program was launched by researchers at Washington University in St. Louis to see whether unintended pregnancies could be reduced by removing three common barriers to birth control -- lack of accurate information, lack of access to effective birth control and lack of funds to pay for it. The study enrolled 9,256 women between the ages of 14 and 45. Most of the minors in the study got their parents’ permission to participate, though four got waivers to enroll without parental consent. All of the study participants were seeking contraception before they enrolled in CHOICE, and none of them intended to get pregnant for at least a year. Counselors in the program laid out various options for birth control -- from most effective to least effective -- and let the women decide which method was best for them. If their choice was medically appropriate, it was provided free of charge. The New England Journal of Medicine study focused on data from 716 teens who were tracked for three years and 688 teens who were tracked for two years. Before joining the study, 48% of these teens had experienced an unplanned pregnancy, 25% had given birth and 18% had had an abortion. After learning about various contraception options, 35% chose the hormone implant, making it the most popular choice. Coming in a close second (at 32%) were intrauterine devices that release the hormone levonorgestrel, followed by birth control pills (13%) and hormone injections that last for three months (9%). Copper IUDs were picked by 5% of women, as were vaginal rings. Rounding out the list was the transdermal patch, the choice of 2% of teens. The most effective choices turned out to be the hormone implant and the copper IUD, both of which had perfect records over a combined 690.6 teen-years of use. As for the others: The hormone-releasing IUD had 5.1 failures per 1,000 teen-years of use; The hormone injections resulted in 5.2 failures per 1,000 teen-years of use; The contraceptive ring produced 51.8 failures per 1,000 teen-years of use; Birth control pills resulted in 56.8 failures per 1,000 teen-years of use; and The transdermal patch had 60.8 failures per 1,000 teen-years of use. The key to the CHOICE program’s success was that more than 70% of the teens were persuaded to pick a long-acting form of birth control, the study authors noted. Earlier this week, the American Academy of Pediatrics issued a policy statement [endorsing teens’ use](http://www.latimes.com/science/sciencenow/la-sci-sn-teen-birth-control-contraception-policy-20140929-story.html" \t "_blank) of hormone implants and IUDs, which can remain in place for up to 10 years. Though **teen pregnancy rates** have been falling **in the U**nited **S**tates since the 1990s, they **are** still far **higher than those of other** industrialized **nations. About 625,000** American **teens became pregnant in 2010**, according to [data](http://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/USTPtrends10.pdf" \t "_blank) from the Guttmacher Institute. The National Campaign to Prevent Teen and Unplanned Pregnancy estimates that teen births cost the United States nearly $10 billion in 2010. Those costs included healthcare needs, public assistance through programs such as the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children, and lost income to mothers who drop out of school or are otherwise unable to reach their educational potential. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has set a [goal](http://www.cdc.gov/winnablebattles/teenpregnancy/index.html" \t "_blank) of reducing the teen birth rate to 30.3 per 1,000 teens by 2015. The teens enrolled in CHOICE are already 36% below that goal, the study authors note.

Teen pregnancy is high now and traps families in the cycle of poverty, which spurs a feedback loop. **NCSL 15[[7]](#footnote-5)**

**Teen** pregnancy and **birth rates for teens age 15 to 19 in the** **U**nited **S**tates **remain among the highest with comparable countries**. Roughly one in four girls will be pregnant at least once before age 20. And about one in five teen moms will have a second child during her teen years. Significant disparities also persist across racial and ethnic lines, geographic regions, rural and urban areas and among age groups. Adolescent pregnancy and parenthood are closely associated with a host of social and economic issues that affect teen parents, their children and society. **Teenage mothers are less likely to finish high school and are more likely to live in poverty**, depend on public assistance, **and be in poor health** than slightly older mothers. **Their children are more likely to suffer health and cognitive disadvantages**, **come in contact with** the child welfare and **correctional systems, live in poverty, drop out of high school and become teen parents** themselves. According to a 2010 analysis by the National Campaign to Prevent Teen and Unplanned Pregnancy, the annual public cost of teen childbearing—due to the cost of public health care, foster care, incarceration and lost tax revenue—is nearly $9.4 billion. High School Completion **Teen** pregnancy and **parenting are significant contributors to** high school **drop-out rates among** teen **girls**. Thirty percent of teenage girls who drop out of high school cite pregnancy or parenthood as a primary reason. This rate is even higher for Hispanic and African American teens, at 36 and 38 percent, respectively. Nationally, only about half of all teen mothers earn a high school diploma by age 22. And among those who have a baby before age 18, about 40 percent finish high school and less than two percent finish college by age 30. Intergenerational Impact **Teen childbearing** not only **has the potential to affect the** mother’s education, but has implications for **children as well: children born to teen moms often do not perform as well** as children of older mothers on early childhood development indicators and school readiness measures, such as communication, cognition and social skills. **Research shows that children of teen mothers** not only start school at a disadvantage, they also fare worse than those born to older parents later on. For example, children born to teens **have lower educational performance**, score lower on standardized tests, and are twice as likely to repeat a grade. Additionally, only around two-thirds of children born to teen mothers earn a high school diploma, compared to 81 percent of children born to adults. Older Teens & Community College The pregnancy rate for women ages 18 and 19 is three times higher than that of younger teens, and the birth rate for older adolescents is nearly four times that of their younger peers. Older teens account for 68 percent of pregnancies and 72 percent of births. With almost 70 percent of 18- and 19-year-olds attending either high school or college, unplanned pregnancies can disrupt or derail educational achievement. Sixty-one percent of women who have children after enrolling in college fail to complete their degree, a rate which is 65 percent higher than that for students who did not have children. In addition, surveys indicate that close to half of all community college students have been pregnant or gotten someone pregnant at some point. Economic Wellbeing and the Cycle of Poverty **Poverty is both a cause and a consequence of teen pregnancy** and childbearing. **Two-thirds of** **young** unmarried **mothers are poor** and around 25 percent go on welfare within three years of a child’s birth. Low educational attainment among teen mothers affects their economic opportunities and earnings in later years. **Teen mothers are less likely to** complete high school or college, and are therefore less likely to **find well-paying jobs.** This reality is evident in the fact that over **the past 20 years, the median income for college graduates has increased 19 percent**, while income among high school drop-outs has decreased 28 percent.The economic consequences of dropping out of school often contribute to the perpetual cycle of economic hardship and poverty that spans generations. Only around 20 percent of fathers of children born to teen mothers marry the mothers. Therefore, child support generally represents a vital income source for these single parent families, accounting for 23 percent of family income among families that receive it. However, teen fathers may pay less than $800 a year in child support, compounding financial difficulties for the parent responsible for day to day care. Teen fathers are often poor themselves; research indicates that they are also less educated and experience earning losses of 10-15 percent annually.

#### Horrific social exclusion is created through cycles of poverty that create barriers to participation for the poor. Hancock 14[[8]](#footnote-6)

5. **Social exclusion is strongly linked to poverty**, but not all people who are socially excluded are poor and not all people who are poor are socially excluded. Thus, members of certain societal groups – for example, minorities, migrants or the disabled – may be excluded to some extent from full participation in society (and its democratic and governance expressions) for non-material reasons linked rather to discrimination, xenophobia, intolerance or legal status. At the same time, some poor people manage to overcome material obstacles to participation in society – education is often key. However, it is obvious that in most cases the deeper the poverty, and the wider the chasm between the poor and the rest of society, the stronger the social exclusion. 6. There are enough definitions of social exclusion to fill meters of shelf-space. Common to all of them is the emphasis on social exclusion as a dynamic, multidimensional concept which takes into account **cumulative and enduring disadvantage, a sort of dissociation from mainstream society** – in contrast to the more static (but sometimes more easily measurable) concepts of **poverty and deprivation**.5 The most recent definition used by the Council of Europe6 is the following: “Social exclusion is a process whereby certain **individuals are pushed to the edge of society and are prevented from participating fully by virtue of their poverty**, or lack of basic competencies and lifelong learning opportunities, or as a result of discrimination. This distances them from job, income and educational opportunities, as well as social and community networks and activities. **They have little access to power and decision-making bodies and** thus often **feel powerless and unable to** take **control** over decisions that affect **their day-to-day lives**.”7

Also poverty causes multiple scenarios for extinction Rice 6[[9]](#footnote-7)

When American s see televised images of bone-thin children with distended bellies, their humanitarian instincts take over. They don’t typically look at unicef footage and perceive a threat that could destroy our way of life. Yet global **poverty** is not solely a humanitarian concern. In real ways, over the long term, it can **threaten** U.S. national **security**. Poverty **erodes** weak states’ **capacity to prevent** the spread of **disease and protect the world’s forests and watersheds—**some of the global threats Maurice Greenberg noted in the Winter 2005 issue. It also **creates** conditions conducive to **transnational criminal enterprises and terrorist activity**, not only **by making desperate individuals** potentially **more susceptible to recruitment**, but also, **and** more significantly, **by undermining** the state’s **ability to prevent** and counter **those** violent **threats. Poverty** can also **give rise to** the tensions that erupt in **civil conflict, which further taxes the state and allows transnational predators greater freedom of action.** Americans can no longer realistically hope that we can erect the proverbial glass dome over our homeland and live safely isolated from the killers—natural or man-made—that plague other parts of the world. Al-Qaeda established training camps in conflict-ridden Sudan and Afghanistan, purchased diamonds from Sierra Leone and Liberia, and now targets American soldiers in Iraq. The potential toll of a global bird-flu pandemic is particularly alarming. A mutated virus causing human-to-human contagion could kill hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of Americans. Today, more than half the world’s population lives on less than $2 per day, and almost 1.1 billion people live in extreme poverty, defined as less than $1 per day. The costs of global poverty are multiple. Poverty prevents poor countries from devoting sufficient resources to detect and contain deadly disease. According to the World Health Organization (who), low- and middle-income countries suffer 90 percent of the world’s disease burden but account for only 11 percent of its health care spending. Poverty also dramatically increases the risk of civil conflict. A recent study by the uk’s Department for International Development showed that a country at $250 gdp per capita has on average a 15 percent risk of internal conflict over five years, while a country at $5,000 per capita has a risk of less than 1 percent. War zones provide ideal operational environs for international outlaws. If in the old days the consequences of extreme poverty could conveniently be confined to the far corners of the planet, this is no longer the case. The end of U.S.-Soviet competition, the civil and regional conflicts that ensued, and the rapid pace of globalization have brought to the fore a new generation of dangers. These are **the complex nexus of transnational security threats: infectious disease, environmental degradation, international crime and drug syndicates, proliferation of small arms and weapons of mass destruction, and terrorism**. Often these threats **emerge from impoverished**, relatively remote **regions** of the world. They thrive especially in conflict or lawless zones, in countries where corruption is endemic, and in poor, weak states with limited control over their territory or resources

The standard is Util. First, Non-natural theories are epistemically inaccessible. **Papineau 07**[[10]](#footnote-8)

Moore took this argument to show that moral facts comprise a distinct species of non-natural fact. However, **any** such **non-naturalist view of morality faces immediate difficulties,** deriving ultimately from the kind of causal closure thesis discussed above. **If all physical effects are due to a limited range of natural causes, and if moral facts lie outside this range, then it follow that moral facts can never make any difference to what happens in the physical world** (Harman, 1986). At first sight this may seem tolerable (perhaps moral facts indeed don't have any physical effects). But it has very awkward epistemological consequences. For beings like us, **knowledge of the spatiotemporal world is mediated by physical processes involving our sense organs and cognitive systems. If moral facts cannot influence the physical world, then it is hard to see how we can have any knowledge of them.**

Everyone takes the avoidance of pain as reasons for actions—our bodies naturally reject pain**Nagel 86[[11]](#footnote-9)**

I shall defend the unsurprising claim that **sensory pleasure is good and pain bad, no matter whose they are.** The point of the exercise is to see how the pressures of objectification operate in a simple case. Physical pleasure and pain do not usually depend on activities or desires which themselves raise questions of justification and value. They are just [is a] sensory experiences in relation to which we are fairly passive, but toward which we feel involuntary desire or aversion. Almost everyone takes the avoidance of his own pain and the promotion **of** his own pleasure as subjective reasons for action in a fairly simple way; they are not back up by any further reasons. On the other hand if someone pursues pain or avoids pleasure, either it as a means to some end or it is backed up by dark reasons like guilt or sexual masochism. What sort of general value, if any, ought to be assigned to pleasure and pain when we consider these facts from an objective standpoint? What kind of judgment can we reasonably make about these things when we view them in abstraction from who we are? We can begin by asking why there is no plausibility in the zero position, that pleasure and pain have [has] no value of any kind that can be objectively recognized. That would mean that I have no reason to take aspirin for a severe headache, however I may in fact be motivated; and that looking at it from outside, you couldn't even say that someone had a reason not to put his hand on a hot stove, just because of the pain. Try looking at it from the outside and see whether you can manage to withhold that judgment. If the idea of objective practical reason makes any sense at all, so that there is some judgment to withhold, it does not seem possible. If the general arguments against the reality of objective reasons are no good, then it is at least possible that I have a reason, and not just an inclination, to refrain from putting my hand on a hot stove. But given the possibility, it seems meaningless to deny that this is so. Oddly enough, however, we can think of a story that would go with such a denial. It might be suggested that the aversion to pain is a useful phobia—having nothing to do with the intrinsic undesirability of pain itself—which helps us avoid or escape the injuries that are signaled by pain. (The same type of purely instrumental value might be ascribed to sensory pleasure: the pleasures of food, drink, and sex might be regarded as having no value in themselves, though our natural attraction to them assists survival and reproduction.) There would then be nothing wrong with pain in itself, and someone who was never motivated deliberately to do anything just because he knew it would reduce or avoid pain would have nothing the matter with him. He would still have involuntary avoidance reactions, otherwise it would be hard to say that he felt pain at all. And he would be motivated to reduce pain for other reasons—because it was an effective way to avoid the danger being signaled, or because interfered with some physical or mental activity that was important to him. He just wouldn't regard the pain as itself something he had any reason to avoid, even though he hated the feeling just as much as the rest of us. (And of course he wouldn't be able to justify the avoidance of pain in the way that we customarily justify avoiding what we hate without reason—that is, on the ground that even an irrational hatred makes its object very unpleasant!) There is nothing self-contradictory in this proposal, but it seems nevertheless insane. Without some positive reason to think there is nothing in itself good or bad about having an experience you intensely like or dislike, we can't seriously regard the common impression to the contrary as a collective illusion. Such things are at least good or bad for us, if anything is. What seems to be going on here is that we cannot from an objective standpoint withhold a certain kind of endorsement of the most direct and immediate subjective value judgments we make concerning the contents of our own consciousness. We regard ourselves as too close to those things to be mistaken in our immediate, nonideological evaluative impressions. No objective view we can attain could possibly overrule our subjective authority in such cases. There can be no reason to reject the appearances here.

Second, Governments has a specific obligation to be utilitarian, **Woller 97**[[12]](#footnote-10)

Moreover, virtually all public policies entail some redistribution of economic or political resources, such that one group's gains must come at another group's ex- pense. Consequently,public**policies in a democracy must be justified to the public**, and especially to those who pay the costs of those policies. Such **[but] justification cannot** simply **be assumed** a priori **by** invoking some higher-order **moral principle**. Appeals to a priori moral principles, such as environmental preservation, also often fail to acknowledge that **public policies inevitably entail trade-offs** among competing values. Thus since policymakers cannot justify inherent value conflicts to the public in any philosophical sense, and **since public policies** inherently **imply winners and losers, the** **policymakers' duty [is]** to the public interest requires them **to demonstrate** that the redistributive effects and value trade-offs implied by **their polices are** somehow **to the** overall **advantage of society**. At the same time, deontologically based ethicalsystems have severe practical limitations as a basis for public policy. At best, [Also,] a priori moral principles provide only general guidance to ethical dilemmas in public affairs and do not themselves suggest appropriate public policies, and at worst, they create a regimen of regulatory unreasonableness while failing to adequately address the problem or actually making it worse

And, Act-omission distinction doesn’t apply to states. **Sunstein and Vermuele 5**[[13]](#footnote-11)

The most fundamental point is that unlike individuals, **governments always** and necessarily **face a choice between** or among **possible policies for regulating third parties. The distinction between acts and omissions may not be intelligible in this context,** and even if it is, the distinction does not make a morally relevant difference. Most generally, government is in the business of creating permissions and prohibitions. When it explicitly or implicitly authorizes private action, it is not omitting to do anything or refusing to act. **Moreover, the distinction between authorized and unauthorized private action** – for example, private killing – **becomes obscure when government** formally **forbids private action but chooses a** set of **policy** instruments **that do[es] not** adequately or **fully discourage it.**

Third, only states of affairs give teleological relevance to ethics **Ariansen 98**[[14]](#footnote-12)

Suspending for a while the idea of morality as a game, one could approach the question of the nature of ethics from another angle. One could try to seek out a set of necessary and sufficient condi- tions for ethics to be operative. **What traits of ethics cannot be lacking without ethics losing its meaning? Will ethics be meaningful in a world where no suffering** (to focus on the duty to alleviate suffering rather that promote happiness) **is known to anyone? Technically it would be possible to tell a lie** or break a promise **in such a society, but the difference between lying and telling the truth** or breaking and keeping promises **would have no moral significance, since any outcome** of any event **is just as good** (rather, as indifferent) **as any other** outcome of the event. In such a world any mention of responsibilities and duties would be meaningless. Ethics clearly needs to relate to joy and suffering. This **axiological orientation is necessary to give meaning to the ethical project**, to mark it out as an ethical project in contrast to other projects of rationalization.

Teleology outweighs and is a litmus test for ethical theories – if other ethics are meaningless then we should use consequentialism anyways. Also if there in any moral uncertainty default to minimizing existential risk, **Bostrom 12**[[15]](#footnote-13)

These reflections on **moral uncertainty suggest[s]** **a**n alternative, complementary **way of looking at** existential **risk**; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate. Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then **we should recognize that there is a great** option **value in preserving** — and ideally improving — **our ability to recognize value** and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value. To do this, **[thus] we must prevent any existential catastrophe.**

Underview, One, Evaluate the round using a comparing worlds paradigm, Truth-testing prescribes an absolute, unmeetable burden to the AFF and gives the NEG infinite ground**. Nelson 08**[[16]](#footnote-14)

And **the truth-statement model** of the resolution **imposes an absolute burden of proof on the aff**irmative: if the resolution is a truth-claim, and the affirmative has the burden of proving that claim, in so far as intuitively we tend to disbelieve truth-claims until we are persuaded otherwise, the affirmative has the burden to prove that statement absolutely true. Indeed, one of the most common theory arguments in LD is conditionality, which argues it is inappropriate for the affirmative to claim only proving the truth of part of the resolution is sufficient to earn the ballot. Such a model of the resolution also gives the negative access to a range of strategies that many students, coaches, and judges find ridiculous or even irrelevant to evaluation of the resolution. **If the neg**ative **need only prevent the aff**irmative **from proving the truth of the resolution, it is logically sufficient to negate** to deny our ability to make truth**-statements** or to prove normative morality does not exist or to deny the reliability of human senses or reason. Yet, even though most coaches appear to endorse the truth-statement model of the resolution, they complain about the use of such negative strategies, even though they are a necessary consequence of that model. And, moreover, **such strategies seem** fundamentally **unfair, as they provide the neg**ative **with** functionallyinfinite ground, as there are **a nearly infinite variety of** such **skeptical objections to normative claims, while continuing to bind the aff**irmative **to a much smaller range of options:** advocacy of the resolution as a whole.

This means that in addition to skeptical arguments, you reject all non-consequentalist standards because they by definition can’t evaluate the end state in a certain world Second, If the full text of the AFF is disclosed an hour before the round, don’t let the negative read a theory interp unless full text of the shell was disclosed on their wiki page at least an hour before the round. A) Solves and deters abuse because I might change my AFF strategy in order to meet your interps, also this spills over to other round because other people you debate against might do the same. This solves abuse, and lets us talk about the topic instead of talking about esoteric theory norms, that are useless outside of debate. B) Checks back against theory prolif. They have bidirectional interps, and a nearly infinite number of ways to argue that the AFF is unfair, that I could predict. Disclosure solves because it gives me a finite list of arguments you may run, that I can prepare for which checks back against bad interps that only win because they’re surprising. C) Encourages deeper theory debates, if they need to happen. If I wasn’t going to adjust my strategy then giving me an our to prep a counter interp, ensures that we actually have a well developed argument, which is key to helping us decide as a community whether or not we think something like Nebel T is a good idea. Also an hour is key because I need a while to change the AFF strategy and potentially meet their interps, and this only applies to the negative because I don’t know what they’ll do in the 1NC so I would have to disclose an interp to check back against every conceivable abusive thing they could do, whereas the AFF was disclosed.

[If time]

Third, AFF gets RVIs, on counter interps or I meets, because its key to ensure proportional punishment on NEG T and theory since the NEG would only claim drop the debater if they were prepared to collapse to theory- that checks theory’s use as a crutch and fosters topical debate. That proves uniqueness for the AFF- the NEG always has bidirectional interps, so deterrence is key. Additionally the AFF is already deterred from reading bad theory because a minute of the 1AR is a quarter of the time but a minute of the 1N is a seventh, so there’s a structural check against abuse, also if they get an RVI they can collapse to six minutes of theory in the 2N making the 2AR impossible. Fourth, Only drop the Negative debater on theory or T, and Drop the AFF’s arguments because the 1NC is reactive to AC strategy and has 7-4, 6-3 time advantage so rejecting the argument is sufficient punishment since reading arguments in the 1N proves no abuse or ground loss. Dropping the NEG is key since NEG abuse is temporal- it actively prevents me from winning the round and the time crunched 1AR and 2AR means I have no recourse against abuse especially because the 2AR is too short to win multiple layers.
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