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#### Interpretation—the aff may not specify a just government

#### A is an generic indefinite singular. Cohen 01

Ariel Cohen (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev), “On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars,” Journal of Semantics 18:3, 2001 <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/188590876.pdf>

\*IS generic = Indefinite Singulars

French, then, expresses the two types of reading differently. In English, on¶ the other hand, generic BPs are ambiguous between inductivist and normative¶ readings. But even in English there is one type of generic that can express only¶ one of these readings, and this is the IS generic. While BPs are ambiguous¶ between the inductivist and the rules and regulations readings, ISs are not. In¶ the supermarket scenario discussed above, only (44.b) is true:¶ (44) a. A banana sells for $.49/lb.¶ b. A banana sells for $1.00/lb.¶ The normative force of the generic IS has been noted before. Burton-Roberts¶ (1977) considers the following minimal pair:¶ (45) a. Gentlemen open doors for ladies.¶ b. A gentleman opens doors for ladies.¶ He notes that (45.b), but not (45.a), expresses what he calls “moral necessity.”7¶ Burton-Roberts observes that if Emile does not as a rule open doors for ladies, his mother could utter [(45.b)] and thereby successfully imply that Emile was not, or was¶ not being, a gentleman. Notice that, if she were to utter. . . [(45.a)] she¶ might achieve the same effect (that of getting Emile to open doors for¶ ladies) but would do so by different means. . . For [(45.a)] merely makes a¶ generalisation about gentlemen (p. 188).¶ Sentence (45.b), then, unlike (45.a), does not have a reading where it makes¶ a generalization about gentlemen; it is, rather, a statement about some social¶ norm. It is true just in case this norm is in effect, i.e. it is a member of a set of¶ socially accepted rules and regulations.¶ An IS that, in the null context, cannot be read generically, may receive a¶ generic reading in a context that makes it clear that a rule or a regulation is¶ referred to. For example, Greenberg (1998) notes that, out of the blue, (46.a)¶ and (46.b) do not have a generic reading:¶ (46) a. A Norwegian student whose name ends with ‘s’ or ‘j’ wears green¶ thick socks.¶ b. A tall, left-handed, brown haired neurologist in Hadassa hospital¶ earns more than $50,000 a year.¶ However, Greenberg points out that in the context of (47.a) and (47.b),¶ respectively, the generic readings of the IS subject are quite natural:¶ (47) a. You know, there are very interesting traditions in Norway, concerning the connection between name, profession, and clothing. For¶ example, a Norwegian student. . .¶ b. The new Hadassa manager has some very funny paying criteria. For¶ example, a left-handed. . .¶ Even IS sentences that were claimed above to lack a generic reading, such¶ as (3.b) and (4.b), may, in the appropriate context, receive such a reading:¶ (48) a. Sire, please don’t send her to the axe. Remember, a king is generous!¶ b. How dare you build me such a room? Don’t you know a room is¶ square?

#### Violation—they specified US

#### Vote neg for limits—specifying a just government offers huge explosion in the topic since they get permutations of more than 50 just governments in the world depending on their definition of just government. Neg positions like the Economy DA, Advantage CPs, etc. are jettisoned when the aff specifies a country that we don’t have specific ev to.

#### Topicality is a voting issue that should be evaluated through competing interpretations – it tells the negative what they do and do not have to prepare for

#### No RVIs—it’s your burden to be topical.
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#### Interpretation—topical affs may not specify workers

#### Bare plurals imply a generic “rules reading” in the context of moral statements

Cohen 1 — (Ariel Cohen, Professor of Linguistics @ Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, PhD Computational Linguistics from Carnegie Mellon University, “On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars”. Journal of Semantics 18: 183-209, Oxford University Press, 2001, accessed 12-7-20, HKR-AM) \*\*BP = bare plurals

According to the rules and regulations view, on the other hand, generic sentences do not get their truth or falsity as a consequence of properties of individual instances. Instead, generic sentences are evaluated with regard to rules and regulations, which are basic, irreducible entities in the world. Each generic sentence denotes a rule; if the rule is in effect, in some sense (different theories suggest different characterizations of what it means for a rule to be in effect), the sentence is true, otherwise it is false. The rule may be physical, biological, social, moral, etc. The paradigmatic cases for which this view seems readily applicable are sentences that refer to conventions, i.e. man-made, explicit rules and regulations, such as the following example (Carlson 1995: 225):

(40) Bishops move diagonally.

Carlson describes the two approaches as a dichotomy: one has to choose one or the other, but not both. One way to decide which approach to choose is to consider a case where the behavior of observed instances conflicts with an explicit rule. Indeed, Carlson discusses just such a case. He describes a supermarket where bananas sell for $0.49/lb, so that (41a) is true. One day, the manager decides to raise the price to $1.00/lb. Immediately after the price has changed, claims Carlson, sentence (41a) becomes false and sentence (41b) becomes true, although the overwhelming majority of sold bananas were sold for $0.49/lb.

(41) a. Bananas sell for $0.49/lb.

b. Bananas sell for $1.00/lb.

Consequently, Carlson reaches the conclusion that the rules and regulations approach is the correct one, whereas the inductivist view is wrong.

While I share Carlson’s judgements, I do not accept the conclusion he draws from them. Suppose the price has, indeed, changed, but the supermarket employs incompetent cashiers who consistently use the old price by mistake, so that customers are still charged $0.49/lb. In this case, I think there is a reading of (41a) which is true, and a reading of (41b) which is false. These readings are more salient if the sentence is modified by expressions such as actually or in fact:

(42) a. Bananas actually sell for $0.49/lb.

b. In fact, bananas sell for $1.00/lb.

BP generics, I claim, are ambiguous: on one reading they express a descriptive generalization, stating the way things are. Under the other reading, they carry a normative force, and require that things be a certain way. When they are used in the former sense, they should be analysed by some sort of inductivist account; when they are used in the latter sense, they ought to be analysed as referring to a rule or a regulation. The respective logical forms of the two readings are different; whereas the former reading involves, in some form or another, quantification, the latter has a simple predicate-argument structure: the argument is the rule or regulation, and the predicate holds of it just in case the rule is ‘in effect’.

#### That outweighs—only our evidence speaks to how bare plurals are interpreted in the context of normative statements like the resolution. This means throw out aff counter-interpretations that are purely descriptive

#### Violation—they specified US

#### Vote neg for predictable limits—specifying a type of worker offers a huge explosion in the topic since they get permutations of thousands of jobs in the world. Generics like worker pics are jettisoned when the aff specifies a type of job that we don’t have specific ev to. Limits explodes neg prep burden and draws un-reciprocal lines of debate, where the aff is always ahead, turns their pragmatics offense.
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#### Rates hikes are coming but gradual

Beckworth & Horan 10/12/21 (David Beckworth is a Senior Research Fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University and a former international economist at the US Department of the Treasury. He is the author of Boom and Bust Banking: The Causes and Cures of the Great Recession. His research focuses on monetary policy, and his work has been cited by the Wall Street Journal, the Financial Times, the New York Times, Bloomberg Businessweek, and the Economist. He has advised congressional staffers on monetary policy and has written for Barron’s, Investor’s Business Daily, the New Republic, the Atlantic, and National Review. David is the author of the Macro Musings blog and also hosts the weekly Macro Musings podcast., Patrick Horan is the Program Manager for Monetary Policy at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University. Patrick received an MA in economics from George Mason University and a BA in economics and political science from the College of the Holy Cross. Previously, he worked as a researcher for the political news website, RealClearPolitics., “Inflation Is Painful, But the Fed Shouldn’t Overreact”, https://www.discoursemagazine.com/economics/2021/10/12/inflation-is-painful-but-the-fed-shouldnt-overreact/)

But if the present inflation is due to transitory supply shocks rather than Fed policy, then the Fed should be careful not to tighten prematurely, which could choke economic recovery. This is not a purely theoretical concern: In the summer of 2008, the Fed was hesitant to cut its target interest rate—which would have made it easier to borrow money and stimulated economic growth—out of a mistaken concern for higher inflation. But the greater threat at that time was financial instability and a contracting economy, which could have been mitigated had the Fed cut its rate sooner. Even more egregiously, the European Central Bank, fearing inflation, raised its target interest rate in 2008 and then again in 2010 and 2011 as it drove the Eurozone into crisis. In both cases, the central banks were misled by inflation caused by supply shocks and responded inappropriately.

Checking the Forecasts

When in doubt over whether inflation is driven by Fed policy or external forces, it is helpful to look at medium-term forecasts for inflation. The figure below shows one popular example: the five-year, five-year-forward inflation forecast that comes from the Survey of Professional Forecasters. This is a five-year forecast of the average inflation rate, beginning five years in the future. For example, the current forecast is for the average inflation rate from 2026 to 2031.

This horizon is useful since it allows us to see beyond the near term, where supply chain disruptions due to the pandemic are affecting inflation. Inflation forecasts this far out, in other words, should be largely reflecting the stance of monetary policy without interference from short-term changes. The figure below shows that the professional forecasters’ outlook for inflation is very close to 2%. They see the Fed keeping inflation anchored over the medium to long term.

The next figure shows another five-year, five-year-forward inflation rate. This measure comes from the bond market and is based on Treasury bonds indexed for inflation. This forecast, unlike the previous one, comes from the interaction of all bond traders around the world. These individuals have skin in the game since they are trying to be profitable in their trades. Consequently, this forecast provides a nice cross-check on the one from the Survey of Professional Forecasters. The figure below demonstrates that here too the forecast is now close to 2%, indicating that bond traders also believe the Fed is committed to keeping inflation near its target over the medium term.

Forecasts over the medium term, then, show that the Fed’s current performance is about right, but that could change depending on how events play out over the next year. If the economic recovery continues to be strong and puts additional upward pressure on inflation, then it might make sense for the Fed to pump the brakes on inflation by tightening its monetary policy. However, if other factors such as the pandemic and supply chain bottlenecks continue to stymie economic activity, then the Fed shouldn’t be too quick to raise interest rates.

For now, the Fed has signaled it will begin slowly reducing bond purchases near the end of this year. The Fed has also indicated it is likely to start incrementally raising interest rates next year if the economic recovery continues. This gradual approach to tightening monetary policy is sensible given the current state of recovery. Therefore, if lawmakers want to address the high prices caused by inflation, rather than blaming the Fed, they should work on ameliorating bottlenecks and shortages.

#### Expanding organized labor’s bargaining power creates upward pressure on interest rates

da Costa 17 [Pedro Nicolaci da Costa was a senior correspondent at Business Insider. He wrote commentary and analysis on economics, the Federal Reserve and financial markets, and is based in Washington, DC. "The shrinking role of unions helps shed light on an economic trend that is puzzling Fed officials." https://www.businessinsider.com/decline-of-unions-helps-fed-solve-low-inflation-puzzle-2017-12]

Weak wage growth has been part and parcel of the low inflation trend, with average hourly earnings gaining just 2.5% annually at latest blush.

For Andrew Kenningham, chief global economist at Capital Economics, there’s an important story behind the subdued price and wage increases that policymakers are largely ignoring.

Technological change and globalization have "reduced the demand for unskilled labor in advanced economies" and caused "trade union membership and the frequency of strikes to fall steeply and has contributed to a surge in part-time, contract and casual work, which has further reduced the bargaining power of labor," he writes in a research note.

The official data bear him out. US union membership peaked at a third of the private sector workforce around 1960, and has declined steadily since to just 6.4%.

Research suggests the prevalence of unions has a positive effect not just on the wages of union workers but also spills over to non-union counterparts, which must raise pay to compete. The opposite is true when unionization declines.

In 2015, there were 7.6 million union members in the private sector, 4.4 million fewer than in 1983, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The number slipped further to an all-time low in 2016.

The low inflation phenomenon is prevalent not just in the United States but across rich economies, suggesting the loss of bargaining power has crossed borders.

"Since the global financial crisis, inflation has been below target in most advanced economies most of the time. The core inflation rate since January 2009 has averaged around 0%, 1% and 1½% in Japan, the euro-zone and the US respectively,"Kenningham said. "And the Fed’s preferred measure of core inflation has been below 2% for 100 of the 104 months since the crisis!"

Fed Chair Janet Yellen conceded in recent testimony "this year’s low inflation could reflect something more persistent" rather than the transitory factors many central bank officials have cited.

Against that backdrop, it’s little wonder markets are questioning the Fed’s own estimates for three interest rate hikes in 2018 and further increases in 2019. The Fed has raised interest rates four times since December 2015 to a 1% to 1.25% range, and looks set to raise interest rates again this week. It has also began shrinking its $4.5 trillion balance sheet, expanded during the Great Recession in an effort to keep long-term rates low while the federal funds rate was already at zero.

#### Over-aggressive monetary policy causes a global debt crisis.

Shang Lin Wei, Professor of Finance @ Columbia, Chief Economist @ ADB, 7-9-21, “The Global Dangers of Rising US Inflation” Project Syndicate. https://www.project-syndicate.org/bigpicture/stagflation-ahead

To anticipate the international consequences of higher US inflation, we need to recognize the risk that the Fed may tighten monetary policy more suddenly and dramatically than its current 3.4% inflation forecast might suggest. For now, a majority of US households, firms, and investors still believe that the Fed will adjust the money-supply spigot in a timely, measured way to prevent inflation from getting out of hand.

But such “inflation anchoring” could prove fragile if Americans see more evidence of the Fed failing to keep inflation near its desired 2% target. Should that happen, both employees’ wage demands and firms’ price-setting will start to reflect the possibility that inflation could shoot up to 5% or more unless the Fed applies the brakes by raising interest rates aggressively.

If US rates rise sharply, history tells us that two types of countries may experience serious financial and economic difficulties. The first group comprises economies that finance a significant part of their investment or consumption with foreign-currency debt, by borrowing either from foreign banks or on international bond markets. Countries with large short-term foreign-currency debts (with less than one year to maturity) and relatively low foreign-exchange reserves are particularly vulnerable to a severe debt or banking crisis.

The second group consists of countries with an overvalued fixed exchange rate, which makes them vulnerable to a run on their currencies and an exchange-rate crisis. So, if the Fed tightens policy significantly, we can expect to see a number of debt and currency crises in Central and South America, Africa, and Asia in the next 2-5 years. Because significant foreign-currency debt and overvalued fixed exchange rates are not mutually exclusive, some countries may suffer several types of crises.

This is why US inflation and interest-rate policy is so important to so many. When the United States sneezes, the rest of the world may catch a cold. But other countries should not expect America to conduct its monetary policy any differently as a result, and nor should they count on the International Monetary Fund or the G7 to be able to direct the US to be more globally minded in managing interest-rate movements.

Even countries not in either of the risk categories will need to address the challenge of imported inflation. China, for example, is deeply concerned about this, even though it currently has relatively modest foreign-currency debts and retains a high level of foreign-exchange reserves.

To prevent imported inflation from fueling domestic inflation, the People’s Bank of China would need to tighten its own supply of liquidity to the economy. For such a policy to be effective, China must either introduce more exchange-rate flexibility or tighten its capital controls, with the former approach promising to be much better for the economy in the long run.

#### Post-covid debt crisis causes nuclear war through hotspot escalation and collapses multilateral governance.

Strategic Partners Marsh McLennan SK Group Zurich Insurance Group, Academic Advisers National University of Singapore Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford Wharton Risk Management and Decision Processes Center, University of Pennsylvania, ’21, “The Global Risks Report 2021 16th Edition” “http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF\_The\_Global\_Risks\_Report\_2021.pdf

Forced to choose sides, governments may face economic or diplomatic consequences, as proxy disputes play out in control over economic or geographic resources. The deepening of geopolitical fault lines and the lack of viable middle power alternatives make it harder for countries to cultivate connective tissue with a diverse set of partner countries based on mutual values and maximizing efficiencies. Instead, networks will become thick in some directions and non-existent in others. The COVID-19 crisis has amplified this dynamic, as digital interactions represent a “huge loss in efficiency for diplomacy” compared with face-to-face discussions.23 With some alliances weakening, diplomatic relationships will become more unstable at points where superpower tectonic plates meet or withdraw.

At the same time, without superpower referees or middle power enforcement, global norms may no longer govern state behaviour. Some governments will thus see the solidification of rival blocs as an opportunity to engage in regional posturing, which will have destabilizing effects.24 Across societies, domestic discord and economic crises will increase the risk of autocracy, with corresponding censorship, surveillance, restriction of movement and abrogation of rights.25 Economic crises will also amplify the challenges for middle powers as they navigate geopolitical competition. ASEAN countries, for example, had offered a potential new manufacturing base as the United States and China decouple, but the pandemic has left these countries strapped for cash to invest in the necessary infrastructure and productive capacity.26 Economic fallout is pushing many countries to debt distress (see Chapter 1, Global Risks 2021). While G20 countries are supporting debt restructure for poorer nations,27 larger economies too may be at risk of default in the longer term;28 this would leave them further stranded—and unable to exercise leadership—on the global stage.

Multilateral meltdown Middle power weaknesses will be reinforced in weakened institutions, which may translate to more uncertainty and lagging progress on shared global challenges such as climate change, health, poverty reduction and technology governance. In the absence of strong regulating institutions, the Arctic and space represent new realms for potential conflict as the superpowers and middle powers alike compete to extract resources and secure strategic advantage.29 If the global superpowers continue to accumulate economic, military and technological power in a zero-sum playing field, some middle powers could increasingly fall behind. Without cooperation nor access to important innovations, middle powers will struggle to define solutions to the world’s problems. In the long term, GRPS respondents forecasted “weapons of mass destruction” and “state collapse” as the two top critical threats: in the absence of strong institutions or clear rules, clashes— such as those in Nagorno-Karabakh or the Galwan Valley—may more frequently flare into full-fledged interstate conflicts,30 which is particularly worrisome where unresolved tensions among nuclear powers are concerned. These conflicts may lead to state collapse, with weakened middle powers less willing or less able to step in to find a peaceful solution.
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#### Passes now, but floor time is key

Sheffey 11/18 [Ayelet, staff reporter for Business Insider with a focus on Capitol Hill. “Mitch McConnell shrugs off Trump’s taunts and attempts to defuse the debt ceiling crisis” https://www.businessinsider.nl/mitch-mcconnell-shrugs-off-trumps-taunts-and-attempts-to-defuse-the-debt-ceiling-crisis/]

With less than a month left to raise the debt ceiling before the US ceases to be able to pay its bills, Mitch McConnell appears to be having a change of heart about helping Democrats out of this pickle.

This comes after Trump called McConnell a "Broken Old Crow" in a Wednesday statement for agreeing to a two-month extension of the debt-ceiling limit back in October.

"He could have won it all using the Debt Ceiling—they were ready to fold," Trump wrote. "Now the Democrats have a big victory and the wind at their back."

But that victory was short-lived. Congress now has until December 15 before the Treasury runs out of money to pay the country's bills. After some initial resistance to help again, McConnell met with Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer on Thursday for a brief meeting to discuss strategies to take on the debt limit before the deadline.

This is a notably different approach than the one from earlier this fall, when McConnell remained adamant it was Democrats' jobs to raise limit but consistently blocked every attempt by Democrats to do just that. He waited until the very last minute in October to step in and help. He vowed he would not step in again, but that story has changed.

"The best way to characterize it is we're going to be discussing the way forward," McConnell told Politico ahead of a meeting in Schumer's office.

McConnell's change of tune

On October 6, McConnell offered the 11 Republican votes needed to suspend the debt ceiling an additional two months, but at the time he made clear his help will not be available when Democrats need to confront the issue again in December. He said at the time that his help would "moot Democrats' excuses about the time crunch they created and give the unified Democratic government more than enough time to pass standalone debt limit legislation through reconciliation."

For months leading up to the suspension, though, Schumer and Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi said raising the debt limit should be a bipartisan task, and with Thursday's meeting, a showdown as seen in October may be avoided.

"We had a good discussion about several different issues that are all extant here as we move toward the end of the session and we agreed to keep talking and working together to try to get somewhere," McConnell told HuffPost following the meeting.

Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen earlier week said that after December 15, she is not confident the Treasury will have the resources to fund the government and stressed the need for the matter to be addressed in a bipartisan way.

#### Big ag is powerful, any attempt to take them down is politically perilous

Brock 21, assistant professor of American politics and public policy at Texas Woman's University (Clare, “Why is corporate lobbying on food skyrocketing?,” *Medium*, <https://medium.com/3streams/food-business-lobbying-and-political-polarization-bc812e93cf28>)

My latest research published in the journal, Interest Groups & Advocacy, suggests that political polarization is altering corporate lobbying in food and agriculture in very specific ways. As partisan polarization increases in this policy area, corporations are increasing their lobbying efforts in Congress. Why is this? Interest groups are working longer and harder to lobby members of Congress because that’s where the largest, loudest, most heated conflict occurs. As conflict increases, lobbying groups have to adjust their strategies accordingly. We often call this prolonged conflict in Congress and the resulting inaction “gridlock”, and in recent decades this has been particularly true. Congress is slow to move and the fights are fierce. Even within committee, legislation that once drew consensus now draws fire. And as partisanship increases, so does gridlock. For lobbyists and those who wish to influence the outcomes of legislation, this means that they must work harder and longer to see legislation through from start to finish. At the same time, gridlock and a prolonged process also means that there may be more opportunity for groups to influence policy content as lawmakers debate specific provisions and ideas to death (or life). This combination matters because polarization is likely to increase the competitive advantage that wealthy interest groups already enjoy. Lobbying is already dominated heavily by corporate interests. This is because lobbying is not cheap and is most easily undertaken as a collective activity. As gridlock prolongs the time between legislation being crafted and its passage, interest groups that would like to influence policy content must engage for increasingly long durations. Sustaining these efforts for year after year becomes both necessary and, for many, financially prohibitive. The wealthiest interest groups and corporations can sustain high levels of lobbying for much longer than more resource-poor groups. And this finding is especially important in a subsystem like food and agriculture, which affects our health and wellbeing on such a fundamental level. Current farm subsidies already reinforce disparities between farmers. In 2019, 54% of all payments went to the wealthiest 1/10th of farmers. As polarization further advantages wealthy interests who are able to sustain lobbying efforts, it is possible that such disparities will worsen. Farm policy impacts the cost of food, gas prices (ethanol is made from corn), food access, conservation policy, and more. This is not to say that wealthy interests and corporations are “buying” legislation. That has never been strictly true. Politicians are undoubtedly influenced by their ideologies, constituencies, and co-partisans. All this is simply to say that an increase in conflict within Congress prolongs the process in a way that exacerbates the advantages of wealthy interest groups. Polarization and gridlock don’t just frustrate Americans, they also have real consequences for policymaking and whose voice gets heard on the Hill.

#### Manchin and Sinema would fight the plan – that’s a massive floor time suck

Harold 21 [Zack, staf reporter for The Guardian, “US minimum wage activists face their toughest foe: Democrat Joe Manchin” https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/feb/22/us-15-dollar-minimum-wage-joe-manchin-west-virginia]

Hopes that the US will finally increase the federal minimum wage for the first time in nearly 12 years face a seemingly unlikely opponent: a Democrat senator from one of the poorest states in the union.

Joe Manchin of West Virginia, the state’s former governor and the Democrats’ most conservative senator, has long opposed his party’s progressive wing and is on record saying he does not support increasing the minimum wage from $7.25 to $15 an hour, the first increase since 2009. “I’m supportive of basically having something that’s responsible and reasonable,” he told the Hill. He has advocated for a rise to $11.

Industry lobbying allied to Republican and – until relatively recently – Democrat opposition has locked the US’s minimum wage at $7.25 since the last raise in 2009.

'Hopefully it makes history': Fight for $15 closes in on mighty win for US workers

None of this has found favor with some low-wage workers in a state where an estimated 278,734 West Virginians lived in poverty in 2019, 16% of the population and the sixth highest poverty rate in the US.

Last Thursday Manchin reaffirmed his stance during a virtual meeting with members of the West Virginia Poor People’s Campaign (WVPPC), a group pushing for an increased minimum wage and other policy changes that would benefit the working class.

That meeting was closed to the media but at an online press conference immediately afterward, participants said Manchin refused to budge. “He was kind of copping out,” said WVPPC member Brianna Griffith, a restaurant worker and whitewater rafting guide who, due to exemptions for tipped workers, only makes $2.62 an hour.

As a result of her sub-minimum wage job, Griffith received only $67 a week in unemployment benefits until that ran out in August. She lost her house and was forced to move in with her grandmother. Although she has now returned to work, business is slow and she estimates tips have fallen by 75%.

When Griffith told Manchin about her plight on Thursday, she said he asked about the $600 stimulus check approved by Congress in December. “He seemed to think that $600 … was enough to get me by,” she said. “I feel like he’s got his head in the clouds and he doesn’t understand what’s happening to poor people in West Virginia.”

Despite Manchin’s insistence on an $11 minimum wage, according to MIT’s living wage calculator, even a $15 minimum wage would only provide a living wage for single West Virginians without children. For a West Virginia family with two working parents and two children, both parents would need to be making at least $20.14 an hour to make ends meet.

Griffith said if the minimum wage was increased to $15 an hour, “I could afford to live on my own. I could afford a car that’s not 25 years old.”

The Rev Dr William Barber, co-chair of the national Poor People’s Campaign, was in last week’s meeting and said Manchin agreed the current $7.25 minimum wage was “not enough”.

But Barber said he was “amazed” Manchin could hear from people like Griffith and still oppose increasing the minimum wage to $15.

“What he is suggesting would just further keep people in poverty and hurting,” he said.

Raising the minimum wage was a key part of Democrats’ 2020 platform. The former presidential candidate and now Senate budget committee chairman, Bernie Sanders, has referred to the current $7.25 rate as “a starvation wage”.

The wage hike, formally known as the Raise the Wage Act of 2021, is now part of a proposed $1.9tn Covid-19 relief bill. The measure would incrementally raise the minimum wage from $7.25 to $15 over the next four years.

With only a razor-thin majority in the Senate, all 50 Democrat senators need to be onboard for the bill to pass. But in addition to Manchin, Kyrsten Sinema of Arizona has told Politico she does not want the minimum wage increase to be part of the Covid relief package.

#### Debt default is the easiest way to wreck the US economy—ruins the US dollar and financial reputation

Egan 9/8 [Matt Egan is an award-winning reporter at CNN, covering business, the economy and financial markets across CNN's television and digital platforms, "'Financial Armageddon.' What's at stake if the debt limit isn't raised", 9/8/21, <https://www.cnn.com/2021/09/08/business/debt-ceiling-default-explained/index.html>]

The easiest way to spark a financial crisis and wreck the US economy would be to allow the federal government to default on its debt. It would be an epic, unforced error — and millions of Americans would pay the price.

And yet that unlikely situation is once again being contemplated. If Congress doesn't raise the limit on federal borrowing the federal government will most likely run out of cash and extraordinary measures next month, Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen warned lawmakers on Wednesday.

In short, a default would be an economic cataclysm. Interest rates would spike, the stock market would crater, retirement accounts would take a beating, the value of the US dollar would erode and the financial reputation of the world's only superpower would be tarnished.

"It would be financial Armageddon," Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's Analytics, told CNN. "It's complete craziness to even contemplate the idea of not paying our debt on time."

But it's a crazy world.

Lawmakers in Washington are again playing chicken with America's creditworthiness. And the path to raising the debt ceiling is not clear.

Even though Congress has in the past raised the debt ceiling with a bipartisan vote, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell vowed in July that Republicans will not vote to raise the debt ceiling.

JPMorgan Chase (JPM) CEO Jamie Dimon urged lawmakers not to even think about going down this path again. During a hearing in May, Dimon said an actual default "could cause an immediate, literally cascading catastrophe of unbelievable proportions and damage America for 100 years."

'Irreparable damage'

In her letter to Congress, Yellen said history shows that waiting "until the last minute" to suspend or increase the debt limit "can cause serious harm" to business and consumer confidence, raise borrowing costs for taxpayers and hurt America's credit rating.

"A delay that calls into question the federal government's ability to meet all its obligations would likely cause irreparable damage to the U.S. economy and global financial markets," Yellen wrote.

A US default would undermine the bedrock of the modern global financial system.

"We pay our debt. That's what distinguishes the United States from almost every other country on the planet," Zandi of Moody's said.

Because of America's long track record of paying its debt, it's very cheap for Washington to borrow. But a default would force ratings companies to downgrade US debt and shatter that borrowing advantage. Markets plunged in 2011 when that debt ceiling standoff caused Standard & Poor's to downgrade America's credit rating.

Higher borrowing costs would make it much harder for Washington to borrow to pay for infrastructure, the climate crisis or to fight future recessions. And refinancing America's nearly $29 trillion mountain of existing debt would become that much more expensive. Interest expenses, which totaled $345 billion in fiscal 2020, would quickly rival what Washington spends on defense.

#### Extinction

Joshua Zoffer 20, Investor at Cove Hill Partners, Fellow at New America, JD Candidate at Yale University Law School, AB from Harvard University, “To End Forever War, Keep the Dollar Globally Dominant”, The New Republic, 2/3/2020, https://newrepublic.com/article/156417/end-forever-war-keep-dollar-globally-dominant

In early 2016, Obama Treasury Secretary Jack Lew cautioned that the dollar’s dominance as a global currency rested, in part, on the U.S. government’s reluctance to fully weaponize it. If foreign markets and governments “feel that we will deploy sanctions without sufficient justification or for inappropriate reasons,” he warned, “we should not be surprised if they look for ways to avoid doing business in the United States or in U.S. dollars.” Lew’s case stemmed from the more fundamental view that the dollar’s international role is “a source of tremendous strength for our economy, a benefit for U.S. companies and a driver of U.S. global leadership”—in other words, a role worth keeping. This view is emblematic of American financial governance since the Second World War. U.S. economic analysts, especially at the Treasury, have jealously guarded the dollar’s role and the many benefits it offers: the ability to run large deficits at low cost and disproportionate influence over the structure of the global economy, among others. Yet in their recent article in The New Republic, David Adler and Daniel Bessner argue the U.S. should abandon these advantages. In their view, the dollar’s role has encouraged American militarism and should be relinquished to curb such behavior. Dollar hegemony is not without cost, but to renounce it would be a profound mistake. Adler and Bessner’s view neglects the sizable economic benefits the dollar’s role confers on the U.S., as well as its possible use as an antidote to military adventurism. It ignores the enormous good that can be done with deficit spending, much of which has gone to the American military but could instead fund progressive programs. And it elides the inability of the U.S. and its global trading partners to shift away from dollar dominance without creating worldwide financial distress. Adler and Bessner are right that the U.S. has misused its privilege, but Washington should not abandon it; rather, American leaders should seek to transform it. Generations of American policymakers have been right to protect the dollar’s key currency role for economic reasons. Most notably, dollar hegemony affords the U.S. the ability to run large and prolonged budget and balance-of-payments deficits. The dollar represents 62 percent of allocated foreign exchange reserves, is used to invoice and settle roughly half of world trade, and accounts for 42 percent of global payments. Because governments, banks, and businesses worldwide need lots of dollars, the world market always stands ready to absorb new U.S.-dollar-denominated debt without charging higher interest rates. Adler and Bessner correctly point out that the rest of the world considers the dollar’s role as the world’s reserve currency to be an “exorbitant privilege,” a term coined in the 1960s by then French Finance Minister Valéry Giscard D’Estaing. The ability to spend beyond its means has enabled the U.S. to fund its impressive military might, whether one views that power as the fountainhead of Pax Americana or the source of illegitimate military adventurism. But these economic benefits go beyond just deficits. The demand for dollars also pushes up the dollar’s value against other currencies, enhancing American purchasing power and offering consumers access to imports on the cheap. The dollar’s role also means American firms rarely need to do business in foreign currencies, reducing transaction costs and exchange-rate risks. More broadly, America’s central economic role gives it outsize influence at crucial moments. At the height of the financial crisis that began in 2008, the Federal Reserve was able to inject vital liquidity into the global financial system by selectively offering dollar swap lines to trusted foreign central banks. Dollar hegemony enabled the U.S. to act swiftly, effectively, and on its own terms. In addition, the dollar’s role offers a potent alternative to kinetic military action as a means of pursuing foreign policy objectives. The dollar’s broad use means access to dollar liquidity—which in turn requires access to the U.S. financial system—is essential for foreign governments and businesses. For foreign banks, especially, being cut off from dollar access is essentially a death sentence. That makes sanctions that do so a powerful tool in the international arena. In 2005, for example, the U.S. used the dollar to strike a devastating blow against North Korea without firing a single shot or even formally enacting sanctions. Using authority provided by Section 311 of the Patriot Act, the Department of the Treasury crippled Banco Delta Asia, a bank accused of facilitating illegal activity by the North Korean government, by merely threatening to cut off its access to the American financial system. Deposit outflows began within days; within weeks the bank was placed under government administration to avoid a full collapse. Pyongyang was hit hard, as other banks ceased their business with it to avoid meeting the same fate. Similarly, though the Trump administration has worked hard to undo it, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran to limit the development of nuclear weapons was made possible, in part, by painful dollar sanctions that brought Iran to the table. Far from being a proximate cause of military conflict, the dollar’s central global role has often been used to contain adversaries without military intervention. Still, skeptics are right to point out that the dollar’s role has indirectly funded American interventionism and that dollar sanctions have been overused, provoking the ire of American allies. But these facts suggest we should use our dollar power to forge a more progressive U.S. order, not abandon the advantage altogether. America’s exorbitant privilege need not fund warships and missiles: The same low-interest borrowing could be used to fund a new universal health care system, expand access to higher education, or pursue any number of large-scale social policy objectives, including financing global public goods that no other country or consortium of countries is prepared to fund, such as climate change mitigation.
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#### The National Labor Relations Bureau should, after soliciting notice and comment, recognize an unconditional right to strike for agricultural laborers.

#### Solves and competes - Notice and comment rulemaking solves the case and spills over to set a precedent that the courts will uphold

Zeisler 14 [Royce Zeisler, J.D. Candidate 2014, Columbia Law School; B.S., B.A. 2012, University of British Columbia, "CHEVRON DEFERENCE AND THE FTC: HOW AND WHY THE FTC SHOULD USE CHEVRON TO IMPROVE ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT", Columbia Business Law Review, 2014, HeinOnline]

An instructive use of this style of regulation occurred in 1991 with the National Labor Relations Board's ("NLRB") promulgation of 29 C.F.R. § 103.30. There, the NLRB promulgated its first rule seeking to cease the costly, frequent, and ineffective litigation aimed at determining collective bargaining units in hospitals.1 3 1 Specifically, the regulation created the legal presumption that, absent "extraordinary circumstances," there were only eight possible collective bargaining units in acute care hospitals. 132 In limiting the presumed form of bargaining units, the NLRB specifically intended to overrule conflicting precedent and create a legal presumption for courts to employ. After promulgation, this rule was challenged and a unanimous Supreme Court upheld the regulation partly based on Chevron deference. 33 Notably, this regulation did not turn litigation into a simple application of predetermined values (as the rules in Vermont Yankee did). 3'4 It simply set the presumption for generalist courts to deploy in deciding the existence of bargaining units.

#### **Normal means is a congressional amendment of existing labor law to remove exceptions – that draws tons of fire from moderate democrats**

TLA 21 [This Legal Alert provides an overview of a specific federal bill. It is not intended to be, and should not be construed as, legal advice for any particular fact situation. "A Resurrected PRO Act Could Pay Dividends For Big Labor This Time Around." https://www.fisherphillips.com/news-insights/a-resurrected-pro-act-could-pay-dividends-for-big-labor-this-time-around.html]

As we recently forecasted, the House of Representatives has reintroduced a bill designed to radically transform the labor relations landscape, substantially tilting the playing field towards organized labor. The “Protecting the Right to Organize Act of 2021,” or PRO Act, was introduced on February 4 after an earlier version of the same legislation failed to clear the Senate last year. However, now that both houses of Congress and the White House are controlled by the Democratic party, this proposal stands closer than ever to becoming law. What do employers – both unionized and non-unionized – need to know about this startling prospect, and what can you do to help prevent it from becoming reality?

The PRO Act: A Primer

If you think you’ve heard about this proposal before, you’re not experiencing déjà vu. The same bill was passed by the House a year ago this month. But at that time, it faced a hostile Senate controlled by the G.O.P. – which kept the proposal from reaching the floor for an up-or-down vote – and a president that would have vetoed the measure in the unlikely event it reached his desk. The winds of change have shifted, however, and we now have a Senate controlled by the Democrats by the slimmest of margins and an unabashedly pro-union president who campaigned on promises to deliver for organized labor.

So what could you be in store for if this law passes? Whether you currently operate in a unionized environment or have yet to encounter a labor union, be prepared to rethink just about everything you know about the regulatory framework governing your labor relations functions. The PRO Act would make it far easier for unions to organize your workforce, grant far more power to workers protesting working conditions, and shackle unionized businesses like never before, while undermining other longstanding employment models embedded with workplaces across the country.

Radical Shift In Union Organizing

If passed, the PRO Act would radically transform the process of union organizing, tilting the balance of power towards unions to a remarkable degree by altering seven critical steps in the organizing process.

Reinstalling “Quickie” Elections: In the absence of majority card support, the PRO Act would reinstate controversial rules substantially reducing the period of time between a petition for representation and the ensuing election is held, placing employers at a significant disadvantage when it comes to educating workers on the facts they may need to make an informed decision.

Cutting Employers Out Of The Process: The bill would deny employers standing to appear in administrative proceedings for purposes of challenging the petitioned-for bargaining unit or otherwise contesting the representation process. It would also give the petitioner an option to choose whether the election will be conducted electronically, by mail, or at an alternative location not controlled by the employer. If the union loses an election in which it possessed a majority of signed authorization cards, then the agency would be empowered to automatically issue a bargaining order.

Creating A National Gag Rule: Further hamstringing employers, the proposed law would for the first time prohibit all businesses from convening mandatory “captive audience” meetings for purposes of sharing facts on third party representation, effectively gagging them from utilizing their free speech rights in a group setting.

A Return To “Micro” Units: The PRO Act would effectively bar employers from challenging petitions for smaller, gerrymandered groupings of employees within departments or shifts that may be more sympathetic to union interests – representing a stark reversal of gains achieved by employers through the National Labor Relation Board’s (NLRB’s) 2017 decision in PCC Structurals, litigated by Fisher Phillips attorneys.

Expanding Pool Of Potential Union Members: The proposed bill would substantially narrow the statutory definition of “supervisor,” thereby expanding the base of workers who could organize into unions and engage in other “concerted” activities protected by the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). It would do so by requiring only that workers devote a majority of their worktime to performing supervisory duties in order to be considered a part of management, while eliminating other key “indicia” of supervisory status such as the responsibility to “assign” and “responsibly direct” other employees.

Permitting Workers To Use Company Equipment: The PRO Act would also restrict employer rights to control their own computers, equipment, and related electronic communications systems by establishing statutory employee rights to use them on premises for protected activities, absent compelling business considerations. Not only would employers be forced to allow workers to do so in union organizing campaigns, but they would also be limited in their ability to manage workplace dialogue via company-owned email, intranet, and other digital messaging platforms.

Compelling Disclosure Of Confidential Fee Information: Finally, the law would revive the moribund “persuader” rule, which attempted to require disclosure of confidential information associated with fees paid to legal counsel in connection with virtually all forms advice rendered in the context of an organizing campaign.

Shifting Power To Protesting Workers

The PRO Act would also take steps to further empower workers participating in workplace disputes – at the expense of their employers’ rights to manage the workplace.

Permitting Secondary Boycotts: Breaking from 85 years of established legal authority, the PRO Act would allow unions to extend economic pressure to ensnare companies that are not otherwise involved with them in a primary labor dispute. The law would eliminate the longstanding prohibition on secondary boycotts and allow unions to apply such pressure through protests, pickets and related activities.

Emboldening Protesting Workers: The proposed law would encourage intermittent and recognition strikes, such as the quickie strikes of the Fight for $15 Movement, by amending federal labor law to authorize strikes regardless of the duration, scope, frequency, or intermittence.

Constraining Unionized Employers

Further, the proposed law would restrict the rights of unionized employers when it comes to several critical activities.

Blocking Permanent Replacements: The PRO Act would prohibit employers from exercising their rights to permanently replace workers engaged in an economic strike. This right has long since been recognized as the employer’s counter-right to the union’s right to strike. Without it, strikers will always be entitled to reinstatement whenever the strike is over – regardless of whether they were replaced in the interim.

Prohibiting “Offensive” and Pre-Strike Lockouts: The bill would also prohibit employers from utilizing lockouts as an offensive economic weapon, or from doing so at all prior to a strike – thereby leaving intact only the prospect of a post-strike “defensive” lockout.

Prohibiting Anticipatory Withdrawal of Recognition: The bill would overturn a 2019 Board decision allowing employers to withdraw recognition in anticipation of contract expiration – compelling them instead to work through the agency’s formal decertification election process.

Forcing Union Contracts: The proposed law would force unionized employers to come to the table within 10 days of an initial union demand, and empower a tripartite arbitration board to impose collective bargaining agreements of up to two years in duration on all parties that fail to reach an agreement within the first 120 days of negotiations for an initial contract, depriving employers of a critical input into the terms and conditions governing their workplace against the backdrop of unreasonable union demands. The bill would also prohibit employers from implementing changes to working conditions upon reaching “impasse” in first contract bargaining – forcing them instead to maintain the “status quo” for the duration of such negotiations.

Shattering Commonplace Workplace Standards For All Employers

But the PRO Act wouldn’t just impact unionized workplaces. It would completely transform workplace law for unionized and non-union businesses alike by invalidating arrangements that have become commonplace over the last several decades.

Broadening Misclassification Law: The PRO Act would significantly expand the definition of “employee” to capture workers who are currently independent contractors, making it difficult for businesses to properly classify workers as such. In bringing California’s ABC test to the national stage, the bill would require businesses to prove (a) the individual is free from the employer’s control, (b) the service they perform is outside the usual course of the employer’s business, and (c) the individual is engaged in the same trade or business as called upon to perform. This would deny many individuals their choice and ability to work independently, threatening the expanding gig economy, and eliminating business flexibility to flex their size due to growth. The bill would also make it an independent violation to misclassify workers as independent contractors.

Expanding Joint Employment: The PRO Act would also codify the extremely broad joint employer standard previously established by the Obama NLRB by virtue of its decision in Browning Ferris Industries (“BFI”), exposing employers to liability for workplaces they don’t control and workers they don’t employ. Under this standard, courts and government agencies would be free to consider the exercise of control over employment terms that is either direct or indirect, and actual or potential, leading to a potential joint employer finding merely by establishing that a business has “reserved” such authority.

Prohibiting Arbitration Agreements: The PRO Act would ban pre-dispute arbitration agreements in all workplace settings, effectively overturning the Supreme Court’s landmark decision in Epic Systems upholding use of class waivers. Eliminating the ability of employers and employees to resolve disputes through arbitration would potentially overwhelm the court system by increasing needless and expensive lawsuits, including class action ligation.

Mandatory Posting Requirement: The bill reinstates prior proposed regulations compelling employers to post notices educating employees on their rights under the NLRA, and to notify all new hires of the information on that notice with penalties of $500 for every incident of technical non-compliance.

Expanding Legal Exposure: Finally, the bill would adopt never-before-seen penalties that would liquidate (double) the amount of damages (up to $100,000) for violations, in addition to providing for backpay, front pay and consequential damages. It would also create a new private right of legal action against employers directly in federal court, providing for recovery of back pay (without any reduction for interim earnings), front pay, consequential, liquidated, and punitive damages, and attorneys’ fees. Punishment at such levels could have a severe chilling effect on employers seeking to assert their free speech and other statutory rights when it comes to day-to-day workplace activities.

What's Next?

It’s worth noting that although it enjoys the support of the new administration, the bill faces a number of hurdles before it becomes law – chief of which is a filibuster that threatens to block any further progress on this legislation to the extent it remains in place through the current session of Congress. Even within the Democratic side of the aisle, the bill could generate opposition from some of its own moderate members. That being said, one of the chief impediments to its passage has already been removed, and the bill could receive a friendlier reception under the current political climate.

#### It’s particularly true for the US – right to strike laws are done by the executive and statute, both cost PC

Brudney 21 [James Brudney, Joseph Crowley Chair in Labor and Employment Law, Fordham Law School. "The Right to Strike as Customary International Law." https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1710&context=yjil]

Application of the international right to strike recognizes variations in nationally-specific approaches. However, the two key areas in which U.S. law deviates from the international right—approving permanent replacements for lawful strikers and allowing the prohibition of all public employee strikes—are central elements of the right itself, rather than more marginal aspects subject to national circumstances. Finally, notwithstanding that U.S. statutory protections for strikes deviate from international standards in these two areas, respect for the international right is reflected in legislation enacted by Congress in recent decades, and by executive action indicating the express understanding of the Obama and Trump Administrations that the right to strike is an integral part of FOA.24

#### Key to democracy and court acquiescence---notice and comment engages participants and creates deference.

Harry First and Spencer Weber Waller 13. Harry First, New York University School of Law. Spencer Weber Waller, Loyola University Chicago School of Law. “Antitrust’s Democracy Deficit”. Fordham Law Review, Volume 81 Issue 5 Article 13. https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4890&context=flr

Redressing antitrust’s democracy deficit on the procedural side can be done with the tools of administrative law. Administrative law is the body of law that controls the procedures of governmental decision making.151 It allows interested persons to participate in decisions that affect their interests. Normally, it requires appropriate notice, the right to be heard, fair procedures, protection of fundamental rights, and judicial review of the resulting decision. These basic features are present in the administrative laws of most foreign legal systems and are part of a growing international consensus.152 The tradeoff is that the decisions of administrative agencies that properly follow these strictures normally are granted a degree of deference as to the interpretation of the laws they enforce.153 Frequently, but not inevitably, private parties also have the right to proceed with actions for damages against private parties who violate their regulatory obligations and even against the government itself when it acts unlawfully, either substantively or procedurally. These tools of administrative law are available to make antitrust enforcement decisions more transparent and more responsive to the interests that the antitrust laws were meant to serve, thereby promoting both better decision making and greater democratic legitimacy.

CONCLUSION

Free markets and free people cannot be assured by the efforts of technocrats. Ultimately, both come about through the workings of democratic institutions, respectful of the legislature’s goals and constrained from engaging in arbitrary action. Antitrust has moved too far from democratic institutions and toward technocratic control, in service to a laissez-faire approach to antitrust enforcement. We need to move the needle back. Doing so will strengthen the institutions of antitrust, the market economy, and the democratic branches of government themselves.

#### US democratic retreat causes terrorism, great power war, famine, and poverty.

Garry Kasparov 17. Chairman of the Human Rights Foundation, founded the Renew Democracy Initiative. “Democracy and Human Rights: The Case for U.S. Leadership”. Feb 16 2017. U.S. Senate. http://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/021617\_Kasparov\_%20Testimony.pdf

The Soviet Union was an existential threat, and this focused the attention of the world, and the American people. There existential threat today is not found on a map, but it is very real. The forces of the past are making steady progress against the modern world order. Terrorist movements in the Middle East, extremist parties across Europe, a paranoid tyrant in North Korea threatening nuclear blackmail, and, at the center of the web, an aggressive KGB dictator in Russia. They all want to turn the world back to a dark past because their survival is threatened by the values of the free world, epitomized by the United States. And they are thriving as the U.S. has retreated. The global freedom index has declined for ten consecutive years. No one like to talk about the United States as a global policeman, but this is what happens when there is no cop on the beat. American leadership begins at home, right here. America cannot lead the world on democracy and human rights if there is no unity on the meaning and importance of these things. Leadership is required to make that case clearly and powerfully. Right now, Americans are engaged in politics at a level not seen in decades. It is an opportunity for them to rediscover that making America great begins with believing America can be great. The Cold War was won on American values that were shared by both parties and nearly every American. Institutions that were created by a Democrat, Truman, were triumphant forty years later thanks to the courage of a Republican, Reagan. This bipartisan consistency created the decades of strategic stability that is the great strength of democracies. Strong institutions that outlast politicians allow for long-range planning. In contrast, dictators can operate only tactically, not strategically, because they are not constrained by the balance of powers, but cannot afford to think beyond their own survival. This is why a dictator like Putin has an advantage in chaos, the ability to move quickly. This can only be met by strategy, by long-term goals that are based on shared values, not on polls and cable news. The fear of making things worse has paralyzed the United States from trying to make things better. There will always be setbacks, but the United States cannot quit. The spread of democracy is the only proven remedy for nearly every crisis that plagues the world today. War, famine, poverty, terrorism–all are generated and exacerbated by authoritarian regimes. A policy of America First inevitably puts American security last. American leadership is required because there is no one else, and because it is good for America. There is no weapon or wall that is more powerful for security than America being envied, imitated, and admired around the world. Admired not for being perfect, but for having the exceptional courage to always try to be better. Thank you.
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#### CP: The United States federal government should:

#### In the event of increased food scarcity, refrain from transforming large-scale non-agricultural land into farmland

#### Invest $1 trillion in food scarcity research, focused on artificial production of food without damaging natural habitats

#### Substantially increase global food security cooperation, including expanding food aid

#### Implement the recommendations of the Tian evidence

#### Tian lists a suite of proposals to solve food security based on globally expanding access to genetically modified sustainable farming – that conclusively solves

**Tian et al 21**-- Tian, Zhixi [principal investigator, Institute of Genetics and Developmental Biology and former research geneticist at Purdue], et al. "Designing future crops: challenges and strategies for sustainable agriculture." The Plant Journal 105.5 (2021): 1165-1178. (AG DebateDrills)

With the rapid development of genome-editing tools in the past decade, the generation of genome-modified (GM) crops has again raised human health and environmental safety considerations (Friedrichs et al., 2019). Although there is broad scientific consensus that GM crops pose no greater risk to consumers than conventional agricultural products, the promotion of GM crops is heavily restricted in many countries, including European nations and China. Because of the precision of genetic changes introduced by CRISPR-Cas9 tools, it is suggested that genome-edited crops (GECs) should be subjected to product-based rather than technology-based regulation. In particular, GECs with gene knockouts or nucleotide variants that have been documented to exist in cultivars or closely related wild species have to be carefully evaluated. In 2016, a regulatory framework for GECs has been proposed (Huang et al., 2016). These regulations include minimization of the risk of the escape of GECs from laboratories and fields at the early stages of research and development, avoidance of the introduction of foreign DNA sequences and off-target DNA editing events, and precise documentation of DNA sequence changes at the target sites by whole genome sequencing. It is definitely necessary for scientists, policy-makers, regulators, and journalists to coordinate and discuss how to improve global food security using genome-editing tools, and at the same time alleviate public concerns related to GECs (Callaway, 2018)

#### Their biodiversity internal explicitly says we won’t do large-scale deforestation – Harker is Blue

**Tian et al 21**-- Tian, Zhixi [principal investigator, Institute of Genetics and Developmental Biology and former research geneticist at Purdue], et al. "Designing future crops: challenges and strategies for sustainable agriculture." The Plant Journal 105.5 (2021): 1165-1178. (AG DebateDrills)

From the perspective of human evolution, each period of rapid population growth, such as during the Neolithic agricultural revolution, which began at about 8000 BC, the hydro agricultural or irrigation revolutions in the Near East, which began about 3000 BC, and the medieval and modern agricultural periods, which began about 1000 AD, benefited from an advance in agriculture (Taiz, 2013; Wallace et al., 2018). The recent rapid population growth during the past 300 years, in contrast, mainly resulted from the Industrial Revolution, which began in Britain about 1760. **The Industrial Revolution greatly increased the range of human activities and accelerated farmland expansion. In 1700, it was reported that nearly 95% of Earth’s ice-free land consisted of wildlands and semi-natural anthromes; however, by 2000, ~55% of these regions were used as arable land** (Figure 1a, data from https://ourworldindata.org/). The Industrial Revolution also gave birth to new technologies and production systems in agriculture, such as the application of larger irrigation systems, and more fertilizers and pesticides. In the 1960s, semi-dwarf wheat and rice varieties were introduced. These semi-dwarf crops exhibit beneficial characteristics, such as improved response to fertilizer input, lodging resistance and enhanced light utilization (Hedden, 2003; Wallace et al., 2018). Along with the fertilizers, pesticides and irrigation systems made possible by the Industrial Revolution, semi-dwarf crops were quickly adopted and resulted in a significant increase in total grain production globally. This big leap in agriculture was known as the ‘Green Revolution’ (Khush, 2001). Indeed, statistical data have revealed that the average daily food supply per person (in terms of calories) has doubled since the middle of the 19th century (Figure 1b, data from https://ourworld indata.org/). It is estimated that the world population will rise to more than 9 billion by 2050 (Alexandratos, 1999; Cassman, 1999), and at that time we will need at least 60% more food than is consumed by humans today. Moreover, our population will continuously increase, reaching over 11 billion by 2100 (Figure 1a, data from https://ourworldindata.org/). **How to feed the increasing population is a challenge facing the whole world** (Tilman et al., 2001; Godfray et al., 2010; Foley et al., 2011; Wallace et al., 2018). **A simple solution to feed a population of 9 billion is to constantly turn wild habitats into farmland**. However, this type of expansion is unrealistic as most of the world’s icefree and non-barren land area has been exhausted, and much of the rest is unlikely to sustain high yields (Cassman, 1999). More importantly, intact forests have been known to play essential roles in protecting the environment, such as storing fresh water, decreasing flooding and regenerating fertile soils. **Clearing of forests will result in prohibitive ecological costs, such as loss of biodiversity and greenhouse gas emissions. It was reported that, due to agriculture expansion, ~30% of all plant species will become extinct** (Taiz, 2013). The destruction of tropical forests releases about 1.1 9 1012 tons of carbon per year, which accounts for 12% of total anthropogenic CO2 emissions (Friedlingstein et al., 2010).

## Case

### UV

#### No 1AR theory

#### 1) irresolvable for 2nr/2ar

#### 2) forces me to split 2nr, decks substantive clash which is the only terminal ! to debate

#### 3) reading it in the UV solves all of their offense

#### No inf abuse bc limited theory args

#### Don’t dtd = infinite prolif of theory args

#### Speccing a country bad –

#### a) that was T

#### b) their a point doesn’t make sense bc theres no reason why that’s good

#### c) these debates are key when it’s impossible to be neg

#### no reasonability

#### a) our shells are t which doesn’t matter

#### b) doesn’t justify that your model of debate is good

#### we spec’d interps in cx

#### affirming harder is irrel – theres no implication of this

### t/l

#### farm-aid wrong – all this says is that there is some drop in a net income, not that farmers wont be able to produce food

#### reiley doesn’t actually say unions solve, just bargaining which is distinct because you can bargain without unions

**The plan requires employers to agree to workers demands which would take time – strikes would deck the supply chain the interim which means the link turn outweighs the case on timeframe**

Phil Mccausland 21 [NBC News Reporter], "Supply chain shortages made farm equipment scarce. Will the John Deere strike make it worse?," NBC News, 10-19-2021 https://www.nbcnews.com/business/business-news/john-deere-strike-and-supply-chain-woes-has-farmers-worried-rcna3207

Some farmers are concerned that the shortage could grow worse after 10,000 John Deere workers went on strike last week. The company had reported record profits this year, and United Auto Workers union members walked off the job at 14 manufacturing plants when it refused to raise wages above 6 percent.

"It's got us worried for sure," said Eric Hopkins, the senior vice president of Hundley Farms, which boasts 20,000 acres of mostly vegetables in central Florida. "They're already low on inventory and parts right now. A strike is only going to exacerbate things, make it worse. If it lasts for a while, not only will they not have new tractors, but when you have a breakdown and there's no parts, your tractor is just going to sit there not being able to harvest or plant a crop."

Feelings among farmers about the John Deere strike are mixed. Many said that they supported the workers' desire for a better deal but that they are worried about the effect of a strike that lasts weeks or months.

A long strike could hamper the country's food supply chain, which has suffered shortages since the start of the coronavirus pandemic, which further delayed John Deere's ability to deliver products and parts in a timely manner. Farmers also worry that a delay could affect their increasingly thin margins.

It's uncertain how long the strike could last and to what degree John Deere will be further slowed. It said it had a continuity plan in place, bringing in salaried nonunion workers to maintain some level of production.

Crops can be damaged if they are planted or harvested late, and the insurance provided by the Agriculture Department requires that seeds are put in the ground and produce is pulled by a particular date to be fully insured.

That's one issue highlighted by David Misener, who travels the country from May to November as a custom farmer. He brings farm equipment and harvests other people's crops for them. His timelines are tight, but he's had to wait long periods for repairs and parts multiple times this season — an unusual occurrence.

Most recently, while he was working a field for a South Dakota farm this month, a bearing went out on a combine harvester, destroying one of its shafts. The only place the local dealer could find a replacement part was in Canada, and Misener had to sit on his hands for a week until it arrived.

"It is extremely crucial that we harvest on a timely schedule, because it can decide whether you have something to harvest or nothing," Misener said.

### Econ Scenario

#### No impact to econ explained – this is just set up as a link turn to like the econ da or innovation da, neither of which we are reading – no new 1AR impacts to incomplete scenarios bc it moots 1ac. This is literally so silly and any new 1AR spin should be rejected if you don’t understand it

#### Don’t let them get away with a silly unexplained link turn to interest rates – this is a DA about rate hikes, not the global economy, so their scenario doesn’t apply. Our da is about market speculation that takes months whereas their scenario takes years to happen

### Biod

#### Duke – no reason why theres an incentive to invest – just asys that people could lead to automation of growth

#### Both Tians – we recut it so there’s alt causes if they win the cp doesn’t solve/whatever else

#### No impact to biod

* Permian-Triassic extinction proves resiliency
* No data on tipping points
* Ecosystems never outright collapse
* 600 models prove no ecosystem collapse

Hance 18 [Jeremy Hance, wildlife blogger for the Guardian and a journalist with Mongabay focusing on forests, indigenous people, climate change and more. He is also the author of Life is Good: Conservation in an Age of Mass Extinction. Could biodiversity destruction lead to a global tipping point? Jan 16, 2018. https://www.theguardian.com/environment/radical-conservation/2018/jan/16/biodiversity-extinction-tipping-point-planetary-boundary]

Just over 250 million years ago, the planet suffered what may be described as its greatest holocaust: ninety-six percent of marine genera (plural of genus) and seventy percent of land vertebrate vanished for good. Even insects suffered a mass extinction – the only time before or since. Entire classes of animals – like trilobites – went out like a match in the wind.

But what’s arguably most fascinating about this event – known as the Permian-Triassic extinction or more poetically, the Great Dying – is the fact that anything survived at all. Life, it seems, is so ridiculously adaptable that not only did thousands of species make it through whatever killed off nearly everything (no one knows for certain though theories abound) but, somehow, after millions of years life even recovered and went on to write new tales.

Even as the Permian-Triassic extinction event shows the fragility of life, it also proves its resilience in the long-term. The lessons of such mass extinctions – five to date and arguably a sixth happening as I write – inform science today. Given that extinction levels are currently 1,000 (some even say 10,000) times the background rate, researchers have long worried about our current destruction of biodiversity – and what that may mean for our future Earth and ourselves.

In 2009, a group of researchers identified nine global boundaries for the planet that if passed could theoretically push the Earth into an uninhabitable state for our species. These global boundaries include climate change, freshwater use, ocean acidification and, yes, biodiversity loss (among others). The group has since updated the terminology surrounding biodiversity, now calling it “biosphere integrity,” but that hasn’t spared it from critique.

A paper last year in Trends in Ecology & Evolution scathingly attacked the idea of any global biodiversity boundary.

“It makes no sense that there exists a tipping point of biodiversity loss beyond which the Earth will collapse,” said co-author and ecologist, José Montoya, with Paul Sabatier Univeristy in France. “There is no rationale for this.”

Montoya wrote the paper along with Ian Donohue, an ecologist at Trinity College in Ireland and Stuart Pimm, one of the world’s leading experts on extinctions, with Duke University in the US.

Montoya, Donohue and Pimm argue that there isn’t evidence of a point at which loss of species leads to ecosystem collapse, globally or even locally. If the planet didn’t collapse after the Permian-Triassic extinction event, it won’t collapse now – though our descendants may well curse us for the damage we’ve done.

Instead, according to the researchers, every loss of species counts. But the damage is gradual and incremental, not a sudden plunge. Ecosystems, according to them, slowly degrade but never fail outright.

“Of more than 600 experiments of biodiversity effects on various functions, none showed a collapse,” Montoya said. “In general, the loss of species has a detrimental effect on ecosystem functions...We progressively lose pollination services, water quality, plant biomass, and many other important functions as we lose species. But we never observe a critical level of biodiversity over which functions collapse.”

#### Tian says interventions wreck biod – those work

* plants are being modified to be successful in droughts
* ocean and island crops are resilient to rising sea levels and salinity
* livestock resistant to diseases
* livestock prepared for droughts

FAOUN 19

Maintaining, using and developing adapted genetic resources A number of countries note the significance of well-adapted species, varieties or breeds in terms of enhancing resilience to climate change. Several specific examples of how such components of BFA have been utilized in adaptation efforts are provided. For example, Papua New Guinea mentions the distribution to farmers of crop accessions identified in ex situ collections as being tolerant to salinity (taro and cassava varieties), drought (cassava, banana and aibika13 varieties) and flooding (taro and banana varieties). It notes that this activity proved very useful in sustaining food security during the drought that struck the country in 2015 and 2016,14 when 40 percent of the population was seriously affected. Panama reports that its criollo livestock breeds have a combination of characteristics that are not found in any introduced breeds, including high fertility rates, longevity, resistance to parasites and diseases and good grazing abilities, including the ability to make use of poor-quality pastures. It notes, in particular, the potential of two locally adapted cattle breeds, the Guaymi and the Guabal^, in climate change adaptation. It also mentions, among its climate change adaptation measures, the development of maize varieties and hybrids that are tolerant of drought and diplodia rot (a fungal disease) and that grow well in soils with low nitrogen levels. With regard to choices at species level, Sudan reports that some of its livestock keepers have replaced cattle and sheep with dromedaries and goats, as the latter species are better suited to a climate change-affected environment that is more prone to droughts.

Some countries note the significance of participatory breeding programmes in the context of climate change. For example, Oman mentions that local wheat and barley landraces have been improved through such programmes to obtain varieties that have shorter growing seasons and can be managed more flexibly, especially during years with prolonged periods of extreme heat and limited water availability. Ensuring farmers have access to the adapted germplasm they need is another issue highlighted. Nepal, for example, mentions the role of community-based seed banks in providing farmers with immediate access to locally adapted germplasm that can be used in efforts to cope with climate change.

#### Interventions will work – more ev – independently, no impact

Child 9 [Matthew Child, Conservation Biologist. Putting ‘Ecosystem Services’ in Their Place! January 2009. <http://www.conservationtoday.org/index.php?/Editorials/Matt-Child/Putting-the-ecosystem-services-argument-in-its-place.html>]

Society can get along just fine without biodiversity.  “What?! Are you high? What’s the matter with you?!” I hear you think to yourselves reservedly.  But ponder it for a second: even if we were to live in a world in which there was no longer biodiversity but some minimum level of ‘biodeficiency’ (perhaps a few plants and a few sparrows and whatever), technology and human industriousness could plausibly allow us to exist on this Earth for posterity. The advent of scenario planning has helped elucidate this possibility by imagining landscapes covered by ‘technogardens’, complete with control towers that mimic the necessities of the seasons1. In this kind of scenario, ecosystem services are created and controlled by the human endeavour. And ecosystems would be human products, subject to the same industrialisation as the panoply of our packaged lives. Such ‘efficiencies’ of land use would theoretically allow society the luxury of setting aside the remaining land for nature reserves and parks. But would we actually do that? Having finally been convinced that nature is merely utilitarian, ironically by those conservationists whose original intention was to demonstrate the opposite, it’s doubtful whether the public would put up much resistance if the remaining land were annexed by Technogarden Inc. (Whose slogan would probably be: Why leave nature to chance?)  There is also no real precedent to believe that governments and industry leaders would stick to a ‘land sparing’ arrangement even if some people did decide that Wilderness (I capitalised to give it a mystical pronoun sort of feel) is invaluable. Take the contemporary example of developing-world agricultural systems: the question is whether to promote ‘wildlife friendly’ farming (a kind of integrated eco-agriculture) or ‘land sparing’ techniques (here: farm; there: nature). Research is beginning to show that land sparing is probably better for biodiversity (Ben Phalan, unpublished data), especially species sensitive to disturbance (which are most of the cool ones). So cordon off pieces of land, farm the living daylights out of it, and then leave the rest for wildlife. Well, yes. However, developing world citizens and their governments probably won’t see it that way. Just ‘leaving’ land alone for nature is anathema to anyone who doesn’t own an iPod.  The truth of the matter is that, no matter how we spin it or how many justifications we give for land to be left alone to produce ‘services’, optimisation will only ever lead to optimisation. It’s the eerie way in which we’re wired: the evolutionary residue of our hoarding Pleistocene past interacting with the neon-emblazoned signs and symbols of society urge us to consume ever greater amounts. Such blatant obsession with material wealth only promulgates Thoreau’s dread observation that “fruit is not ripe until turned to dollars”. Inadvertently, the value-laden ecosystem service argument for conservation will only lead to a more impoverished world. Search your feelings: you know this to be true.  By reducing nature to dollar signs destined for the cold quarantine of appraisal, we slick the conveyer belts of industrial progress. There is no way we can create a paradigm shift in the consumer conscious if we concede that ecosystems and economics exist on the same scale. The problem is twofold: firstly, if we agree that species can be valued then it can be deduced that most species are not valuable. (That’s pretty catchy, right? Maybe it’ll become a marketing campaign for Technogarden Inc.). The majority of ecosystem services are provided by a core group of species that fulfil basic functional criteria2. And there’s no real naming of names when it comes to species and ‘services’. In practical terms, this means that most species can be substituted and the ‘services’ we so cherish will still be delivered. It also means that rare and endangered species are probably not worth the ‘cost’ of protecting because they fail to effectively (and consistently) produce an anthropocentric service. “But what about keystone species?!” I hear you cry in anguish, “They’re pretty cool and can’t really be substituted!”  No, they can’t really. It’d be tricky at the very least. But I’m going to say something controversial right now, brace yourselves: the consequences of losing keystone species exists on a scale below the potential of the human endeavour to engineer solutions. Most species losses have severe ecological repercussions, this much is definitely true. But it’s probably a safe bet that, in reality, very few of these cases would translate into tangible disadvantages for humans. Don’t get me wrong, services like flood abatement, water purification, fibre production and so on are important. But their resilience and quality is mostly determined by sound land management (burning regimes, erosion control, stocking rates), and has little or nothing to do with what most people think of when they hear the word ‘biodiversity’: birds and animals. (The ‘charismatic megafauna’, to give it a buzz phrase spin). Ecosystems services are real and important but most of them can be produced and managed at the producer trophic level. Bird and animal diversity is far more important for sustaining and creating biodiversity (in terms of ensuring ecological relationships and maintaining evolutionary connections). This is an important argument if we recognise and want to convince others of our role as stewards of life. But it is dishonest and ultimately destructive to the conservation movement to try and shove the ‘biodiversity’ concept into what is already a pretty shallow economic framework.  Unless we are, of course, speaking about (drum-roll) the greatest hoax of all: “Existence Value”!

#### Adaptation solves – the interventions will be effective

Rosengrant 13 [Mark W. Rosegrant, Director of the Environment and Production Technology Division at the International Food Policy Research Institute, et al., 2013, “The Future of the Global Food Economy: Scenarios for Supply, Demand, and Prices,” in Food Security and Sociopolitical Stability, p. 39-40]

The food price spikes in the late 2000s caught the world’s attention, particularly when sharp increases in food and fuel prices in 2008 coincided with street demonstrations and riots in many countries. For 2008 and the two preceding years, researchers identified a significant number of countries (totaling 54) with protests during what was called the global food crisis (Benson et al. 2008). Violent protests occurred in 21 countries, and nonviolent protests occurred in 44 countries. Both types of protest took place in 11 countries. In a separate analysis, developing countries with low government effectiveness experienced more food price protests between 2007 and 2008 than countries with high government effectiveness (World Bank 201la). Although the incidence of violent protests was much higher in countries with less capable governance, many factors could be causing or contributing to these protests, such as government response tactics, rather than the initial food price spike. Data on food riots and food prices have tracked together in recent years. Agricultural commodity prices started strengthening in international markets in 2006. In the latter half of 2007, as prices continued to rise, two or fewer food price riots per month were recorded (based on World Food Programme data, as reported in Brinkman and Hendrix 2011). As prices peaked and remained high during mid-2008, the number of riots increased dramatically, with a cumulative total of 84 by August 2008. Subsequently, both prices and the monthly number of protests declined. Several researchers have studied the connection between food price shocks and conflict, finding at least some relationship between food prices and conflict. According to Dell et al. (2008), higher food prices lead to income declines and an increase in political instability, but only for poor countries. Researchers also found a positive and significant relationship between weather shocks (affecting food availability, prices, and real income) and the probability of suffering government repression or a civil war (Besley and Persson 2009). Arezki and Bruckner (2011) evaluated a constructed food price index and political variables, including data on riots and anti-government demonstrations and measures of civil unrest. Using data from 61 countries over the period 1970 to 2007, they found a direct connection between food price shocks and an increased likelihood of civil conflict, including riots and demonstrations. Other researchers have broadened the analysis by considering government responses or underlying policies that affect local prices, and consequently influence outcomes and the linkage between food price shocks and conflict. Carter and Bates (2012) evaluated data from 30 developing countries for the time period 1961 to 2001, concluding that when governments mitigate the impact of food price shocks on urban consumers, the apparent relationship between food price shocks and civil war disappears. Moreover, when the urban consumers can expect a favorable response, the protests only serve as a motivation for a policy response rather than as a prelude to something more serious, such as violent demonstrations or even civil war. Many in the international development community see war and conflict as a development issue, with a war or conflict severely damaging the local economy, which in turn leads to forced migration and dislocation, and ultimately acute food insecurity. Brinkman and Hendrix (2011) ask if it could be the other way around, with food insecurity causing conflict. Their answer, based on a review of the literature, is "a highly qualified yes," especially for intrastate conflict. The primary reason is that insecurity itself heightens the risk of democratic breakdown and civil conflict. The linkage connecting food insecurity to conflict is contingent on levels of economic development (a stronger linkage for poorer countries), existing political institutions, and other factors. The researchers say establishing causation directly is elusive, considering a lack of evidence for explaining individual behavior. The debate over cause and effect is ongoing. Policies can nevertheless be implemented to reduce price variability. Less costly forms of stabilization, at least in terms of government outlays, include reducing import tariffs (and quotas) to lower prices and restricting exports to increase food availability. However, these types of policy responses, while perhaps helping an individual country's consumers in the short run, can lead to increased international price volatility, with potential for disproportionate adverse impacts on other countries that also may be experiencing food insecurity.