## 1AC

### Advantage 1: Education

#### Education is on the decline, Pantuso 20

Phillip Pantuso, 1-8-2020, "Why Is American Education Declining?," River, https://therivernewsroom.com/why-is-american-education-declining/

But a decade later, in an era of divided politics, one of the rare things the right and left have agreed on is the failure of Common Core. In December 2019, the latest results came out from the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), which compares the United States’ ranking to other countries every three years. It showed that despite billions of dollars being spent, academic performance by American 15-year-olds was stagnant overall: slightly above students from peer nations in reading, but below the middle of the pack in math, according to [The New York Times](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/12/03/us/us-students-international-test-scores.html), with a widening achievement gap between high and low performers. About 20 percent of American 15-year-olds could not read at the level expected of a 10-year-old, according to Andreas Schleicher, director of education and skills at the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, which administers the PISA test. That was on the heels of **the** [**latest results**](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/10/30/us/reading-scores-national-exam.html) **of the National Assessment of Educational Progress**, a US test that showed that two-thirds of children are not proficient readers. Compared to the last time the test was given, in 2017, the average eighth-grade reading score declined in more than half of all 50 states, and the average score in fourth-grade reading declined in 17 states. Math scores remained relatively flat overall.

#### Strikes lead to teaching reform but legal restrictions hinder success, Bradford 21

Derrell Bradford, February 11, 2021, "A Rolling National Teacher Strike Is Why Schools Are Closed," Education Next, https://www.educationnext.org/rolling-national-teacher-strike-is-why-schools-are-closed/

To better understand what is happening today, it is worth examining the activism of teachers unions in recent years as they confronted state and local governments. In 2018, we saw a series of teacher strikes and job actions that captured the nation’s attention. What we now know as Red for Ed—marked both by the red t-shirts that became the uniform of teachers-union activism and, perhaps also, the Republican political leanings of states in which the strikes happened (Kentucky, Arizona, Oklahoma, and West Virginia)—were teacher protests at a scale perhaps not seen since those in Wisconsin opposing then-Governor Scott Walker’s Act 10 reforms, which, among others things, made it more difficult for unions to maintain their representation of public-school teachers. The protests in 2018 provide compelling context for escalating teachers-union activism in the years that follow. But first, they highlighted the issues that ostensibly matter to teachers unions and, perhaps by proxy, teachers themselves. At the root of the Kentucky protests were public-employee pensions, an unpopular incumbent trying to change them, and, to a lesser extent, tax-credit scholarship legislation that would have helped private schools. Kentucky’s state-employee pension plan is one of the nation’s worst funded, with approximately 16 percent of the assets it needed to meet expected liabilities. The state’s Republican governor at the time, Matt Bevin, along with the legislature, passed pension-reform legislation that the Kentucky Education Association and other public-employee unions opposed through a series of [sickouts](https://apnews.com/article/8ccdc06911434dc6ba40dc3a813aaad6) and days of action at the Capitol that essentially shut down many of the state’s school districts. With Kentucky teachers engaged, Governor Bevin was summarily defeated by the state’s attorney general, Andy Beshear, a Democrat who opposed the pension plan and who benefitted from substantial teacher and teachers-union activism. As [Vox](https://www.vox.com/identities/2019/11/6/20951459/kentucky-democrat-beshear-bevin-teachers) reported at the time, Kentucky Education Association president Eddie Campbell asserted that he’d never seen teachers so engaged in the political process. He also stated that “the case they made to their communities changed the course of this election and the course of public education in this state.” In Oklahoma, West Virginia, and Arizona, the issue was more straightforward: teacher pay. And the teacher strikes, sickouts, rallies, and activism overall were effective in achieving the goal of increasing teacher pay. Oklahoma legislators increased teacher pay by on average $6,000 (approximately 16 percent). West Virginia’s teachers won a 5-percent increase, while Arizona’s protests saw [Governor Doug Ducey increase teacher pay](https://education.azgovernor.gov/edu/increasing-teacher-pay) by 20 percent preemptively. While the fight over public-employee pensions is incredibly complicated, there were winning arguments to be made for increasing teacher compensation in these states. Ultimately, those arguments carried the day. But the pay increases were not the most important achievements of these efforts. Instead, as a series of advocacy actions, teachers unions were able to test a range of important theories about what was possible and, more importantly, what was tolerable to the citizens in their respective states. When teachers strike, local economies are affected. Working parents may need to stay home and watch their children, and the education of children is disrupted in proportion to the length of the strike. If there was any lesson to be learned from these early efforts, it was that teachers unions, now emboldened, could cause massive disruption to daily life and emerge better off for it economically. But the strategy had only been tested in red states. To understand whether it could work across the country, it would need to be successful in one of the nation’s large urban districts, as well. In 2019, strikes in Los Angeles and Chicago provided just this opportunity. Hooray for Hollywood United Teachers of Los Angeles’s weeklong strike in January of 2019 disrupted the city, its politics, and relationships between teachers, families, and over 630,000 students and their schools. It was a tension-rich affair exhaustively covered by the national media. And it featured a cast of characters right out of a Hollywood film. Alex Caputo-Pearl, the leader of United Teachers of Los Angeles, appeared in the role of champion of the common man, economic justice, and worker rights. Austin Beutner, the district superintendent and Caputo-Pearl’s ostensible foil, had been a highly successful businessman. And the city’s mayor, Eric Garcetti, rounded out the production as the charismatic dealmaker with higher political aspirations. The tilt was watched in living rooms across America. Democratic presidential candidates chimed in in support of the striking teachers. In contrast to the Oklahoma, West Virginia, and Arizona cases, in Los Angles, the union failed to achieve a clear financial win. Beutner, who had taken to the editorial pages of the [Wall Street Journal](https://www.wsj.com/articles/l-a-schools-have-a-math-problem-11547509576?mod=searchresults_pos12&page=1) to explain the district’s dire fiscal straits, exacerbated by pension commitments many described as unsustainable, had put a deal on the table before the strike. That was the deal that was largely accepted after the strike. The mayor committed to putting a tax increase on the ballot for schools. The initiative wound up getting rejected by voters. But United Teachers of Los Angeles claimed victory anyway. They’d stopped the city for the better part of the week. Soon after, raising teacher pay became a key element of the platforms of several of the Democratic presidential candidates, including California’s own Senator Kamala Harris. The union had also opposed charter schools in the city and recommended a moratorium as a policy plank in its list of demands. The [school board voted 5-1](https://www.utla.net/news/school-board-approves-moratorium-charters) in support of a resolution doing just that. If the Los Angeles strike was about how to get to yes, the Chicago strike was about one word: “no.” Newly elected mayor Lori Lightfoot, a progressive’s progressive in a state where unions are an essential fixture of daily political life, offered the Chicago Teachers Union a 14-percent raise over five years at the start of their negotiations. The union refused. On October 17, 2019, the CTU began a 15-day strike that disrupted the lives and learning of 300,000 students. The mayor and the CTU eventually reached an agreement. Los Angeles and Chicago answered the question the initial Red for Ed efforts posed: could broadscale teacher activism in the form of job actions and outright strikes result in financial or policy wins for those same unions? The answer was clearly yes. These large-scale disruptions could extract policy victories from elected officials on both sides of the political aisle. Covid-19 and the Rolling National Teacher Strike While the efficacy of strikes and job actions in the era of labor solidarity seems to have been more than proven, it is still difficult, both logistically and legally, for teachers unions to strike in many parts of the country. In New York, for instance, the state’s Taylor Law prohibits public employees from striking. Disregarding this law can have serious consequences (as the Transport Workers Union once discovered) such as fines and the suspension of automatic dues collection. As labor watchdog Mike Antonucci has noted, a national teacher strike would rapidly deplete the strike funds of both national teachers unions. In normal times, such a sweeping action would be unworkable.

#### Higher wages increases student performance, Evans 19

David Evans, 5-3-2019, "Does Raising Teacher Salaries Improve Performance?," Pacific Standard, https://psmag.com/education/what-do-teacher-salaries-do-to-teacher-performance

RAISING SALARIES ATTRACTS AND KEEPS GOOD TEACHERS In Texas, increasing teacher pay [reduced turnover](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0047272713002119), which in turn increased student performance. Likewise, national studies from [the United States](https://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1162/003465300558894) and [the United Kingdom](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S004727271500208X#bb0130) also find that students do better when teachers have relatively better wages. Studies from Latin America have looked specifically at the pull factor of higher wages for civil servants—of which teachers are a subset. In Brazil, higher wages for civil servants [drew more educated candidates](https://eml.berkeley.edu/~ffinan/Finan_MPoliticians.pdf) into the service. In Mexico, higher salaries for civil servants attracted more candidates who were [more conscientious and who had higher IQs](http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.295.2587). But higher salaries also attract less qualified candidates. In education, one challenge is selecting those candidates who will go on to be great teachers, which brings us to the topic of higher standards for teachers. REFORMS BEYOND JUST SALARY INCREASES ARE NEEDED What countries that have made large gains in learning have shown is that combining salary increases with other critical reforms is the way to success. Setting higher standards to enter the teaching profession is a way to both pay teachers what they're worth while making sure the very best candidates are teaching. Finland and Singapore, two countries known for high performance on international tests, have [highly competitive entry](https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/20488/9781464801518.pdf#page=167) into the teaching profession. In both countries, a small fraction of applicants to teacher training schools are accepted, allowing teacher training schools to only accept those applicants with excellent academic credentials. By contrast, a recent study of teacher preparation graduate programs in the U.S. found that [fewer than half required a 3.0 grade point average](https://www.nctq.org/publications/2018-Teacher-Prep-Review). Ecuador provides a clear example of how [increasing teacher selectivity can lead to gains](https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/702609). Ecuador doubled teachers' starting salaries in 2009. At around the same time, it introduced a national hiring exam and teacher evaluation systems, and it made getting into teacher training colleges and subsequently getting a job as a teacher more selective. The country also instituted incentives for high performing teachers. Ecuador went on to register the [highest student literacy gains](https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/702609?af=R&amp=&) of any country in Latin America on regional tests conducted between 2006 and 2013. In other countries, the key reforms may be different. [Brazil registered large learning gains](https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/2383/656590REPLACEM0hieving0World0Class0.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) in the first decade of this century after a [series of reforms in the 1990s](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/lessons-from-pisa-for-the-united-states/brazil-encouraging-lessons-from-a-large-federal-system_9789264096660-9-en). These reforms increased teacher salaries while also increasing the educational requirements to become a teacher, expanding in-service support for teachers, ensuring more financing for rural schools, and, later, introducing better measurement and publicity around student learning results. Kenya recently saw [student learning rise](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10833-018-9325-4) with a nationwide program that included detailed teachers' guides, professional development, and coaching for teachers. THE OPTIMAL EDUCATION SYSTEM In a recent study, the World Bank highlighted how many education systems seem to be [stuck in a low-learning trap](https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/28340/211096ov.pdf), where teachers and schools lack both the support and the motivation to give students what they need. Low teacher salaries, together with inadequate support for teachers and little selectivity in teacher preparation, can keep U.S. schools far below their potential. But increased pay is not enough. As experiences from around the world show, higher pay must be accompanied by an array of other reforms–ranging from increased selectivity into the field to more mentoring and coaching to help teachers already in the field give their best to our students.

#### Educational innovation solves extinction.

Peter **Serdyukov 17**. National University, La Jolla, California. 03/27/2017. “Innovation in Education: What Works, What Doesn’t, and What to Do about It?” Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 4–33.

Introduction Education, being a social institution serving the needs of society, is indispensable for society to survive and thrive. It should be not only comprehensive, sustainable, and superb, but must continuously evolve to meet the challenges of the fast-changing and unpredictable globalized world. This evolution must be systemic, consistent, and scalable; therefore, school teachers, college professors, administrators, researchers, and policy makers are expected to innovate the theory and practice of teaching and learning, as well as all other aspects of this complex organization to ensure quality preparation of all students to life and work. Here we present a systemic discussion of educational innovations, identify the barriers to innovation, and outline potential directions for effective innovations. We discuss the current status of innovations in US education, what educational innovation is, how innovations are being integrated in schools and colleges, why innovations do not always produce the desired effect, and what should be done to increase the scale and rate of innovation-based transformations in our education system. We then offer recommendations for the growth of educational innovations. As examples of innovations in education, we will highlight online learning and time efficiency of learning using accelerated and intensive approaches. Innovations in US education For an individual, a nation, and humankind to survive and progress, innovation and evolution are essential. Innovations in education are of particular importance because education plays a crucial role in creating a sustainable future. “Innovation resembles mutation, the biological process that keeps species evolving so they can better compete for survival” (Hoffman and Holzhuter, 2012, p. 3). Innovation, therefore, is to be regarded as an instrument of necessary and positive change. Any human activity (e.g. industrial, business, or educational) needs constant innovation to remain sustainable. The need for educational innovations has become acute. “It is widely believed that countries’ social and economic well-being will depend to an ever greater extent on the quality of their citizens’ education: the emergence of the so-called ‘knowledge society’, the transformation of information and the media, and increasing specialization on the part of organizations all call for high skill profiles and levels of knowledge. Today’s education systems are required to be both effective and efficient, or in other words, to reach the goals set for them while making the best use of available resources” (Cornali, 2012, p. 255). According to an Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) report, “the pressure to increase equity and improve educational outcomes for students is growing around the world” (Vieluf et al., 2012, p. 3). In the USA, underlying pressure to innovate comes from political, economic, demographic, and technological forces from both inside and outside the nation. Many in the USA seem to recognize that education at all levels critically needs renewal: “Higher education has to change. It needs more innovation” (Wildavsky et al., 2012, p. 1). This message, however, is not new – in the foreword to the 1964 book entitled Innovation in Education, Arthur Foshay, Executive Officer of The Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute of School Experimentation, wrote, “It has become platitudinous to speak of the winds of change in education, to remind those interested in the educational enterprise that a revolution is in progress. Trite or not, however, it is true to say that changes appear wherever one turns in education” (Matthew, 1964, p. v).

### Advantage 2: Warming

#### Transition to renewables is inevitable and happening now, Murphy 6-4

Brian Murphy, 6-4-2021, "Renewable energy in transition," EY, https://www.ey.com/en\_us/power-utilities/renewable-energy-in-transition

In brief: **The energy transition is inevitable and is in fact accelerating** despite the pandemic. Decarbonization, decentralization and digitization are the defining trends of the energy transition. Capital is available and investment in renewables has been rising in the US Renewable energy is currently a theme impacting every facet of the power and utilities (P&U) industry. Many energy tipping points have either arrived or are about to, and as a new administration in Washington, DC aims to further accelerate the transition away from fossil fuels, C-suite executives are evaluating and investing in renewables projects. “The inflection point has been developing over the past few years and accelerating over the past six months,” said Veeral Patel, Strategy and Transactions Partner with Ernst & Young LLP. “Technology is making renewables cheaper even without subsidies. The US Government is focused on this, along with China, Canada, India and others. The investor community has been moving away from pure financial returns, and there are more corporate pledges and commitments to be carbon-neutral or negative. We have complete alignment.” In a spring 2021 EY webcast, 72% of participants said that they had already invested in renewables projects, and a further 10% were considering it. Yet, fewer than half indicated they have an overall plan for decarbonization. What factors should be in play for those looking to make renewables-focused deals, and what trends are developing in the market? And with capital typically spread thin at utilities amid broader needs to transform and modernize, what sources of financing and tax considerations are the most favorable? Policies that are increasingly favorable toward renewables have greater momentum. While the specifics are likely to remain fluid, expect action — potentially transformative action — this year. Utilities are in a place to drive this transition and lead in that shift. Brad Hartnett Power & Utilities Domain Analyst at Ernst & Young LLP Renewables market trends Understandably, some P&U companies may question whether the COVID-19 pandemic has delayed or derailed the clean energy transition; but underlying trends show that, if anything, it is accelerating. We focus on what we call the three Ds: Decarbonization. At least 13 of the 30 largest US publicly traded electric and gas utilities have set goals to achieve zero or net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 or a 100% clean electricity goal by 2040. This trend is also reflected at the state and local levels of governments, which are making pledges of their own. Now, the federal government is headed in a new direction as well: rejoining the Paris Agreement on climate change and driving the relevant policy changes. And environmental, social and corporate governance (ESG) concerns are becoming more prominent with corporate investors and in board-level conversations.

#### Increased strikes are key to a successful low-carbon transition that doesn’t exasperate inequality, otherwise large corporations will continue to shutdown unions, Cha 21

J. s Cha, 4-14-2021, "**Passing Climate Bills Without Labor Standards Won't Transition the Economy**," Truthout, https://truthout.org/articles/passing-climate-bills-without-labor-standards-wont-transition-the-economy/

**The failed unionization attempt at the Amazon warehouse** in Bessemer, Alabama, isn’t just a setback for the labor movement, it **is a setback for all progressive movements, especially the climate movement.** Amazon [openly violated several labor laws](https://truthout.org/articles/union-calls-foul-play-as-amazon-unionization-vote-fails/) in the unionization drive, and these violations are likely to be adjudicated in front of the National Labor Relations Board. But the fact remains that Amazon is not afraid to act illegally, and this level of unchecked corporate power is fatal for the climate. To stop the worst impacts of the climate crisis, we need to reduce the power of corporations and the fossil fuel industry. **Strong labor legislation like the Protecting the Right to Organize Act** (PRO Act), supporting worker organizing drives and incorporating labor standards into climate legislation all empower workers and provide a balance to and check on corporate power. **There is a direct link between empowering workers and climate policy**. As Rep. Jamaal Bowman (D-New York) [articulated](https://earther.gizmodo.com/why-the-pro-act-is-part-of-a-green-new-deal-1846441751), the PRO Act would help facilitate a just transition for fossil fuel workers by making it easier for workers to unionize. Through unionizing, these workers would have more access to training and retraining opportunities to prepare them for different work as their industries transition. Moreover, as the [Just Transition Listening Project found](https://www.labor4sustainability.org/files/JTLP_report2021.pdf), unionized workers receive more support and better transition packages when they lose their jobs because workers bargaining as a unit have more power than when workers are forced to bargain on an individual basis. **The best way to support displaced fossil fuel workers, however, is to ensure there is a job for them to transition into that pays a similar wage with comparable benefits.** The job creation potential of climate policy is [well-established](https://www.sierraclub.org/trade/how-build-back-better-plan-for-economic-renewal) — as many as 15 million jobs over 10 years could be created through low-carbon investments. Plus, the fossil fuel industry is no longer the job creator it once was. Over 100,000 fossil fuel workers lost their jobs during the pandemic, the majority of which [are not likely to return](https://newrepublic.com/article/161937/fossil-fuel-companies-job-killers). Yet, many fossil fuel workers are rightfully wary of just transition efforts, as many jobs in low-carbon sectors pay far less with fewer benefits. Without raising wages and standards in low-carbon industries, low-carbon jobs will never be an attractive alternative for workers in fossil fuel industries. To this end, the PRO Act would also help workers in low-carbon sectors unionize. Fossil fuel jobs are not inherently well-paying jobs. Years of workers organizing and striking, often in bloody conditions, made fossil fuel companies treat their workers better. Similarly, workers organizing in low-carbon sectors can raise wages and make more low-carbon jobs better jobs. Beyond organizing, integrating labor standards into climate policy is another way to ensure low-carbon jobs are good jobs. New York State recently [passed labor protections for renewable energy projects](https://www.climatejobsny.org/news/2021/4/6/cjnys-statement-on-new-yorks-historic-renewable-energy-job-standards) in the most recent budget. The provisions not only require construction on renewable energy projects bigger than 5 megawatts to have prevailing wage and project labor agreements, but also require labor peace agreements for operations and maintenance work on systems 5 megawatts and larger. In labor peace agreements, employers agree to not oppose unionization and workers agree not to strike or stop work. They prevent the type of corporate opposition to unionizing we saw Amazon deploy. Amazon is not afraid to act illegally, and this level of unchecked corporate power is fatal for the climate. New York State leads the way in creating good climate jobs. In 2017, in partnership with Climate Jobs NY and Cornell University’s Worker Institute, Gov. Andrew Cuomo [announced](https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/governor-cuomo-announces-major-climate-and-jobs-initiative-partnership-worker-institute-cornell) a $1.5 billion investment to create 40,000 climate jobs through investments in energy efficiency and renewable energy projects. In 2019, Governor Cuomo announced a partnership with the Danish company Ørsted for a massive offshore wind project, which then [announced](https://nabtu.org/press_releases/nabtu-orsted-sign-landmark-mou/) it had entered into a project labor agreement with the North America’s Building Trades Unions to build the offshore wind turbines. The more labor standards are incorporated into low-carbon projects, the more real the possibility for a just transition becomes as good, low-carbon jobs are actually created and not just promised. Moreover, making low-carbon sectors good employers is important not just for fossil fuel workers, but for all workers. Proliferating more low-wage jobs increases our already record levels of inequality. Emissions reductions through exploitation of workers can never be a just transition. And workers that were historically excluded from the fossil fuel economy must have access to good low-carbon jobs to begin to address past injustices and ensure all workers can take part in the low-carbon future. Emissions reductions through exploitation of workers can never be a just transition. The power of the fossil fuel industry has successfully stopped ambitious climate effort and fed decades of climate denial. Organized workers can build the power needed to challenge corporate power. Through supporting worker-organizer and labor standards as part of climate policy, the climate movement not only shows solidarity but also builds the movement and power needed to push for comprehensive climate policy.

#### Inequality causes Extinction

CREAMER 9 — Robert Creamer, political organizer, strategist, and author, owner of Strategic Consulting Group—a political consulting firm that works on many of the country’s most significant issue campaigns, married to Congresswoman Jan Schakowsky of Illinois, 2009 (“Why Growing Income Inequality Is Bad for America,” The Huffington Post, October 27th, Available Online at <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-creamer/why-growing-income-inequa_b_335115.html>, Accessed 10-27-2009)

4). Finally, increased **income inequality is completely undemocratic. It is a betrayal of our most fundamental democratic values. And it is dangerous to our prospects for long-term survival.** The increasing inequality of income leads inexorably to increasing inequality in the distribution of wealth. Power in the society is more and more concentrated in the hands of a few. It becomes more and more likely that some of our most powerful citizens came to that station not because of their merit, but because they got it the "old fashion way" -- they inherited it. That is directly contrary to our shared belief in a more democratic society -- where power and opportunity are broadly shared -- where no one's power or station in life are determined by accident of birth. The earliest Americans came to this continent to escape tyranny, aristocracy and plutocracy. Progressives who stand up against the increasing concentration of economic power in the hands of a few are standing for one of the proudest traditions of our democracy. And our commitment to the democratic distribution of power is not simply an expression of utopian idealism. **In his** brilliant **study of why societies in the past have failed**, called Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed , Pulitzer Prize-winning physiologist and ethno-geographer Jared **Diamond concluded** that **one of the most common factors was "rational behavior" by actors -- and decision-making elites -- that benefited some individual or private self-interest but was harmful to the prospects of the entire society.** He found that this was often complicated because the benefits to a small group that profited from the action were great in the short run, and the resulting damage to everyone else was not very palpable or immediate, except over time. This problem became especially acute when elites thought **they could insulate themselves from the consequences of communal disaster**. Then, they were even less prone to make decisions in the public interest. The **increased inequality in the distribution of wealth and income makes this kind of decision-making more and more likely. We see when the interests of the wealthy stand in the way of solutions to the problems of climate change and environmental destruction** -- or when we fail to raise enough money for the public education that benefits all children because the few who can afford private schools refuse to pay "higher taxes." The **creation of a democratic society, built on egalitarian principles, is the only real systematic means of assuring that the interests of the entire society are not sacrificed to those of powerful** elites. Most stories of decisions leading to catastrophic collapse involve decision-making elites whose interests diverge from the society at large. Democracy is the only real antidote. The **undemocratic** **increase in the distribution of wealth and income is not only wrong. It is also dangerous to our future survival**.

#### Climate Change Causes Extinction – 12 studies

Ng ’19 [Yew-Kwang; May 2019; Professor of Economics at Nanyang Technology University, Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences in Australia and Member of the Advisory Board at the Global Priorities Institute at Oxford University, Ph.D. in Economics from Sydney University; Global Policy, “Keynote: Global Extinction and Animal Welfare: Two Priorities for Effective Altruism,” vol. 10, no. 2, p. 258-266; RP]

Catastrophic climate change Though by no means certain, CCC causing global extinction is possible due to interrelated factors of non‐linearity, cascading effects, positive feedbacks, multiplicative factors, critical thresholds and tipping points (e.g. Barnosky and Hadly, [2016](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0005); Belaia et al., [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0008); Buldyrev et al., [2010](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0016); Grainger, [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0027); Hansen and Sato, [2012](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0029); IPCC [2014](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0031); Kareiva and Carranza, [2018](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0033); Osmond and Klausmeier, [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0056); Rothman, [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0066); Schuur et al., [2015](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0069); Sims and Finnoff, [2016](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0072); Van Aalst, [2006](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0079)).[7](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-note-1009_67) A possibly imminent tipping point could be in the form of ‘an abrupt ice sheet collapse [that] could cause a rapid sea level rise’ (Baum et al., [2011](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0006), p. 399). There are many avenues for positive feedback in global warming, including: the replacement of an ice sea by a liquid ocean surface from melting reduces the reflection and increases the absorption of sunlight, leading to faster warming; the drying of forests from warming increases forest fires and the release of more carbon; and higher ocean temperatures may lead to the release of methane trapped under the ocean floor, producing runaway global warming. Though there are also avenues for negative feedback, the scientific consensus is for an overall net positive feedback (Roe and Baker, [2007](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0065)). Thus, the Global Challenges Foundation ([2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0026), p. 25) concludes, ‘The world is currently completely unprepared to envisage, and even less deal with, the consequences of CCC’. The threat of sea‐level rising from global warming is well known, but there are also other likely and more imminent threats to the survivability of mankind and other living things. For example, Sherwood and Huber ([2010](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0071)) emphasize the adaptability limit to climate change due to heat stress from high environmental wet‐bulb temperature. They show that ‘even modest global warming could … expose large fractions of the [world] population to unprecedented heat stress’ p. 9552 and that with substantial global warming, ‘the area of land rendered uninhabitable by heat stress would dwarf that affected by rising sea level’ p. 9555, making extinction much more likely and the relatively moderate damages estimated by most integrated assessment models unreliably low. While imminent extinction is very unlikely and may not come for a long time even under business as usual, the main point is that we cannot rule it out. Annan and Hargreaves ([2011](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0004), pp. 434–435) may be right that there is ‘an upper 95 per cent probability limit for S [temperature increase] … to lie close to 4°C, and certainly well below 6°C’. However, probabilities of 5 per cent, 0.5 per cent, 0.05 per cent or even 0.005 per cent of excessive warming and the resulting extinction probabilities cannot be ruled out and are unacceptable. Even if there is only a 1 per cent probability that there is a time bomb in the airplane, you probably want to change your flight. Extinction of the whole world is more important to avoid by literally a trillion times.

### Advantage 3: Degrowth

#### Unconditional Strikes damage businesses, Cramton 99

Peter Cramton, August, 1999, “The Effect of Collective Bargaining Legislation on Strikes and Wages”, University of Maryland, https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.880.1399&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Of all the policy variables, a ban on replacement workers is associated with the largest strike costs. Unconditional strike durations increase by roughly two weeks following a ban on the hiring of replacement workers. The estimated additional strike cost is $1.9 million per contract negotiation. The average wage gain is $3.9 million. Assuming that the strike costs are divided equally, unions gain on average $2.9 million per contract and employers lose over $4.8 million per contract. This is consistent with the considerable and opposing interest unions and employers have shown toward this type of legislation.

#### Stopping growth solves extinction from eco collapse – decoupling is impossible even under perfect conditions, and transition dangers are overhyped

Hickel 18 [Jason Hickel is an anthropologist, author, and a fellow of the Royal Society of Arts. Why Growth Can’t Be Green. Foreign Policy Magazine. September 12, 2018. https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/09/12/why-growth-cant-be-green/]

Warnings about ecological breakdown have become ubiquitous. Over the past few years, major newspapers, including the Guardian and the New York Times, have carried alarming stories on soil depletion, deforestation, and the collapse of fish stocks and insect populations. These crises are being driven by global economic growth, and its accompanying consumption, which is destroying the Earth’s biosphere and blowing past key planetary boundaries that scientists say must be respected to avoid triggering collapse.

Many policymakers have responded by pushing for what has come to be called “green growth.” All we need to do, they argue, is invest in more efficient technology and introduce the right incentives, and we’ll be able to keep growing while simultaneously reducing our impact on the natural world, which is already at an unsustainable level. In technical terms, the goal is to achieve “absolute decoupling” of GDP from the total use of natural resources, according to the U.N. definition.

It sounds like an elegant solution to an otherwise catastrophic problem. There’s just one hitch: New evidence suggests that green growth isn’t the panacea everyone has been hoping for. In fact, it isn’t even possible.

Green growth first became a buzz phrase in 2012 at the United Nations Cosnference on Sustainable Development in Rio de Janeiro. In the run-up to the conference, the World Bank, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and the U.N. Environment Program all produced reports promoting green growth. Today, it is a core plank of the U.N. Sustainable Development Goals.

But the promise of green growth turns out to have been based more on wishful thinking than on evidence. In the years since the Rio conference, three major empirical studies have arrived at the same rather troubling conclusion: Even under the best conditions, absolute decoupling of GDP from resource use is not possible on a global scale.

A team of scientists led by the German researcher Monika Dittrich first raised doubts in 2012. The group ran a sophisticated computer model that predicted what would happen to global resource use if economic growth continued on its current trajectory, increasing at about 2 to 3 percent per year. It found that human consumption of natural resources (including fish, livestock, forests, metals, minerals, and fossil fuels) would rise from 70 billion metric tons per year in 2012 to 180 billion metric tons per year by 2050. For reference, a sustainable level of resource use is about 50 billion metric tons per year—a boundary we breached back in 2000.

The team then reran the model to see what would happen if every nation on Earth immediately adopted best practice in efficient resource use (an extremely optimistic assumption). The results improved; resource consumption would hit only 93 billion metric tons by 2050. But that is still a lot more than we’re consuming today. Burning through all those resources could hardly be described as absolute decoupling or green growth.

In 2016, a second team of scientists tested a different premise: one in which the world’s nations all agreed to go above and beyond existing best practice. In their best-case scenario, the researchers assumed a tax that would raise the global price of carbon from $50 to $236 per metric ton and imagined technological innovations that would double the efficiency with which we use resources. The results were almost exactly the same as in Dittrich’s study. Under these conditions, if the global economy kept growing by 3 percent each year, we’d still hit about 95 billion metric tons of resource use by 2050. Bottom line: no absolute decoupling.

Finally, last year the U.N. Environment Program—once one of the main cheerleaders of green growth theory—weighed in on the debate. It tested a scenario with carbon priced at a whopping $573 per metric ton, slapped on a resource extraction tax, and assumed rapid technological innovation spurred by strong government support. The result? We hit 132 billion metric tons by 2050. This finding is worse than those of the two previous studies because the researchers accounted for the “rebound effect,” whereby improvements in resource efficiency drive down prices and cause demand to rise—thus canceling out some of the gains.

Study after study shows the same thing. Scientists are beginning to realize that there are physical limits to how efficiently we can use resources. Sure, we might be able to produce cars and iPhones and skyscrapers more efficiently, but we can’t produce them out of thin air. We might shift the economy to services such as education and yoga, but even universities and workout studios require material inputs. Once we reach the limits of efficiency, pursuing any degree of economic growth drives resource use back up.

These problems throw the entire concept of green growth into doubt and necessitate some radical rethinking. Remember that each of the three studies used highly optimistic assumptions. We are nowhere near imposing a global carbon tax today, much less one of nearly $600 per metric ton, and resource efficiency is currently getting worse, not better. Yet the studies suggest that even if we do everything right, decoupling economic growth with resource use will remain elusive and our environmental problems will continue to worsen.

Preventing that outcome will require a whole new paradigm. High taxes and technological innovation will help, but they’re not going to be enough. The only realistic shot humanity has at averting ecological collapse is to impose hard caps on resource use, as the economist Daniel O’Neill recently proposed. Such caps, enforced by national governments or by international treaties, could ensure that we do not extract more from the land and the seas than the Earth can safely regenerate. We could also ditch GDP as an indicator of economic success and adopt a more balanced measure like the genuine progress indicator (GPI), which accounts for pollution and natural asset depletion. Using GPI would help us maximize socially good outcomes while minimizing ecologically bad ones.

But there’s no escaping the obvious conclusion. Ultimately, bringing our civilization back within planetary boundaries is going to require that we liberate ourselves from our dependence on economic growth—starting with rich nations. This might sound scarier than it really is. Ending growth doesn’t mean shutting down economic activity—it simply means that next year we can’t produce and consume more than we are doing this year. It might also mean shrinking certain sectors that are particularly damaging to our ecology and that are unnecessary for human flourishing, such as advertising, commuting, and single-use products.

But ending growth doesn’t mean that living standards need to take a hit. Our planet provides more than enough for all of us; the problem is that its resources are not equally distributed. We can improve people’s lives right now simply by sharing what we already have more fairly, rather than plundering the Earth for more. Maybe this means better public services. Maybe it means basic income. Maybe it means a shorter working week that allows us to scale down production while still delivering full employment. Policies such as these—and countless others—will be crucial to not only surviving the 21st century but also flourishing in it.

#### No impact to economic decline – prefer best studies

**Drezner 14** Daniel, IR prof at Tufts, The System Worked: Global Economic Governance during the Great Recession, World Politics, Volume 66. Number 1, January 2014, pp. 123-164

The final significant outcome addresses a dog that hasn't barked: the effect of the Great Recession on cross-border conflict and violence. During the initial stages of the crisis, multiple **analysts asserted** that **the** financial **crisis would lead states to** increase their **use of force** as a tool for staying in power.42 They voiced genuine concern that the global economic downturn would lead to an increase in conflict—whether **through** greater internal repression, **diversionary wars, arms races, or** a ratcheting up of **great power conflict**. Violence in the Middle East, border disputes in the South China Sea, and even the disruptions of the Occupy movement fueled impressions of a surge in global public disorder. **The aggregate data suggest otherwise**, however. The Institute for Economics and Peace has concluded that "**the average level of peacefulness in 2012 is** approximately **the same as** it was in **2007**."43 **Interstate violence** in particular has **declined** since the start of the financial crisis, **as have military expenditures** in most sampled countries. Other **studies confirm** that **the** Great **Recession has not triggered** any increase in **violent conflict**, as Lotta Themner and Peter Wallensteen conclude: "[T]he pattern is one of relative stability when we consider the trend for the past five years."44 The secular decline in violence that started with the end of the Cold War has not been reversed. Rogers Brubaker observes that "**the crisis has not** to date **generated** the surge in **protectionist nationalism or ethnic exclusion** that might have been expected

### Advocacy

#### Thus the plan:

#### Resolved: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike. I reserve the right to answer any questions in CX to avoid friviolous theory.

#### The unconditional right to strike was denied with the shutting down of the NLRA, Bondi 95

Victor Bondi , 1995, "American Decades: 1940-1949," No Publication, <https://www.cengage.com/search/productOverview.do?N=197+4294921854+4294916915+4294904579&amp;Ntk=P_EPI&amp;Ntt=15051676421114137871909840985170930831&amp;Ntx=mode%2Bmatchallpartial>

Durin g the 1930s and World War II, organized labor made progress on many fronts. Various labor unions also formed an alliance with the Democratic Party, then in control, and promoted legislation and government regulation to cement these gains. However, in the 1946 election the Republican Party won control of Congress and set about to eliminate or roll back what they perceived to be the excessive power of labor unions. The Republican controlled Congress passed the Taft-Hartley Act over the veto of President Harry S Truman, reducing or eliminating many labor union advantages provided for in **the National Labor Relations Act of 1935**. These **included** the unconditional closed shop; the checkoff system, which enabled unions to collect dues from all employed members; the **unconditional right to strike at any time;** and immunity from employer lawsuits over breaches of contract and strike damages.

#### The Unconditional Right to Strike is defined in the NLRA as,

[National Labor Relations Board](https://www.nlrb.gov/), [The National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) is comprised of a team of professionals who work to assure fair labor practices and workplace democracy nationwide. Since its creation by Congress in 1935, this small, highly respected, independent Federal agency has had daily impact on the way America's companies, industries and unions conduct business. Agency staff members investigate and remedy unfair labor practices by unions and employers.], xx-xx-xxxx, "NLRA and the Right to Strike," No Publication, https://www.nlrb.gov/about-nlrb/rights-we-protect/your-rights/nlra-and-the-right-to-strike

NLRA and the Right to Strike **The Right to Strike**. Section 7 of the Act states in part, “Employees shall have the right. . . to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.” Strikes are included among the concerted activities protected for employees by this section. Section 13 also concerns the right to strike. It reads as follows: Nothing in this Act, except as specifically provided for herein, shall be construed so as either to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike, or to affect the limitations or qualifications on that right. It is clear from a reading of these two **provisions** that: the law not only guarantees the right of employees to strike, but also **places limitations** and qualifications **on** the exercise of **that right**. **Lawful** and unlawful strikes. The lawfulness of a **strike** may **depend on the object, or purpose, of the strike, on its timing, or on the conduct of the strikers.** The object, or objects, of a strike and whether the objects are lawful are matters that are not always easy to determine. Such issues often have to be decided by the National Labor Relations Board. The consequences can be severe to striking employees and struck employers, involving as they do questions of reinstatement and backpay. Strikes for a lawful object. Employees who strike for a lawful object fall into two classes: economic strikers and unfair labor practice strikers. Both classes continue as employees, but unfair labor practice strikers have greater rights of reinstatement to their jobs. Economic strikers defined. If the object of a strike is to obtain from the employer some economic concession such as higher wages, shorter hours, or better working conditions, the striking employees are called economic strikers. They retain their status as employees and cannot be discharged, but they can be replaced by their employer. If the employer has hired bona fide permanent replacements who are filling the jobs of the economic strikers when the strikers apply unconditionally to go back to work, the strikers are not entitled to reinstatement at that time. However, if the strikers do not obtain regular and substantially equivalent employment, they are entitled to be recalled to jobs for which they are qualified when openings in such jobs occur if they, or their bargaining representative, have made an unconditional request for their reinstatement. Unfair labor practice strikers defined. Employees who strike to protest an unfair labor practice committed by their employer are called unfair labor practice strikers. Such strikers can be neither discharged nor permanently replaced. When the strike ends, unfair labor practice strikers, absent serious misconduct on their part, are entitled to have their jobs back even if employees hired to do their work have to be discharged. If the Board finds that economic strikers or unfair labor practice strikers who have made an unconditional request for reinstatement have been unlawfully denied reinstatement by their employer, the Board may award such strikers backpay starting at the time they should have been reinstated. **Strikes unlawful because of purpose**. A strike may be unlawful because an object, or purpose, of the strike is unlawful. **A strike in support of** a union **unfair labor practice**, or one that would cause an employer to commit an unfair labor practice, may be a strike for an unlawful object. For example, it is an unfair labor practice for an employer to discharge an employee for failure to make certain lawful payments to the union when there is no union security agreement in effect (Section 8(a)(3)). A strike to compel an employer to do this would be a strike for an unlawful object and, therefore, an unlawful strike. Furthermore, Section 8(b)(4) of the Act prohibits strikes for certain objects even though the objects are not necessarily unlawful if achieved by other means. An example of this would be a strike to compel Employer A to cease doing business with Employer B. It is not unlawful for Employer A voluntarily to stop doing business with Employer B, nor is it unlawful for a union merely to request that it do so. It is, however, unlawful for the union to strike with an object of forcing the employer to do so. In any event, employees who participate in an unlawful strike may be discharged and are not entitled to reinstatement. Strikes unlawful because of timing—Effect of no-strike contract. A strike that violates a no-strike provision of a contract is not protected by the Act, and the striking employees can be discharged or otherwise disciplined, unless the strike is called to protest certain kinds of unfair labor practices committed by the employer. It should be noted that not all refusals to work are considered strikes and thus violations of no-strike provisions. A walkout because of conditions abnormally dangerous to health, such as a defective ventilation system in a spray-painting shop, has been held not to violate a no-strike provision. Same—Strikes at end of contract period. Section 8(d) provides that when either party desires to terminate or change an existing contract, it must comply with certain conditions. If these requirements are not met, a strike to terminate or change a contract is unlawful and participating strikers lose their status as employees of the employer engaged in the labor dispute. If the strike was caused by the unfair labor practice of the employer, however, the strikers are classified as unfair labor practice strikers and their status is not affected by failure to follow the required procedure. Strikes unlawful because of misconduct of strikers. Strikers who engage in serious misconduct in the course of a strike may be refused reinstatement to their former jobs. This applies to both economic strikers and unfair labor practice strikers. Serious misconduct has been held to include, among other things, violence and threats of violence. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that a “sitdown” strike, when employees simply stay in the plant and refuse to work, thus depriving the owner of property, is not protected by the law. Examples of serious misconduct that could cause the employees involved to lose their right to reinstatement are: • Strikers physically blocking persons from entering or leaving a struck plant. • Strikers threatening violence against nonstriking employees. • Strikers attacking management representatives.

### Framing

#### The standard is maximizing expected well being. to clarify the aff defends hedonistic act util.

#### Prefer,

#### [1] Death outweighs—agents can’t act if they fear for their bodily security—my framework constrains every NC.

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

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

**Moen 16** [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] SJDI

Let us start by observing, empirically, that **a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that** pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable**.** **On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues.** This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for **there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have.** “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 **The special** value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning **about values.** If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, **I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so**, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but **for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable.** You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” **If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.**3 As Aristotle observes**: “We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.**”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that **pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value.**

#### [4] consequentialism

#### A] No act-omission distinction – choosing to omit is an act itself – people psychologically decide not to act which means being presented with the aff creates a choice between two actions, neither of which is an omission

#### B] No intent-foresight distinction – If we foresee a consequence, then it becomes part of our deliberation which makes it intrinsic to our action since we intend it to happen

### Underview

#### Aff gets 1AR theory to prevent infinite abuse it’s DTD to deter future abuse because it’s the most severe punishment, no RVIs because you can dump on a 30 sec shell for 6 minutes, and competing interps because it creates a race to the top so we set the best norms and reasonability is arbitrary – 1AR theory comes first the 1AR is too short to be able to rectify abuse and adequately cover substance.

#### Procedural fairness first a) probability – one round cant alter subjectivity, but it can rectify fairness skews, b) link turns their role of the ballot since it proves we couldn’t engage in it and it is exclusionary, c) answers are self-defeating since they presuppose the judge evals them fairly.

#### The constitution established the US as a just government, National Archives

National Archives, xx-xx-xxxx, "The Constitution of the United States: A Transcription," https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/constitution-transcript

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

1. **Independent reason to drop the negative debater before the NC: they lied:**
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**They said that they would send a general outline of the neg if i sent the aff, which is why I sent it, but then they didn’t and said it depends on CX. This is completely unfair because they lied, and especially since this is a NEW AFF I wasn’t even obligated to send it and I probably wouldn’t have. This is an independent to drop the debater right NOW because they lied which is unfair for the affirmative, drop to deter future abuse. No RVI, creates chilling effect and were simply being unfair, which is bad for fairness and education. We wouldn’t debate it debate weren’t fair and they perpetuate an unfair debate space, which ruins debate. Ruins education because it gives to easy of a ballot for the neg.**