## 1

#### Interpretation: the affirmative must defend that only just governments ought to recognize the right to strike

#### Just governments respect liberties

Dorn 12 James A. Dorn, Cato Journal, "The Scope of Government in a Free Society", Fall 2012, https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/2012/12/v32n3-10.pdf

If laws are just, liberty and property are secure. The most certain test of justice is negative—that is, justice occurs when injustice (the violation of natural rights to life, liberty, and property) is prevented. The emphasis here is on what Hayek (1967) called “just rules of conduct,” not on the fairness of outcomes. No one has stated the negative concept of justice better than the 19th century French classical liberal Frederic Bastiat ([1850] 1964: 65): When law and force confine a man within the bounds of justice, they do not impose anything on him but a mere negation. They impose on him only the obligation to refrain from injuring others. They do not infringe on his personality, or his liberty or his property. They merely safeguard the personality, the liberty, and the property of others. They stand on the defensive; they defend the equal rights of all. They fulfill a mission whose harmlessness is evident, whose utility is palpable, and whose legitimacy is uncontested. In short, the purpose of a just government is not to do good with other people’s money, but to prevent injustice by protecting property and securing liberty.

#### Violation—the US is not just and is racist

Nellis, Ph.D., 18, Report to the United Nations on Racial Disparities in the U.S. Criminal Justice System, https://www.sentencingproject.org/publications/un-report-on-racial-disparities/, Sentencing Project,

The United States criminal justice system is the largest in the world. At yearend 2015, over 6.7 million individuals1) were under some form of correctional control in the United States, including 2.2 million incarcerated in federal, state, or local prisons and jails.2) The U.S. is a world leader in its rate of incarceration, dwarfing the rate of nearly every other nation.3) Such broad statistics mask the racial disparity that pervades the U.S. criminal justice system, and for African Americans in particular. African Americans are more likely than white Americans to be arrested; once arrested, they are more likely to be convicted; and once convicted, and they are more likely to experience lengthy prison sentences. African-American adults are 5.9 times as likely to be incarcerated than whites and Hispanics are 3.1 times as likely.4) As of 2001, one of every three black boys born in that year could expect to go to prison in his lifetime, as could one of every six Latinos—compared to one of every seventeen white boys.5) Racial and ethnic disparities among women are less substantial than among men but remain prevalent.6) The source of such disparities is deeper and more systemic than explicit racial discrimination. The United States in effect operates two distinct criminal justice systems: one for wealthy people and another for poor people and people of color. The wealthy can access a vigorous adversary system replete with constitutional protections for defendants. Yet the experiences of poor and minority defendants within the criminal justice system often differ substantially from that model due to a number of factors, each of which contributes to the overrepresentation of such individuals in the system. As former Georgetown Law Professor David Cole states in his book No Equal Justice,

#### Prefer –

#### 1] Precision — anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 2] Limits – there are 200 governments in the world – letting them pick an unjust ones explodes limits via infinite permutations of governments

#### 3] Phil ed – 1AR will claim no government is just but that just means that we defend ideal theory. That’s good –

#### A] forces philosophical contestation which can uniquely happen in LD debate whereas you can util debate on any topic

#### B] outweighs – framework debate allows to identify injustice which is a prereq to any other theory voter because they’re all philosophically grounded

#### Fairness- consittutive of comp activites, args presume

#### Edu- funded ny schools

#### DTD- dta illogical, time skew

#### No RVI’s- illogical, baiting

#### CI – intervention, collapses, race to top

#### T first – 1] aff abuse frames neg abuse 2] norming a] set early b] only 2 months to set T norms ow on urgency

## 2

### Metaethic

#### Permissibility and presumption Negate,

#### 1] Text – Ought is defined as expressing obligation[[1]](#footnote-1) which means absent a proactive obligation you vote neg since the aff can’t prove an obligation. O/W since text is the only thing we have access to prior to the round.

#### 2] Safety – It’s ethically safer to presume the squo since we know what the squo is but we can’t know whether the aff will be good or not if ethics are incoherent.

#### 3] Real world – Policymakers don’t pass policies they aren’t sure about, they shelve them for later.

#### Dire situations prove people act on the particular circumstances they are given not to universal norms, Hooft 1

Stan Van Hooft, *understanding* Virtue Ethics, 2006

In contrast, because virtue ethics envisages individuals responding to morally salient situations from out of their well-formed characters, the focus is upon the particularity of those situations. The individual is not described as applying a general principle, but as responding to the particular case. This position has been called “**particularism**”. It **is well illustrated by** the **people of the French village of Le Chambon, who courageously and generously sheltered fleeing Jewish refugees during the Second World War**. **They did so as a simple and direct response to a perceived need in a concrete situation. There are no reports of the villagers consulting general principles or deducing their duties from universal norms.** Even the village pastor took the simple and direct approach, expressive of his Christian commitment, of helping the refugees because they just happened to show up looking for help. **The villagers felt pangs of sympathy for the persecuted, saw that there was something they could do to help, and were motivated to do it.** There is no doubt that these actions could be justified rationally on the basis of moral principles, but the **reports of the events do not record anyone referring to such principles in order to generate a sense of obligation**.

Thus the meta ethic is consistency with particularism

Prefer:

1. Bindingness – Only particularism is binding because we still use it when presented with extreme moral dillemas. Without bindingness ethics has no value since people won’t have any reason to follow the ethic.
2. Normativity – Broad general principles aren’t normative because they don’t guide action in instances where two duties conflict i.e. returning a book VS saving a baby. Resolving this conflict concedes to the validity of particularism because it proves duties aren’t universally binding. Normativity is necessary for ethics because not being able to act would freeze action and prevent future action.

### Framing

#### Because we live in particular frames of reference, the other is constituitively unknowable. The other interrupts our ability to think about the world and waits for a response which makes us obligated to respect them, Morgan 2

Michael L. Morgan, March 21, 2011, "The Cambridge Introduction to Emmanuel Levinas" No Publication, https://www.amazon.com/Cambridge-Introduction-Emmanuel-Levinas/dp/0521193028

**I skip to Levinas’s main idea**:9 this solitude of the I inhabiting the world is shattered or interrupted. **The I is not alone; there is an other person whose face I confront and experience**. In Time and the Other, Levinas puts it this way: “… **the Other is what I myself am not. The Other is this, not because of the Other’s character, or physiognomy, or psychology, but because of the Other’s very alterity**. **The Other is, for example, the weak, the poor, ‘the orphan and the widow,’ whereas I am the rich or the powerful**.”10 In social life, I am always confronted by another particular person, who is near or far, friend or foe, present or absent, but always in the world with me and more importantly over against me **or before me**. **This person is different from me fundamentally – prior to considering her features or character, her height, complexion, her features, or the color of her hair, her humor and mood, whatever. She is a person like me, but because her perspective, her experiences, are inaccessible to me, she is radically separated from me and different from me.** And her difference is all about what she imposes upon me simply in virtue of being there, before me. **What she imposes is dependence and need, integrity and demand**. **Her presence, before it says anything else to me, says “let me live,” “let me be here too,” “feed me,” “allow me to share the world and be nourished by it too.” I am imposed upon, called into question, beseeched and commanded, and thereby I am responsible, Levinas says.** In Totality and Infinity, Levinas says: “I must have been in relation with something I do not live from.” This relation occurs as an “encounter [with] the indiscrete face of the Other that calls me into question. The Other … paralyzes possession, which he contests by his epiphany in the face.… I welcome the Other who presents himself in my home by opening my home to him.”11 **My thinking about the world and understanding it is also, in this way, like my inhabiting and enjoying what nature provides me, interrupted. Something outside or prior to my thinking confronts me: it is the demand and need of another person, of each and every other person. In this way, I am responsible before I am an observer or explainer or interpreter; I am, in a sense, a moral agent before I am a cognitive one**. Levinas even associates this “epiphany of the face of the other” or encounter with the other person’s need and demand with “language.” What **he means is that words, communication, and speech all arise out of and are embedded in a prelinguistic relationship of encounter between myself and a particular other person**. This relationship, moreover, has an ethical character; it is a relationship with the other **person’s “face,” not with her appearance or features or whatever; it is with the fragility and dependence on me of her very being**.

#### Limiting the other to a set of categories destroys the obligation to the other by closing off our unique connection to them and turning them into another object which we just impose meaning upon.

#### Thus the Standard is preventing the totalization of the other. This is a side constraint to all other frameworks since other theories presuppose a connection with the other to generate obligations.

#### Prefer additionally:

#### [1] Value Pluralism – only my framework explains why people have conflicting values because we experience the world through a subjective lense. That means the framework hijacks all others since proving your fw true doesn’t disprove mine.

### Offense

#### 1] The aff violates particularism,

#### A] The US legal dictionary defines unconditional as,

Us Legal, Inc., xx-xx-xxxx, "Unconditional Law and Legal Definition," No Publication, https://definitions.uslegal.com/u/unconditional/

**Unconditional means** without conditions; **without restrictions; or absolute**. For instance, unconditional promise is a promise that is unqualified in nature. A party who makes an unconditional promise must perform that promise even though the other party has not performed according to the bargain.

#### That can’t be particular because it doesn’t take into account exceptions.

#### B] I have no idea what countries, sectors, govenrments, etc. the aff applies too which proves its not particular

#### 2] The aff is a form of totalization saying workers all should strike when each worker lives in different circumstances and don’t all want to be grouped in and stereotyped as a striker or rioter.

#### 3] The affs notions of freedom through striking are self defeating and totalizing as they treat everyone the same, Only through labor can the self recognize it’s existence, Achtenberg 16

Achtenberg, Deborah, 2016-12-31, "Essential Vulnerabilities," No Publication, https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/29703/1000242.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

What is this, however, but freedom? According to Levinas, “freedom denotes the mode of remaining the same in the midst of the other” (TI 45/16). “Such is the definition of freedom,” Levinas says, “to maintain oneself against the other, despite every relation with the other to ensure the autarchy of an I [moi]” (TI 46/16). Separation is freedom, then, since separation is accomplished in enjoyment and enjoyment is taking in contents but remaining distinct from them. In enjoying contents, I make them my own. I transmute the other into the same. Such “imperialism of the same is the whole essence of freedom” (TI 87/59). How, concretely, do I maintain myself as a self (a psychism, an ego) while living from what is not myself? That is, how do I, concretely, maintain my freedom? I do so in a home. A home both protects me from what is outside and enables me to connect to and utilize it. In a home, I withdraw from the elements in which I have been immersed—elements that are indefinite (apeiron) and thus threatening—and recollect myself. Interiority, in other words, is accomplished in a home. The home breaks “the plenum of the element” (TI 156/130), and it does so without isolating me. The dwelling remains open to the element from which it separates. It is both removal and connection (TI 156/131). The window concretely makes the ambiguity of removal and connection possible. Enjoyment is sensibility. It is prior to consciousness and comprehension: “‘anterior’ to the crystallization of consciousness, I and non-I, into subject and object” (TI 188/162). Its function is not objectification, not even a “fumbling objectification [objectivation qui se cherche]” (TI 187/161), but a “transcendental function” (TI 188/163). Enjoyment is “by essence satisfied” (TI 187/161). It is an “immediate relation” (TI 158/131). In it, sensibility is “steeped in the element” (TI 158/131) and “‘possesses’ without taking” (TI 158/131). Enjoyment can, however, move into objectification with vision or the gaze: “objectification operates in the gaze in a privileged way” (TI 188/163). Vision and representation move into grasp, specifically, into touch and labor: “The connection between vision and touch, between representation and labor, remains essential. Vision moves into grasp” (TI 191/165). Unlike enjoyment, vision is not transcendental but is horizonal or perspectival: “Vision opens upon a perspective, upon a horizon, and describes a traversable distance, in- freedom 63 vites the hand to movement and to contact, and ensures them” (TI 191/165). Concretely, when I look through the window of a home, I am not immersed in elements but gain some distance on them so that I can grasp the elemental and labor (TI 158/131). The laboring hand that grasps, Levinas says, “takes and comprehends” (prend et comprend) (TI 161/135). The hand that comprehends “is mastery, domination, disposition,” and these “do not belong to the order of sensibility” (TI 161/135). In grasping or comprehending, the hand postpones the future through possessing, storing, protecting, and so on: “Possession masters, suspends, postpones the unforeseeable future of the element—its independence, its being” (TI 158/132). Labor “in its possessive grasp suspends the independence of the elements” (TI 158/132). The suspension is comprehension or ontology: “in this suspension possession comprehends the being of the existent” (TI 158/132). “The thing evinces this hold or comprehension—this ontology” (TI 158/132). The postponement or separation takes place in the body, which is “the very regime in which separation holds sway” (TI 163/137). But there, as with enjoyment, there is an ambiguity in the mastery of freedom: “To be a body is on the one hand to stand [se tenir], to be master of oneself, and, on the other hand, to stand on the earth, to be in the other, and thus to be encumbered by one’s body” (TI 164/138). The ambiguity is simultaneously one “of sovereignty and of submission” (TI 164/138). This simultaneous ambiguity is consciousness: “The ambiguity of the body is consciousness” (TI 165/139). Comprehension and consciousness, then, evince a higher degree of freedom on the atheist stage. Enjoyment is the ambiguity of independence through dependence on another. Comprehension or consciousness is the increased freedom of postponement and comprehension which ambiguously takes place within suffering. The freedom found within consciousness, comprehension, and ontology delineates clearly the second stage of development according to Levinas as well as taking us into the central concepts of Totality and Infinity. The first stage is the stage of the il y a or immersion in the totality, in which there is no clear distinction between I and not-I. The second stage is the stage of atheism or interiority, in which there is objectification and ontology. Ontology, as Levinas says in a crucial passage, is the intelligence of beings, which promotes freedom by reducing the other to the same. Intelligence is “the logos of being—that is, a way of approaching the known being such that its alterity with regard to the knowing being vanishes. The process of cognition is at this stage identified with the freedom of the knowing being encountering nothing which, other with respect to it, could limit it” (TI 42/12). “Ontology, which reduces the other to the same, promotes freedom—the freedom that is the identification of the same, not allowing itself to be alienated by the other” (TI 64 freedom 42/13). Ontology, then, postpones being that affects it, objectifies being and reduces it to the same. Consciousness is not mere reflection or reception but is, from the very first, active and resistant. The resistance takes place through enjoyment, postponement, objectification, and reduction of the other to the same. What I enjoy becomes me (my contents, my contentment). What I comprehend is brought into my horizon (my perspective). This, for Levinas, is freedom on the atheist stage. It takes place first through enjoyment and then through comprehension, intelligence, or knowledge. Knowledge is the height of this type of freedom: “If freedom denotes the mode of remaining the same in the midst of the other, knowledge, where an existent is given by interposition of impersonal Being, contains the ultimate sense of freedom” (TI 45/16). But there is a way of relating besides knowledge and a level of development beyond interiority, namely, the social stage on which I accept that there is something—someone—other than me, separate from me, radically exterior to me. Hence the subtitle of the book, An Essay on Exteriority. By sociality, Levinas means relating to an other without assuming the other to myself, that is, without either enjoying the other, and thus transmuting the other into my contents, or knowing the other by bringing the other into my own horizon. On the social stage, I do not reduce the other to the same but welcome the other, where welcoming is not sensibility or comprehension but a different type of response. With sociality, I cease ontologizing. I do not see the other as an object. Instead, sociality is metaphysics: “Metaphysics, transcendence, the welcoming of the other by the same, of the Other by me” (TI 43/13). Metaphysics is transcendental not atheistic. It welcomes the other rather than being all about the self. It is exteriority not interiority or immersion. With sociality, metaphysics, transcendence, exteriority, we attain a new level of freedom, a grounded or founded freedom not an arbitrary one. It is because Levinas believes there is a metaphysical stage that he can be a philosopher of the other. Metaphysics “is concretely produced as the calling into question of the same by the other” (TI 43/13). What is called into question, more specifically, is my freedom. Ontology, we have seen, reduces the other to the same and promotes freedom. Metaphysics “calls into question the freedom of the exercise of ontology” (TI 43/13). Metaphysics is critique: “critique does not reduce the other to the same as does ontology, but calls into question the exercise of the same” (TI 43/13). The calling into question cannot occur within the free self turned in on itself. Instead, the other brings it about: “A calling into question of the same—which cannot occur within the egoist spontaneity of the same—is brought about by the other” (TI 43/13). freedom 65 Reason is the manifestation of arbitrary freedom since, as Levinas regularly maintains, thought and reason know themselves: “That reason in the last analysis would be the manifestation of a freedom, neutralizing the other and encompassing him, can come as no surprise once it was laid down that sovereign reason knows only itself ” (TI 43/14). The manner in which this arbitrary freedom of the interiority stage takes place is through understanding the other by way of a concept or a theme, through understanding the other as an object. I reduce the other to the same, and in so doing produce my arbitrary freedom “by interposition of a middle and neutral term that ensures the intelligence of being” (TI 43/13).

## 3

#### The stock market is trending upwards but it’s uncertain – blips aren’t enough to disprove the general trend and recent developments prove.

Miao and Macheel 10/21 [Tanaya and Hannah; 10/21/21; Reporter at CNBC, Associate Markets Reporter, graduated summa cum laude from Duke University with a degree in public policy; “S&P 500 slips from record, but heads for winning week on strong earnings,” CNBC, <https://www.cnbc.com/2021/10/21/stock-market-futures-open-to-close-news.html>] Justin

The S&P 500 edged lower a day after the benchmark closed at a record. The broad market index fell 0.3% while the Dow Jones Industrial Average added 12 points, or 0.03%, helped by a 4% rise in shares of American Express, which reported strong quarterly earnings Thursday. Meanwhile, the Nasdaq Composite shed 1% after poor results from two technology companies. Shares of Intel retreated more than 10% following a weaker-than-expected sales report. The semiconductor company blamed an industry-wide chip shortage for its revenue miss. Social media stocks also dropped after Snap said its advertising business declined due to Apple’s privacy changes. Snap shares sunk more than 23%. Facebook and Twitter pulled back 4% and 3%, respectively. However, several tech stocks rose to all-time highs. Tesla shares extended their rally, rising 1% after hitting a new intraday high earlier in the morning. The stock closed 3% higher Thursday after posting record profit and revenue, along with strong margins. Netflix, Ebay and Microsoft also climbed to new all-time highs. Despite the blips in the tech sector, overall earnings season has been terrific so far, boosting the broader market back to an all-time high following a two-month lull. So far for the third quarter earnings season, 84% of the 117 companies that have reported have beat analysts’ earnings estimates, according to Refinitiv. Profits are on pace in the quarter to increase 34.8%, according to Refinitiv. “After a 5% rally on seven green days in a row for the S&P it makes some sense for the market to consolidate,” said Cliff Hodge, Cornerstone Wealth’s chief investment officer, adding that disappointing results from Intel and IBM and hawkish comments from Federal Reserve chair Jerome Powell on inflation and policy tightening “are adding some jitters.” “The setup into year-end looks great given the liquidity dynamics on corporate buybacks,” Hodge said, “but longer term there are still the unresolved headwinds of valuation, the transition to mid-cycle in the economy, and a tightening Fed that may prove challenging now that we’re back at all-time highs.” S&P 500 posts new record Stephen Kolano, CIO for BNY Mellon Investor Solutions, added that although the S&P 500 is up 20% for the year, things may still seem a little uncertain for investors looking toward the end of the year due to cost pressures, labor shortages and commentary from company management on earnings calls and comments from Fed chair Jerome Powell and other policymakers. “You’re starting to see some profit taking as a result of that,” Kolano told CNBC. “Where investors are going first and foremost is the companies that have run the fastest, which is a lot of the tech.” In Thursday’s regular session, the S&P 500 notched both a fresh intraday high and new record close. The broad index rose 0.3% for its seventh consecutive positive session. The Nasdaq Composite rose 0.6%, while the Dow shed 6.26 points, or 0.02%. All three major averages are on track to close the week higher for three straight weeks of gains. The Dow touched an intraday record earlier in the week. On the month, the Dow and S&P are up 5% while the Nasdaq is up 4%. “In a quarter where we thought things would slow down and there was concern about what profit margins were going to look like, these companies are still doing well,” said Victoria Fernandez, chief market strategist at Crossmark Global Investments. Strong jobs data also added to the positive market sentiment on Thursday. Initial jobless claims fell to a new pandemic low of 290,000 last week, the Labor Department reported Thursday — down 6,000 from the previous week and lower than the 300,000 expected from economists surveyed by Dow Jones. One of investors’ fears during the market’s recent struggles was a China property crisis. However, investors got good news on that front overnight with China’s Evergrande reportedly paying a key interest payment that was due to foreign bondholders, staving off a default for the property developer.
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#### The right to strike signals a victory for the union. Best data proves union strike victories statistically cause stock market crash.

Lee and Mas 12 [David; Princeton University and National Bureau of Economic Research; Alexandre; Princeton University and National Bureau of Economic Research; “Long-Run Impacts of Unions on Firms: New Evidence from Financial Markets, 1961–1999,” The Quarterly Journal Of Economics; February 2012; <https://academic.oup.com/qje/article-abstract/127/1/333/1834007?redirectedFrom=fulltext>] Justin

We begin analyzing the stock market reaction to union victories using event-study methodologies. The most distinctive feature of our data—crucial for our research design—is the long panel (up to 48 months before and after the election) of high frequency data on stock market returns for each firm. This feature allows us to use the pre-event data to test the adequacy of the benchmarks used to predict the counterfactual returns in the postevent period. The long panel also allows us to examine returns several months beyond the event, so as to capture the long-run expected effects of new unions, without having to rely heavily on the assumption that the stock price immediately and instantaneously adjusts to capture the expected presence of the unions.9

Our event-study analysis reveals substantial losses in market value following a union election victory—about a 10% decline in market value, equivalent to about $40,500 per unionized worker. According to our calculations, if unionization represented a one-to-one transfer from investors to workers through higher wages, this magnitude would be in line with a union wage premium of 10%. Because the total loss of market value represents the sum of transfers to workers and any other productivity impacts of unionization this implies, for example, that if the true union compensation premium were greater than 10%, there would be positive productivity effects of unions. The evidence supporting our event-study estimates is compelling: we find that these firms’ average returns are quite close to the benchmark returns every month leading up to the election, but precisely at the time of the election, the actual and benchmark returns diverge. The results for these firms are robust to a number of different specifications. In the sample of firms where we know that the union is a small fraction of the workforce, we donot find a similar divergence of returns from the benchmark.

Importantly, we find that the effect takes 15 to 18 months to fully materialize, a somewhat slow market reaction. As we discuss, this short-run mispricing can persist if exploiting the slow reaction is not sufficiently profitable to arbitrageurs. Indeed, our own analysis shows that strategies designed to exploit the mispricing entail a significant degree of fundamental risk. The fact that union victories are sufficiently rare and spread throughout time prevents the necessary diversification that could generate an attractive arbitrage opportunity. For example, our analysis suggests that attempts to exploit the short-lived mispricing would lead to a portfolio that would be dominated by simple buy-and hold strategies

The event-study estimate appears to average a great deal of heterogeneity in the effects. We additionally employ a regression discontinuity (RD) design, implicitly comparing close union victories to close union losses, and consistent with DiNardo and Lee (2004), we find little evidence of a significant discontinuous relationship between the vote share and market returns. If anything, the RD point estimates show a 4% positive (though statistically insignificant) effect of union certification (vis-`a-vis union defeat). The event-study estimates vary systematically by the observed vote share, with the largest negative abnormal returns for cases where the union won the election by a large margin.

#### The next market crash causes economic collapse – conditions are ripe for failure.

Vallejo 10/4 [Justin; 10/4/21; Citing personal finance expert Robert Kiyosaki; “‘Biggest crash in world history’: Personal finance expert Robert Kiyosaki predicts economic crisis in October,” Independent, <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/robert-kiyosaki-market-crash-october-b1930754.html>] Justin

"This is going to be the biggest crash in world history. We have never had this much debt pumped up… the debt to GDP ratio is out of sight," Mr Kiyosaki said. Mr Kiyosaki said the stock market was being artificially inflated by the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve with decisions disconnected from the realities of the current economy in the United States. The reason why Ms Yellen and Mr Powell are "scrambling", he said, is they’ve expanded the volume of money while the velocity of money is plummeting as no one spends and their cash lingers in savings. Mr Kiyosaki said people don’t have to go to Harvard University to understand that "you can’t keep printing fake money … that’s not good". "So they pump all this money in, prices go up," he told Kitco News on Wednesday. "So it is transitory inflation, but we’re stacked with this massive debt and all it’s done is bump up the stock market and real estate market." "The money has not gone into the economy, that’s the sad part. So the rich get richer, but the poor and middle class are getting poorer. It’s tragic what’s happening today." He added earlier that the "house of cards" is coming down and that real estate would crash with the stock market, while the impact from China’s Evergrande Group implosion would spread to the United States. Evergrande, the second-largest developer in China, is on the brink of bankruptcy with more than $300bn in debt – the most indebted company in the world.

#### Economic Collapse goes Nuclear.

Tønnesson 15, Stein. "Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace." International Area Studies Review 18.3 (2015): 297-311. (the Department of Peace and Conflict, Uppsala University, Sweden, and Peace research Institute Oslo (PRIO), Norway)

Several recent works on China and Sino–US relations have made substantial contributions to the current understanding of how and under what circumstances a combination of nuclear deterrence and economic interdependence may reduce the risk of war between major powers. At least four conclusions can be drawn from the review above: first, those who say that interdependence may both inhibit and drive conflict are right. Interdependence raises the cost of conflict for all sides but asymmetrical or unbalanced dependencies and negative trade expectations may generate tensions leading to trade wars among inter-dependent states that in turn increase the risk of military conflict (Copeland, 2015: 1, 14, 437; Roach, 2014). The risk may increase if one of the interdependent countries is governed by an inward-looking socio-economic coalition (Solingen, 2015); second, the risk of war between China and the US should not just be analysed bilaterally but include their allies and partners. Third party countries could drag China or the US into confrontation; third, in this context it is of some comfort that the three main economic powers in Northeast Asia (China, Japan and South Korea) are all deeply integrated economically through production networks within a global system of trade and finance (Ravenhill, 2014; Yoshimatsu, 2014: 576); and fourth, decisions for war and peace are taken by very few people, who act on the basis of their future expectations. International relations theory must be supplemented by foreign policy analysis in order to assess the value attributed by national decision-makers to economic development and their assessments of risks and opportunities. If leaders on either side of the Atlantic begin to seriously fear or anticipate their own nation’s decline then they may blame this on external dependence, appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, contemplate the use of force to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately refuse to be deterred by either nuclear arms or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. Such a dangerous shift could happen abruptly, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party. Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. The greatest risk is not that a territorial dispute leads to war under present circumstances but that changes in the world economy alter those circumstances in ways that render inter-state peace more precarious. If China and the US fail to rebalance their financial and trading relations (Roach, 2014) then a trade war could result, interrupting transnational production networks, provoking social distress, and exacerbating nationalist emotions. This could have unforeseen consequences in the field of security,

## Case

### Solvency

#### Plan flaw - they said US not US government

#### If in order for a government to be just it must recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike, then any aff that is inherent is not currently a just government which means it doesn’t prove the truth of the resolution.

Baca says tech workers strike in squo which means either an unconditional right isn’t key or strikes fail

#### Missing IL in the aff about passing right to strike and strikes actually increasing

### Adv1

#### Infrastructure passed, that’s their internal link to spillover it says “infrastructure drama” Grayer 11-6

[Annie Grayer, Manu Raju and Clare Foran, Cnn, 11-6-2021, "Congress passes $1.2 trillion bipartisan infrastructure bill, delivering major win for Biden", CNN, https://www.cnn.com/2021/11/05/politics/house-votes-infrastructure-build-back-better/index.html, date accessed 11-6-2021] //Lex AT

(CNN)Congress has passed [a $1.2 trillion bipartisan infrastructure bill](http://www.cnn.com/2021/07/28/politics/infrastructure-bill-explained/index.html), delivering on a major pillar of President Joe Biden's domestic agenda after months of internal deliberations and painstaking divisions among Democrats.

#### Also rejoining paris which is in your ev thumps leadership and means US I already spilling over

#### Extinction from warming requires 12 degrees, far greater than their internal link, and intervening actors will solve before then

Sebastian Farquhar 17, master’s degree in Physics from the University of Oxford, leads the Global Priorities Project (GPP) at the Centre for Effective Altruism, et al., 2017, “Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance,” https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf

The most likely levels of global warming are very unlikely to cause human extinction.15 The existential risks of climate change instead stem from tail risk climate change – the low probability of extreme levels of warming – and interaction with other sources of risk. It is impossible to say with confidence at what point global warming would become severe enough to pose an existential threat. Research has suggested that warming of 11-12°C would render most of the planet uninhabitable,16 and would completely devastate agriculture.17 This would pose an extreme threat to human civilisation as we know it.18 Warming of around 7°C or more could potentially produce conflict and instability on such a scale that the indirect effects could be an existential risk, although it is extremely uncertain how likely such scenarios are.19 Moreover, the timescales over which such changes might happen could mean that humanity is able to adapt enough to avoid extinction in even very extreme scenarios.

### Adv 2

#### No global sprint or arms race – aff claims overexaggerate normal military behavior and ignore actual spending.

Perry and Scharre '20 [Lucas and Paul; 3/16/20; Project Coordinator at the Future of Life Institute; Senior Fellow and Director of the Technology and National Security Program at the Center for a New American Security; "AI Alignment Podcast: On Lethal Autonomous Weapons with Paul Scharre," https://futureoflife.org/2020/03/16/on-lethal-autonomous-weapons-with-paul-scharre/?cn-reloaded=1]//GJ

Paul Scharre: If there’s an arms race, it’s a very strange one because no one is building the weapons. We see militaries advancing in robotics and autonomy, but we don’t really see sort of this rush to build autonomous weapons. I struggle to point to any programs that I’m aware of in militaries around the globe that are clearly oriented to build fully autonomous weapons. I think there are lots of places where much like these incremental advancements of autonomy in cars, you can see more autonomous features in military vehicles and drones and robotic systems and missiles. They’re adding more autonomy. And one might be violently concerned about where that’s going. But it’s just simply not the case that militaries have declared their intention. We’re going to build autonomous weapons, and here they are, and here’s our program to build them. I would struggle to use the term arms race. It could happen, maybe worth a starting line of an arms race. But I don’t think we’re in one today by any means.

It’s worth also asking, when we say arms race, what do we mean and why do we care? This is again, one of these terms, it’s often thrown around. You’ll hear about this, the concept of autonomous weapons or AI, people say we shouldn’t have an arms race. Okay. Why? Why is an arms race a bad thing? Militaries normally invest in new technologies to improve their national defense. That’s a normal activity. So if you say arms race, what do you mean by that? Is it beyond normal activity? And why would that be problematic? In the political science world, the specific definitions vary, but generally, an arms race is viewed as an increase in defense spending overall, or in a particular technology area above normal levels of modernizing militaries. Now, usually, this is problematic for a couple of reasons. One could be that it ends up just in a massive national expenditure, like during the case of the Cold War, nuclear weapons, that doesn’t really yield any military value or increase anyone’s defense or security, it just ends up net flushing a lot of money down the drain. That’s money that could be spent elsewhere for pre K education or healthcare or something else that might be societally beneficial instead of building all of these weapons. So that’s one concern.

#### No impact even if there is one – militaries won’t deploy risky tech too early.

Horowitz '19 [Michael; 8/22/19; Professor of Political Science and the Associate Director of Perry World House at the University of Pennsylvania, PhD in Government from Harvard University; “When speed kills: Lethal autonomous weapon systems, deterrence and stability”, Journal of Strategic Studies, Vol. 42, Issue 42, p. 767-788]//GJ

Another risk is that competitive dynamics mean countries will accelerate their weapons development cycles and deploy LAWS before fully testing them, due to a fear of falling behind. This would essentially resolve the trust dilemma in a way that makes accidents more likely.61 Given concern that LAWS could be more prone to accidents, such a development would be especially dangerous. This risk of an LAWS arms race causing countries to take short cuts in weapons development seems unlikely, however. Militaries want weapons they can control (excluding potential exceptions noted above), and they are unlikely to approve of deploying weapon systems they view as less able to accomplish a mission, or more likely to put their own forces in danger, than alternatives. Thus, the incentive to deploy effective systems will hedge at least somewhat against short-cuts in the weapons development process. Moreover, public awareness about the risks of AI could play a role in shaping how militaries consider deploying AI systems, even in a competitive scenario. Fear of AI should lead most militaries to be more careful, rather than less careful, in the testing and development of LAWS. The pressure to stay ahead will compete with the pressure to deploy effective systems.

1. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)