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#### Interpretation: “workers” is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend that a just government recognizes a specific group of workers unconditional right to strike

Nebel 19. [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs. He writes a lot of this stuff lol – duh.] “Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution.” Vbriefly. August 12, 2019. <https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/?fbclid=IwAR0hUkKdDzHWrNeqEVI7m59pwsnmqLl490n4uRLQTe7bWmWDO_avWCNzi14> TG

Both distinctions are important. Generic resolutions can’t be affirmed by specifying particular instances. But, since generics tolerate exceptions, plan-inclusive counterplans (PICs) do not negate generic resolutions.

Bare plurals are typically used to express generic generalizations. But there are two important things to keep in mind. First, generic generalizations are also often expressed via other means (e.g., definite singulars, indefinite singulars, and bare singulars). Second, and more importantly for present purposes, bare plurals can also be used to express existential generalizations. For example, “Birds are singing outside my window” is true just in case there are some birds singing outside my window; it doesn’t require birds in general to be singing outside my window.

So, what about “colleges and universities,” “standardized tests,” and “undergraduate admissions decisions”? Are they generic or existential bare plurals? On other topics I have taken great pains to point out that their bare plurals are generic—because, well, they are. On this topic, though, I think the answer is a bit more nuanced. Let’s see why.

“Colleges and universities” is a generic bare plural. I don’t think this claim should require any argument, when you think about it, but here are a few reasons.

First, ask yourself, honestly, whether the following speech sounds good to you: “Eight colleges and universities—namely, those in the Ivy League—ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions. Maybe other colleges and universities ought to consider them, but not the Ivies. Therefore, in the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions.” That is obviously not a valid argument: the conclusion does not follow. Anyone who sincerely believes that it is valid argument is, to be charitable, deeply confused. But the inference above would be good if “colleges and universities” in the resolution were existential. By way of contrast: “Eight birds are singing outside my window. Maybe lots of birds aren’t singing outside my window, but eight birds are. Therefore, birds are singing outside my window.” Since the bare plural “birds” in the conclusion gets an existential reading, the conclusion follows from the premise that eight birds are singing outside my window: “eight” entails “some.” If the resolution were existential with respect to “colleges and universities,” then the Ivy League argument above would be a valid inference. Since it’s not a valid inference, “colleges and universities” must be a generic bare plural.

Second, “colleges and universities” fails the [upward-entailment test](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#IsolGeneInte) for existential uses of bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Lima beans are on my plate.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some lima beans on my plate. One test of this is that it entails the more general sentence, “Beans are on my plate.” Now consider the sentence, “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” (To isolate “colleges and universities,” I’ve eliminated the other bare plurals in the resolution; it cannot plausibly be generic in the isolated case but existential in the resolution.) This sentence does not entail the more general statement that educational institutions ought not consider the SAT. This shows that “colleges and universities” is generic, because it fails the upward-entailment test for existential bare plurals.

Third, “colleges and universities” fails the adverb of quantification test for existential bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Dogs are barking outside my window.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some dogs barking outside my window. One test of this appeals to the drastic change of meaning caused by inserting any adverb of quantification (e.g., always, sometimes, generally, often, seldom, never, ever). You cannot add any such adverb into the sentence without drastically changing its meaning. To apply this test to the resolution, let’s again isolate the bare plural subject: “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” Adding generally (“Colleges and universitiesz generally ought not consider the SAT”) or ever (“Colleges and universities ought not ever consider the SAT”) result in comparatively minor changes of meaning. (Note that this test doesn’t require there to be no change of meaning and doesn’t have to work for every adverb of quantification.) This strongly suggests what we already know: that “colleges and universities” is generic rather than existential in the resolution.

#### It applies to “workers” – 1] upward entailment test – “a just government ought to recognize workers unconditional right to strike” doesn’t entail that a just government ought to recognize peoples unconditional right to strike because it doesn’t prove that all people should strike, 2] adverb test – adding “always” to the res doesn’t substantially change its meaning because recognition is unconditional.

#### Violation: They spec \_\_\_\_\_\_

#### Standards:

#### [1] precision – the counter-interp justifies them arbitrarily doing away with random words in the resolution which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution. Independent voter for jurisdiction – the judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote aff if there wasn’t a legitimate aff.

#### [2] Limits and ground – their model allows affs to defend anything from teachers to doctors to the police— there's no universal DA since each has different functions and political implications — that explodes neg prep and leads to random worker of the week affs which makes cutting stable neg links impossible — limits key to reciprocal engagement since they create a caselist for neg prep and it takes out ground like DAs to certain occupations which are some of the few neg generics when affs spec occupations.

#### [3] TVA solves – you could’ve read your plan as an advantage under a whole res advocacy.

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation. Outweighs because it’s the only intrinsic part of debate – all other rules can be debated over but rely on some conception of fairness to be justified.

#### Drop the debater – a] deter future abuse and b] set better norms for debate.

#### Competing interps – [a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm, [b] it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate.

#### No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices

## 2

#### Interp: Debaters must disclose round reports on the 2021-22 NDCA LD wiki for every round they have debated this tournament. Round reports disclose which positions (AC, NC, K, T, Theory, etc.) were read/gone for in every speech.

#### Violation: screenshot in the doc – they have only done it for r1

Graphical user interface, application

Description automatically generated

#### Standards:

#### 1] Level Playing Field – big schools can go around and scout and collect flows but independents are left in the dark so round reports are key to prep- they give you an idea of overall what layers debaters like going for so you can best prepare your strategy when you hit them. Accessibility first and independent voter – it’s an impact multiplier

#### 2] Strategy Education – round reports help novices understand the context in which positions are read by good debaters and help with brainstorming potential 1NCs vs affs – helps compensate for kids who can’t afford coaches to prep out affs.

CA paradigm issues

## 3

#### The stock market is booming despite corona – consumer confidence is soaring.

Ziemer 21 [Colin; New York Stock Exchange; The author may be wrong cuz it was placed under a picture so idk if it was the author or picture creds, if not assume DealBook as the author; “What is going on?” Dealbook | Business and Policy; NYTimes; 8/19/20, Updated 5/7/21; <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/19/business/dealbook/stock-market-record-high.html>] Justin

‘This market is nuts’

The S&P 500 is 0.1 percent higher than it was six months ago, setting a record at the close of trading yesterday. That doesn’t seem so momentous — until you consider what happened in between: The blue-chip index shed a third of its value in the early stages of the pandemic and then roared back, soaring more than 50 percent from its low in late March.
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What gives? A new market record may seem strange when set against the human and economic devastation of the pandemic. (Or as one analyst put it: “This market is nuts.”). As Andrew explains in a guest appearance in The Morning, our sister newsletter, there are five major considerations that investors are making to justify the rally:

1️⃣ Looking past bad news today and anticipating better conditions 12 to 18 months from now

2️⃣ The continued good fortunes of a few big tech companies

3️⃣ An almighty market pop that would arise from news of a vaccine breakthrough

4️⃣ An accommodating Fed printing money and keeping rates low

5️⃣ The hope that Congress overcomes its divisions and pumps the economy with more stimulus

Can it last? “Markets often operate as something of an experiment in mass psychology,” The Times’s Matt Phillips writes. So what could dampen the mood? • The market is very top-heavy, with just five companies — Alphabet, Amazon, Apple, Facebook and Microsoft — accounting for more than a fifth of the S&P 500’s market value. Those tech giants have gained around 40 percent so far this year, while the 495 other stocks in the index have collectively lost a few percentage points. • Another potentially ominous sign comes from company insiders, who have been selling their holdings in greater numbers. The data platform AlphaSense sifted through regulatory filings for DealBook and found that disclosures of executive stock sales so far this month have already surpassed last month’s total, and are on track to beat the record set in February, when the market set its previous high. Here’s what is happening In case there was any doubt, Joe Biden has been confirmed as the Democratic presidential nominee. He was formally nominated by the party last night at the party’s national convention. Also onscreen: Former President Bill Clinton and Jill Biden rejected President Trump’s handling of the pandemic, Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez highlighted progressive priorities in her cameo appearance, and other Democrats focused on improving health care. Tonight’s agenda includes Senator Elizabeth Warren (more on her below), former President Barack Obama and Senator Kamala Harris, Mr. Biden’s running mate. Cost-cutting measures at the Postal Service were put on hold. Postmaster General Louis DeJoy announced that operational changes, which drew criticism for causing mail delays and for potentially affecting voting by mail, would now take place after the November elections. A Senate panel found extensive links between the 2016 Trump campaign and Russia. The Republican-led Senate Intelligence Committee released a nearly 1,000-page report concluding that some Trump advisers maintained extensive contacts with Russian intelligence officials who sought to disrupt the 2016 election.

The shipping giant A.P. Moller-Maersk raised profit expectations. The world’s biggest container company not only reinstated full-year financial guidance, but pegged it above pre-pandemic levels, a sign that international trade may not be as bad as feared (provided there isn’t a second wave of the virus, the company noted). The Danish company’s shares jumped more than 7 percent in early trading today.

C.E.O. pay reached a seven-year high. The left-leaning Economic Policy Institute found that leaders of the 350 largest American companies earned an average of $21.3 million last year, setting the ratio of C.E.O.-to-worker pay at 320-to-1. Rising stock markets could propel executives’ pay to similarly high levels again this year, despite pandemic-inspired cuts to salaries, which tend to be a small proportion of C.E.O.’s stock and option-based pay packages.

SPACs are so hot right now Another day, another flurry of news about so-called special-purpose acquisition companies, the publicly traded M.&A. machines that are Wall Street’s hot new craze. (How hot? These “blank check” firms have raised more than $30 billion so far this year, according to SPAC Research, compared with $13.6 billion in all of 2019.) Another electric vehicle maker went public by merging with a SPAC. Canoo, which sells van-like vehicles that require a subscription, announced plans to merge with Hennessy Capital Acquisition Corp IV to gain a stock listing. It’s the fourth electric vehicle company to pursue this route, after Nikola, Lordstown Motors and Fisker. More SPACs have been founded, featuring some prominent names: • Starboard Value, the activist hedge fund, announced plans to raise $300 million, following in the footsteps of Bill Ackman and Dan Loeb. • Bill Foley, a longtime financier with plenty of experience with SPACs, raised $1.3 billion, increasing the size of the deal by $100 million. • And Kevin Hartz, the co-founder of Eventbrite, raised $200 million for a new SPAC to buy a tech start-up. Mr. Hartz explained to DealBook the thinking behind his SPAC, and how he’s dealing with the competition. Consumer internet companies, marketplaces and fintech start-ups are on his radar, and the fund’s smaller size allows it to target younger companies with founders that he wants to take a bet on, much like the traditional venture model. Indeed, he is banking on his relationships with venture funds and start-up founders around Silicon Valley to stand out in an increasingly crowded field. (In addition to founding Eventbrite, Mr. Hartz was an early investor in Airbnb and Uber.) • What, in his mind, is driving the SPAC boom? Strong equity markets are helping SPAC deals get done quickly despite pandemic-imposed travel restrictions. “We had our first org meeting with Goldman Sachs on June 18 — we retained our lawyer then — and 60 days later we’re now a public entity in the market ready to go,” Mr. Hartz told Lauren Hirsch, our new DealBook reporter. How to spend it As lockdowns ease, where people are opening their wallets shows how the pandemic is reshaping spending habits. Check out this series of infographics assembled by The Times using location-tracking data from smartphones for state- and store-level details of shopping activity. The revenge of brick-and-mortar retailers. In-store shopping is still (mostly) down from pre-pandemic times, forcing retailers with physical locations to up their online game. For some, that has paid off handsomely: Target reported its strongest sales growth in history this morning, propelled by digital sales that nearly tripled in its most recent quarter. That followed Walmart’s blowout earnings yesterday, in which its U.S. online sales doubled. • New nationwide e-commerce data also reflects this trend, with retailers that sell online as well as in store (Walmart and Target) growing faster than their online-only counterparts (Amazon). As of June, online-only retailers accounted for 55 percent of overall e-commerce sales in the U.S., according to the Census Bureau.

Look out ahead. Walmart executives said that government stimulus was the main “tailwind” driving the jump in sales: They mentioned “stimulus” 13 times on their call with analysts yesterday. Keeping up that red-hot sales streak might depend on lawmakers negotiating a new round of unemployment insurance and support measures, which is shaping up to be less generous than before. “As stimulus funds tapered off toward the end of the quarter, sales started to normalize,” Brett Biggs, Walmart’s C.F.O., said on the call.

#### 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.

#### Crashes lead to a great depression.

Rusoff 21 [Jane; ThinkAdvisor Contributing Editor specializing in interviews with thought leaders. She has written for The New York Times, The Washington Post, USA Today and Esquire, among numerous other publications. Author/co-author of five books, Jane was a staff editor at London Express Features and Billboard’s Merchandising Magazine; “Harry Dent: ‘Biggest Crash Ever’ Likely by End of June,” ThinkAdvisor; 3/10/21; <https://www.thinkadvisor.com/2021/03/10/harry-dent-biggest-crash-ever-likely-by-end-of-june/>] Justin

Why will the downturn that you see be so harsh?

The only reason the 2008 downturn didn’t turn into a depression was that they turned on the monetary spigots so hard and blew us out of it, which kept the bubble going. They kept printing money and put it off. Now we’ve got a bigger bubble. This downturn is going to be the Great Depression that the deep recession of 2008 was [falling into].

How long do you think the depression will last?

If the economy finally falls apart after this much stimulus, economists will flip from being endlessly bullish to endlessly bearish. They’ll say, “Now we’re in a decade-long-plus depression, like the 1930s.” But I’ll say, “Nope, this thing will be hell: It’s going to do its work very fast. By 2024, it will be over.” By 2023 or 2024, we’re going to be coming out of it into what I call the next Spring Boom.

Right now, you favor investing in Treasury bonds. What’s your strategy?

Man, what’s better than sleeping with 30-year Treasury bonds — the safest investment in the reserve currency of a country that’s in big trouble — but not as much as Europe and Japan are in and nowhere near as much as China is in. We’re in the best house in a bad neighborhood.

What will happen to the 30-year Treasury bond during the massive crash you foresee?

It’s going to fall to half a percent and maybe zero. It will expand your money 30%, 40%, 50%, while stocks are crashing 70%, 80%, 90%. Real estate will go down 30%, 40%, 50%. Commodities are already down 50% and are going down another 30% or 40%. Everything is going to default. Cash will preserve your money. The 30-year Treasury will magnify your money.

So, do you think 50% of an investment portfolio should be in Treasurys?

If you’re willing to take more risk, you’ll have one bucket in long-term U.S. Treasury bonds and maybe in a few other good governments, like Sweden or Australia. Triple-A corporates could go in there too. Then you’ll have another bucket — of short stocks, not leveraged.

Stocks are very volatile on the way down. You can also be in REITs that are in very solid areas, like multi-family housing in affordable cities and medical facilities because those will hold up the best.

There’s a discernable euphoria now among investors. But John Templeton, the renowned investor and fund manager, famously said that “bull markets die on euphoria.” Do you agree with that?

Yes. And Jeremy Grantham [GMO co-founder] said [on Jan. 5] this level of euphoria means you’re within months — not years — of a major bubble peak. You’re at the end.

Wil cryptocurrency be part of that huge crash?

Yes. I think Bitcoin is the big thing long term and that crypto and blockchain is a big trend. It’s like the internet of finance — money and assets — instead of information. So it’s a big deal — but in its early stages.

Bitcoin is going to go to 58 [thousand], 60, 80 — and then end up back at 3,000 to 4,000. I would buy it long term, a couple of years from now. I wouldn’t touch it between now and then.

What are your expectations for the economy once the pandemic substantially fades?

Some industries are never going to come back. We’re not back to where we were before COVID — by GDP or any other major indicator. Everybody is acting like “When we get over COVID, we’ll be back better than ever.” The stock market is already anticipating that. But it’s wrong.

The only reason people are spending is because the government handed businesses and consumers tons of money. But it will get to a point where it’s not going to matter how much money is printed — and then you’ll have an avalanche. A huge collapse is coming.

What specifically will cause it?

There’s is no way you can [keep] having fake earnings, fake GDP, fake interest rates and super-high valuations. Financial assets have to come down to reality.

What are the implications?

Loans will fail by the boatload. Then money disappears. That causes bank and business failures. We have to get all the financial leverage, financial assets and debt out of our economy.

Twenty percent of public companies are zombies. They can’t even pay their debt service in a growth economy. They’re already dead. We’ve just keeping them alive with embalming.

#### Extinction.

Liu '18 [Qian; 11/13/18; Managing Director of Greater China for The Economist Group, previously director of the global economics unit and director of Access China for the Economist Intelligence Unit, PhD in economics from Uppsala University; "The next economic crisis could cause a global conflict. Here's why," <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/the-next-economic-crisis-could-cause-a-global-conflict-heres-why/>] Justin

The next economic crisis is closer than you think. But what you should really worry about is what comes after: in the current social, political, and technological landscape, a prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising income inequality, could well escalate into a major global military conflict. The 2008-09 global financial crisis almost bankrupted governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the global economy back from the brink, using massive monetary stimulus, including quantitative easing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates. But monetary stimulus is like an adrenaline shot to jump-start an arrested heart; it can revive the patient, but it does nothing to cure the disease. Treating a sick economy requires structural reforms, which can cover everything from financial and labor markets to tax systems, fertility patterns, and education policies. Policymakers have utterly failed to pursue such reforms, despite promising to do so. Instead, they have remained preoccupied with politics. From Italy to Germany, forming and sustaining governments now seems to take more time than actual governing. And Greece, for example, has relied on money from international creditors to keep its head (barely) above water, rather than genuinely reforming its pension system or improving its business environment. The lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented excess liquidity that central banks injected into their economies was not allocated to its most efficient uses. Instead, it raised global asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008. In the United States, housing prices are now 8% higher than they were at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, according to the property website Zillow. The price-to-earnings (CAPE) ratio, which measures whether stock-market prices are within a reasonable range, is now higher than it was both in 2008 and at the start of the Great Depression in 1929. As monetary tightening reveals the vulnerabilities in the real economy, the collapse of asset-price bubbles will trigger another economic crisis – one that could be even more severe than the last, because we have built up a tolerance to our strongest macroeconomic medications. A decade of regular adrenaline shots, in the form of ultra-low interest rates and unconventional monetary policies, has severely depleted their power to stabilize and stimulate the economy. If history is any guide, the consequences of this mistake could extend far beyond the economy. According to Harvard’s Benjamin Friedman, prolonged periods of economic distress have been characterized also by public antipathy toward minority groups or foreign countries – attitudes that can help to fuel unrest, terrorism, or even war. For example, during the Great Depression, US President Herbert Hoover signed the 1930 Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, intended to protect American workers and farmers from foreign competition. In the subsequent five years, global trade shrank by two-thirds. Within a decade, World War II had begun. To be sure, WWII, like World War I, was caused by a multitude of factors; there is no standard path to war. But there is reason to believe that high levels of inequality can play a significant role in stoking conflict. According to research by the economist Thomas Piketty, a spike in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Income inequality then declines for a while, before rising again, until a new peak – and a new disaster. Though causality has yet to be proven, given the limited number of data points, this correlation should not be taken lightly, especially with wealth and income inequality at historically high levels. This is all the more worrying in view of the numerous other factors stoking social unrest and diplomatic tension, including technological disruption, a record-breaking migration crisis, anxiety over globalization, political polarization, and rising nationalism. All are symptoms of failed policies that could turn out to be trigger points for a future crisis. Voters have good reason to be frustrated, but the emotionally appealing populists to whom they are increasingly giving their support are offering ill-advised solutions that will only make matters worse. For example, despite the world’s unprecedented interconnectedness, multilateralism is increasingly being eschewed, as countries – most notably, Donald Trump’s US – pursue unilateral, isolationist policies. Meanwhile, proxy wars are raging in Syria and Yemen. Against this background, we must take seriously the possibility that the next economic crisis could lead to a large-scale military confrontation. By the logic of the political scientist Samuel Huntington , considering such a scenario could help us avoid it, because it would force us to take action. In this case, the key will be for policymakers to pursue the structural reforms that they have long promised, while replacing finger-pointing and antagonism with a sensible and respectful global dialogue. The alternative may well be global conflagration.

## 4

#### Counterplan text: All just governments except for the United States should recognize an unconditional right to strike for workers.

#### The fifty states and appropriate territories of the United States should ratify a cooperative horizontal federalism model interstate compact to recognize an unconditional right to strike for teachers.

#### The counterplan solves and creates a cooperative horizontal federalism model – the perm also fails

Hall, 6 [Noah D., Assistant Professor, Wayne State University Law School, “Toward a New Horizontal Federal Interstate Water Management in the Great Lakes Region,” <https://www.greatlakeslaw.org/blog/files/Hall_Colorado.pdf>, Corrigan]

For over one hundred years, federal and state governments have struggled with management of the Great Lakes. A vast resource shared by two countries, ten states and provinces, and hundreds of Indian tribes and First Nations, the Great Lakes are a quintessential commons that have seen their share of tragedies. Addressing the potentially competing pressures of economic development and environmental protection is only part of the challenge. The real struggle has been in governance: How is management of an international transboundary resource best accomplished under the legal and political limitations of constitutional federalism? This question is not unique to the Great Lakes. With the federal government stepping back (or being pushed back) from environmental protection, states need to explore new options for managing regional resources and environmental problems that cross political boundaries. A proposal being considered by the Great Lakes states and provinces takes a new approach to interstate environmental protection. Under the proposed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin Water Resources Compact1 and companion Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin Sustainable Water Resources Agreement,2 the world’s largest freshwater resource would be protected and managed pursuant to minimum standards administered primarily under the authority of individual states and provinces. The proposed compact and agreement put riparian water use rules and environmental protection standards into a proactive public law regime in eight states and two Canadian provinces. The standards represent numerous advances in the development of water use law, including uniform treatment for ground and surface water withdrawals, water conservation, return flow, and prevention of environmental impacts. The significance of the proposed compact and agreement goes far beyond water law and the Great Lakes region. What has been proposed is a new federalist model for creating common state environmental standards to protect interstate natural resources. The model can be termed “cooperative horizontal federalism.” Cooperative horizontal federalism is an approach in which states jointly develop common minimum legal standards (substantive and/or procedural) to manage a shared resource, but leave the individual states with the flexibility and autonomy to administer those standards under state law. In the context of Great Lakes water management, cooperative horizontal federalism provides a mechanism for the states to craft regional minimum standards to govern water withdrawals, while allowing states to develop individual programs tailored to their specific needs. The discretion given to states is not absolute; they are subject to programmatic review and enforcement by their peers. Under this approach, the regulatory standards, programmatic obligations, and enforcement mechanisms come from the states’ obligations to each other, not from a congressional mandate. This cooperative horizontal federalism model for interstate environmental protection creates a third option to federal and individual state policymaking.

#### Lack of new horizontal federalism framework undermines national stability and escalates conflict

Gerken and Holtzblatt, 14 [Heather K., “Dean and Sol & Lillian Goldman Professor of Law at Yale Law School, and Ari, Partner, Wilmer Hale, practice focuses on appellate and government and public policy litigation, “The Political Safeguards of Horizontal Federalism,” Michigan Law Review, p. Jstor, Corrigan]

Spillovers and Democracy Other scholars worry that spillovers threaten our democracy. Some fear that they undermine national unity. Professor Zimmerman has offered the most comprehensive social-science account of interstate conflict, devoting an entire book to identifying the best means for promoting cooperative state relations.42 Erbsen has offered the most detailed account of this concern on the law side, going so far as to catalogue eight sources of "constitutionally significant interstate friction."43 Nor are these scholars alone. The worry that the friction generated by spillovers can threaten national unity has become something of a trope in the literature.44 In the worst case, the worry is that interstate tension will lead to violent confrontation, whether on a mass scale, as with the Civil War, or on a more limited basis, as with armed border skirmishes.45 Even tensions that do not escalate to violence are thought to be prob lematic. Some commentators, like Erbsen, worry that such tensions might encourage citizens to identify more with their state or region than with the nation and thus generate "entrenched regionally-defined factions that would undermine national stability" over time.46 Others worry about maintaining interstate relations.47 Metzger, for instance, argues that unchecked poli cymaking spillovers in "contexts of sharp public contestation" can threaten "interstate harmony."48 She writes, for instance, that "states' fears that they would be forced to recognize same-sex marriages absent DOMA . . . could have led to interstate strife."49 Spillovers, then, bring to the fore all the wor ries about the centrifugal effects of federalism. A number of scholars worry that spillovers violate a different set of democratic values: those having to do with state sovereignty.50 As we detail in Part IV, sovereignty is a stand-in for a larger set of concerns about state autonomy, equality among the states, territoriality, and self-rule. These prin ciples amount to something of a mantra in the horizontal federalism litera ture and are regularly invoked, separately and together, in much of the work on the subject even by those who don't use similar tendency within the doctrinal silos that fall within the ambit of hori zontal federalism.52 Spillovers impinge on state sovereignty by depriving a state of full control over its territorial domain. These arguments also tap into a deeply intuitive concern about territori ality and self-rule. We worry about spillovers because they prevent citizens within a state from exercising control over their own destinies. In essence, spillovers allow the representatives of one state's citizens to tell another's what to do.53

#### Internal war escalates and turns biological and nuclear

**Donahue 2018 [**Chris, Editor for the Carolina Political Review, Guns will not save us from Tyranny, Carolina Political Review, March 31, <https://www.carolinapoliticalreview.org/editorial-content/2018/3/31/guns-will-not-save-us-from-tyranny>, Abe Corrigan]

In the event of an actual revolt among the American people, the government would be fighting for its own self preservation and there would be no restraint from the military. As we’ve seen in historical examples of tyrannical governments battling civil revolts, the hunger for self preservation drives excessive force, horrific atrocities, and disregard for civilian lives. Look to the Spanish Civil War in the 1930’s and the bombing of Guernica, or the more recent Syrian Civil War, in which civilians have been gassed in chemical attacks and entire cities turned into battlegrounds.

Rierson fails to recognize the desperation of an all out war for survival, and so the argument that the government may decide that winning is “more trouble than it's worth” doesn’t apply. With the trillion dollar military industrial complex behind the government, along with the rest of the world’s elite who depend on the status quo of the US government, a fight to the bitter end would be worth every penny.

I’m willing to grant Rierson that the fight may not end immediately, but modern technologies like nuclear and biochemical weapons make this kind of war for self-preservation unwinnable. The last time the United States fought directly for its survival was World War II, and it ended very poorly for its opponent. Even if a revolt against the US was successful, there would be nothing left to claim victory over but rubble. To return to President Eisenhower, on the topic of nuclear weapons he once said, “You cannot have this type of war. There just aren’t enough bulldozers to scrape the bodies off the streets.”

#### Turns case – Interstate compacts are the best solution for climate change – helps overcome industry opposition

Curley, 2015 [Michael, Visiting Scholar with the Environmental Law Institute, “A Role for Interstate Compacts in Coastal Resilience and Climate Change Mitigation,” Environmental Law Reporter, accessed through Hein Online, Corrigan]

The Benefits of Collaboration All three initiatives have the regulatory power to mandate greenhouse gas emissions abatement within their jurisdictions, but their long-term viability could be greatly enhanced if they coordinate their efforts. (42) There is little question that encompassing a greater diversity of sources will foster a more robust market for allowances. (43) Including more sources in the market will increase flexibility and minimize costs by enabling firms to find the lowest cost methods and locations of abatement. (44) Additionally, as the defeat of ACES revealed, the initiatives will face adamant opposition from industry and hostile political forces; therefore collaboration is critical, as political capital pooled by a larger community of states would have greater potential to overcome such opposition. (45) Aside from increasing the likelihood of initiative survival, a larger collaboration of states might also facilitate the transfer of technology and ideas, while enhancing the competitiveness and cost-efficiency of abating greenhouse gas emissions in the United States. (46) There are strong signals that coordination between the regional initiatives will continue to grow. First, both WCI and the Midwest Accord appear to have integrated a number of the lessons learned from RGGI, the first initiative of this type, into their own regulatory frameworks. This influence is well documented in the WCI and the Midwest Accord's regulatory designs and is made explicitly clear in some of their founding documents. (47) Most importantly, the shared characteristics of the initiatives' cap-and-trade programs could greatly ease a future integration, especially because their procedural and functional similarities will facilitate the registration, tracking, and trade of allowances across the initiatives. Second, in May 2010 the three initiatives joined their resources to create the Three-Regions Offsets Working Group, which released a white paper on how best to design and implement an interregional program to ensure the quality of offsets. (48) This action is significant because it signals that the initiatives share a "common vision" and may work towards a mechanism that will allow parties in any initiative to develop interchangeable offset projects in another initiative's jurisdiction. (49)