# 2AC---Kentucky RR---Round 7

## Civil Service

### Civil Service---2AC

#### Civil service outweighs:

#### Governance is key to cool-headed policymaking in the face of food shocks, pandemics, and environmental crises. That’s Shulman.

#### Err aff: it’s the only check against opaque risks we don’t know are coming.

### Diplomacy---2AC

#### Diplomacy checks extinction:

#### It defuses tensions in hotspots like Ukraine and Taiwan that otherwise go nuclear and spills over to cooperation on arms control, terror, and Arctic security. That’s Kimmage.

### Warming---2AC

#### Warming causes extinction:

#### Tipping points cause runaway heating that break the prerequisite systems for life and forces geoengineering, risking escalatory weather wars. That’s Ripple.

### Trump---2AC

#### Trump causes extinction:

#### Weakened cooperation makes us more vulnerable to every threat, while his aggression draws us into wars. He’s also combative and unpredictable, undermining deterrence and causing miscalc. That’s Öniş.

### Corruption---2AC

#### Corruption causes extinction:

#### It collapses institutional legitimacy, wreaks havoc on the environment, and causes instability and terror. That’s Berkebile and Vernard.

### Meltdowns---2AC

#### Nuclear meltdowns cause extinction:

#### It causes cascading systemic and environmental failures, disrupting food and the basic preconditions for life. That’s Bonacic.

### Cyberattacks---2AC

#### Cyberattacks cause extinction:

#### 1. Miscalc. Security officials misperceive them as attacks on nuclear systems, causing escalation. That’s Acton.

#### 2. Grid collapse. Lack of energy devastates every type of infrastructure and interconnected systems. That’s Heyes.

## OFF

### T-Subsets---2AC

#### Counter-interp: subsets affs are topical.

#### a) Aff ground. They rob the aff of subset-specific advantage ground and makes PICs compete.

#### b) Predictability. Labor law has never covered every worker. Their interp says ‘CBR for workers’ doesn’t exist in the status quo.

Sarah Anzia & Jessica Trounstine 24. Professor of public policy and political science at the University of California, Berkeley. Professor of political science at Vanderbilt University. "Building a Movement: The Parallel Paths of Public- and Private-Sector Unions in Early 20th Century America." University of California, Berkeley. 9/3/2024. gspp.berkeley.edu/assets/uploads/research/pdf/Anzia\_Trounstine\_PublicPrivateUnions\_09\_04\_24.pdf

Many scholars have noted these divergent trends and pointed to the very different legal structures governing labor-management relations in the private and public sectors as an important contributor. The NLRA of 1935 explicitly excludes the public sector from coverage (NLRA 1935, Sec.2. [§152.]). Government employees did not have similar legal protections as private-sector employees until decades later, and even then (for state and local workers) only at the state level, when during the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, most states passed laws requiring government employers to recognize and collectively bargain with unions of their employees. From this, a conventional wisdom emerged that public- and private-sector unionization developed along separate paths—and that before the 1960s, organizations of government employees remained small, weak, and ineffective.

#### c) Reasonability. ‘Limits first’ races to nowhere.

#### No offense: functional limits like states, process, employment law, and natural limits check aff quantity, while legal disads and politics solve ground.

### AT: Workers

#### ‘Workers’ mean any worker. It’s the plural of ‘worker!’

Ramona Manglona 24. Chief district judge for the Northern Mariana Islands. "Lilles v. J.C. Tenorio Enter." 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 114723.

B. The Workforce Act (48 U.S.C. § 1806(d))

After the CNRA was enacted, Congress passed other legislation adding to and amending CW-1 permit petition requirements. Relevant to this case is the July 24, 2018, passage of the 2018 U.S. Workforce Act, Pub. L. 115-218 (2018), 48 U.S.C. § 1806(d), which amended the CNRA's provisions. The Act made four major changes to the transition program that are pertinent to this case. First, the CW-1 permit may be valid for up to three years. 48 U.S.C. § 1806(d)(7)(B). Second, the Act now requires employers to apply to the U.S. Secretary of Labor ("SOL") for a temporary labor certification ("TLC") confirming that (1) there are insufficient U.S. workers

<Footnote begins>

"The term 'United States worker' means any worker who is-- (A) a citizen or national of the United States; (B) an alien who has been lawfully admitted for permanent residence; or (C) a citizen of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, or the Republic of Palau (known collectively as the 'Freely Associated States') who has been lawfully admitted to the United States pursuant to-- (i) section 141 of the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States and the Governments of the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia (48 U.S.C. 1921 note); or (ii) section 141 of the Compact of Free Association between the United States and the Government of Palau (48 U.S.C. 1931 note)." 48 U.S.C. § 1806(i)(6).

<Footnote ends>

willing, able, and qualified to perform the services and (2) the nonimmigrant worker's employment would not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed U.S. workers. Id. § 1806(d)(2)(A)(i).

### --AT: ILO

#### **ILO has no intent to define generally.**

ILO 81 – International Labor Organization, 1981, “Report VI (1): Safety and Health and the Working Environment,” International Labor Conference, 67th Session, https://webapps.ilo.org/public/libdoc/ilo/1980/80B09\_513\_engl.pdf

5. For the purpose of the proposed instrument-

(a) the term " branches of economic activity " includes work in the public service ;

(b) the term " workers " means all employed persons, including public employees ;

(c) the term "workplace" should cover all places where workers need to be or to go by reason of their work and which are under the direct or indirect control of the employer ;

(d) the term "regulations" should cover all provisions given force of law by the competent authority or authorities.

#### It also says subsets are permitted.

ILO 81 – International Labor Organization, 1981, “Report VI (1): Safety and Health and the Working Environment,” International Labor Conference, 67th Session, <https://webapps.ilo.org/public/libdoc/ilo/1980/80B09_513_engl.pdf>

The Government members of Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom submitted an amendment proposing to introduce in this Point also the possibility of the partial exclusion of certain categories of workers. As a similar amendment to Paragraph 3(2) had already been adopted with respect to branches of economic activity, no objection was raised to this amendment, which was adopted.

### AT: In

#### We meet ‘in.’ The plan applies to all federal workers in the U.S.

**‘In’ means within.**

Carlos Bea 21. Federal Court of Appeals Judge for the Ninth Circuit. "Salisbury v. City of Santa Monica." Westlaw. 998 F.3d 852

“It is a **fundamental canon** that where the ‘statutory text is plain and unambiguous,’ a court ‘must apply the statute according to its terms.’” Wheeler v. City of Santa Clara, 894 F.3d 1046, 1054 (9th Cir. 2018) (quoting Carcieri v. Salazar, 555 U.S. 379, 387, 129 S.Ct. 1058, 172 L.Ed.2d 791 (2009)). The relevant operative language of the FHAA bars discrimination “in the sale or rental” of a dwelling, “in the terms, conditions, or privileges of sale or rental of a dwelling,” and “in the provision of services or facilities in connection with such dwelling.” 42 U.S.C. § 3604(f)(1)–(2) (emphases added). The preposition “in” limits the scope of the preceding term “[w]ithin the limits or bounds of” the “place or thing” that **follows**. Oxford English Dictionary (2d ed. 1989); see also Simonoff v. Expedia, Inc., 643 F.3d 1202, 1206 (9th Cir. 2011) (“The **word** ‘in’ **means** to ‘express[ ] **relation** of presence, existence, situation, inclusion ...; inclosed or surround by limits, as in a room.’” (citation omitted)). The prohibitions and duties enumerated in the following subsection, 42 U.S.C. § 3604(f)(3), modify the meaning of “[t]o discriminate” in the preceding subsections and are subject to the same “sale” or “rental” limitation.

### T-CBR---2AC

#### 1. We meet.

#### a) Textually. Plan in a vacuum is most objective and checks positional competition.

#### b) Functionally. [xxx]

#### 2. Counter-interp. We can give rights to excluded workers.

#### ‘Collective bargaining rights’ require good faith bargaining to the point of impasse. This is the ‘universally recognized’ definition.

Harry Edwards 85. Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit. Amalgamated Transit Union Int'l v. Donovan, 1985 U.S. App. 1985. Lexis.

[\*950] In sum, Congress struck a delicate balance in section 13(c). The statute provides that state law should govern the labor relations of public transit authorities and their employees, but it conditions federal transit aid, in part, on the continuation of collective bargaining rights. In setting out those rights, Congress chose not to incorporate the entire structure and requirements of the NLRA into section 13(c), for to do so would force states to choose between federal transit aid and their exclusion from the coverage of the NLRA. On the other hand, Congress made it clear that federal labor policy would dictate the substantive meaning of collective bargaining for purposes of section 13(c). "Good faith" bargaining, to a point of impasse if necessary, over wages, hours and other terms and conditions of employment has always been the essence of federally-defined collective bargaining rights; indeed, excluding the federal sector, it is the almost universally recognized definition of collective bargaining in the United States.

#### ‘Strengthen’ means to make stronger.

Merriam Webster 25, 5-16-2025, "Definition of STRENGTHEN", No Publication, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/strengthen

: to make stronger

intransitive verb

: to become stronger

#### 3. Prefer it.

#### a) Predictability. “Universally recognized” definitions in law are key to prep. [xxx]

#### b) Overlimiting. [xxx].

#### c) Functional Limits. Employment Law CP, Cap K, the Econ DA solve.

#### 4. Reasonability. ‘Limits first’ races to nowhere.

### Prez Powers DA---2AC

#### Perm do both

#### Perm plan and The Supreme Court should grant cert in a test case and hold the will of congress supersedes the executive.

#### Condo is a voting issue. Kicking if perms or theory induces argumentative accountability, deepening research and solving time and strategy skew.

#### 1. No link: their evidence is about swift responses to military crises, but the aff doesn’t strike down the national security exemption. Instead, the plan says that Trump improperly classified workers. That’s Finkin.

<For Reference>

Rather than rely on findings and explanations that are not supported by data, we can better understand the impact of arbitration on national security from the text of the FSLMRS and from cases applying it. The EO’s abrogation of collective bargaining and grievance arbitration is predicated on the claim that, in an agency with a primary function in national security, even if not the dominant function, the obligation to bargain collectively with unions imposes inflexibility that threatens national security, irrespective of the work these employees do. However, by operation of law, the FSLMRS in 5 U.S.C. § 7112(b)(6) already prohibits a bargaining unit from including “any employee engaged in intelligence, counterintelligence, investigative, or security work which directly affects national security.” The FLRA has provided extensive interpretation of the meaning of subsection (b)(6)’s exemptions.

#### Which means the aff is targeted and excludes workers that actually matter for flexibility.

Nicolas Handler 25. Associate Professor of Law at Texas A&M. “Unpacking Trump’s Attack on Federal Sector Unions.” 4/29/25 https://www.lawfaremedia.org/article/unpacking-trump-s-attack-on-federal-sector-unions.

In addition, the unions could argue that, contrary to the requirement of Section 7103(b), collective bargaining rights can “be applied to” the targeted agencies “in a manner consistent with national security requirements and considerations.” Indeed, all of these agencies have been engaged in collective bargaining for decades, under presidents of both parties, without any apparent interference with national security. It is possible that in some cases the agencies’ missions or priorities have changed such that they are now more central to national security than they used to be. For instance, the list of targeted agencies includes Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), which is poised to play an important role in the administration’s border security policy. The administration’s fact sheet, among other examples, notes that ICE’s CBA has created roadblocks to amending the agency’s cybersecurity policy. But it is less apparent why other agencies, like the Veterans Administration or the Food and Drug Administration, cannot continue under their existing contracts without impairing national security.

#### The aff’s workers are irrelevant for flex, the DA’s thumped, and agencies can void CBAs during emergencies.

Ronald Sanders & Robert Tobias 25. Former director of civilian personnel for the Defense Department and chief human resources officer for the IRS. Associate director for HR strategy at the Office of Personnel Management. "Federal collective bargaining is in the U.S. national interest." Government Executive. 8/29/2025. govexec.com/management/2025/08/federal-collective-bargaining-us-national-interest/407791

Executive Order 14251 simply fails to make a case

Here’s our rationale. Executive Order 14251, cited above, as well as his more recent Aug. 27 order, lists those agencies that POTUS has now declared as having “...as their primary function intelligence, counterintelligence, investigative, or national security work” as enumerated in the 1978 Civil Service Reform Act’s title VII, the Federal Labor Management Relations Statute. And the vast majority of those agencies currently have collective bargaining agreements with the unions representing their employees.

Thus, despite literally decades to the contrary—with workplace disputes effectively resolved via the CSRA—the president’s order would preclude employees in cabinet departments and executive agencies from Commerce to Agriculture and Labor to Veterans Affairs from participating in collective bargaining, including the likes of VA nurses, Social Security claims examiners, IRS customer service representatives, National Park Service rangers, analysts with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases and more. Why? Because POTUS asserts that bargaining over their terms and conditions of employment (just as their private sector counterparts and even their contractors do), would allegedly impact our national security.

But neither the EO and its accompanying fact sheet, nor the president’s most recent action, explain how those federal employees, all currently represented by labor organizations, fit the national security criteria in existing law. In our view, a president’s bare and bold declaration that the criterion is applicable, made without any explanation whatsoever, is not convincing enough to supersede that law. We also note that employees in the CIA, National Security Agency and FBI, whose position descriptions describe their national security work, have been validly excluded from participating in collective bargaining for years, by President Carter’s 1979 Executive Order 11271.

Interestingly, those federal employees who may actually impact national security—such as law enforcement officers like uniformed Border Protection personnel in the Department of Homeland Security, whose union has been a strong and vocal supporter of President Trump—are not covered by any such national security exclusion. So says the fact sheet accompanying EO 14251. Why are those employees allowed to bargain and VA nurses, CDC analysts, IRS customer service representatives, etc., are not?

The president’s executive orders are a solution in search of a problem.

The 1978 CSRA already provides two complementary procedures to prevent “national security” from invading the sphere of federal collective bargaining.

First, if an agency believes that a union proposal directly or indirectly impedes national security, it can declare that proposal “non-negotiable” and thereafter, it can simply refuse to bargain any further on that proposal. If the union disagrees with that agency’s non-negotiability determination, it can file a negotiability appeal with the Federal Labor Relations Authority, an agency established by the 1978 CSRA, and have it adjudicated. And if it loses, it may appeal to the federal courts.

Moreover, if there’s a national security exigency, Section 7106(a)(2)(D) of that same 1978 CSRA states an agency may “take any actions that may be necessary to carry out the agency mission in the case of an emergency,” including superseding the terms of an existing collective bargaining agreement. Thus, if an unexpected but bona fide national security issue emerges and impedes an agency’s operation because of its collective bargaining obligations, that agency can declare an emergency and act.

But the president’s orders cite no specific national security threat or incident, past, present or future. Thus, they are unnecessary.

#### 2. 60 years of federal bargaining thump.

#### 3. A unitary executive is bad and prevents solutions to existential threats.

Kevin Frazier 25. AI Innovation and Law Fellow at The University of Texas School of Law. “Effective Governance and the Executive.” 6/11/25. https://lawliberty.org/forum/effective-governance-and-the-executive/

Effective Governance and the Unitary Executive

The primary blind spot in Rogers’s piece rests with his selection of constitutional principles to defend the unitary executive; he omits effective governance. In my own work on the right to effective governance, I argue that “early Americans shared a belief that the underlying purpose of the government was to advance the well-being of the governed.” That belief informed the decision to abandon the flawed Articles of Confederation and adopt a structure more aligned with the social, economic, and political realities of the day. Rogers failed to explore whether a unitary executive, in practice, has advanced the general welfare. As an aside, effective governance need not and should not have a partisan valence—it merely refers to the capacity of the government to address the essential purposes for having a central authority, such as coordinated international and economic policy, provision of national defense, protection against invasions of fundamental rights, and the like.

Effective governance requires systems that can respond to complex challenges with appropriate speed, expertise, and democratic input. The unitary executive theory, while appealing in its theoretical clarity, may actually impede these goals in practice. As evidenced by recurring administrative failures across administrations of both parties, concentrating decision-making power in a single executive has not demonstrably improved government performance on some of the aforementioned basic aspects of effective governance.

The structural flaws of a unitary executive reveal themselves in systematic governance breakdowns that go beyond individual leadership qualities. When presidential authority dominates the executive branch, we often witness the deterioration of institutional expertise as career officials with specialized knowledge depart amid shifting political winds. The centralization of decision-making authority creates bottlenecks that prevent nimble responses to emerging challenges, as evidenced by the sluggish adaptation to numerous crises over the past two decades. Perhaps most concerning is the policy whiplash that occurs when each new administration reorients entire agencies around presidential priorities rather than enduring public needs—a phenomenon we’ve seen play out dramatically across trade policy, healthcare implementation, and immigration enforcement.

Consider the cascading failures we’ve witnessed in critical infrastructure oversight. The Federal Aviation Administration’s delayed response to alarming air traffic controller shortages exemplifies how centralized control can impair timely action. Despite years of internal warnings from technical experts, political appointees delayed implementing recommended staffing reforms. This pattern repeated itself with the East Palestine train derailment, where regulatory capture and centralized decision-making diluted safety standards that independent regulators had long advocated. These weren’t failures of individual leadership but predictable outcomes of a governance model that subordinates expertise to hierarchical control. More generally, a massive reduction in executive branch staff does not bode well for the ability of the federal government to efficiently and sufficiently respond to threats to public well-being. As Andrew Rudalevige, a political scientist at Bowdoin, relayed to The New York Times:

The damage caused to governmental expertise and simple competence could be long lasting. Firing probationary workers en masse may reduce the government employment headcount, slightly, but it also purged those most likely to bring the freshest view and most up-to-date skills to government service, while souring them on that service.

Similarly, troubling patterns emerge in how executive agencies handle fundamental rights. The due process failures in immigration proceedings stem directly from the executive branch’s ability to reshape entire enforcement apparatuses without meaningful checks. When presidents can unilaterally reconstruct agency priorities—as we’ve seen with abrupt shifts in enforcement targeting, detention policies, and asylum procedures—the consistent application of law gives way to political expediency. These compromises of fundamental rights aren’t bugs but features of a system that concentrates too much authority in a single elected official with incentives that often diverge from safeguarding individual liberties.

What these cases highlight is that the unitary executive theory fails to address a fundamental requirement of democratic governance: institutional capacity to deliver results that serve the public good while protecting core rights. A governance model focused solely on hierarchical control without equal attention to expertise, deliberation, and institutional knowledge may consolidate authority without improving outcomes. Historical experience suggests that effective governance emerges not from concentration of power but from thoughtfully designed systems that balance democratic accountability with professional expertise, rapid response capabilities with careful deliberation, and centralized coordination with distributed implementation.

#### 4. Aff solves the terminal. Civil servants have the expertise necessary to tackle every crisis their ev describes. That’s Shulman.

### Advantage CP---2AC

#### 1. Permutation: do both. It shields the net benefit.

#### 2. Permutation: do the counterplan.

#### 3. Links to the net benefit.

#### 4. Permutation: do the plan and every combo of planks.

### Bargaining Key---2AC

#### Unions are key.

#### a) Morale. Workers perceive them as necessary in order to form collective identity and serve the public. Otherwise, they quiet quit, refuse to come back, or never join the government. That’s Bruno.

<For Reference>

This report, The Relationship Between Unions and Meaningful Work describes findings from a survey of a small group of Illinois public sector workers which investigates the work motivations of public employees. The study shows new evidence that government employees are strongly motivated to find “purpose in work that is greater than the extrinsic outcomes of the work.” Additionally, we find that government employees view their public sector union as a primary source of intrinsic motivation.

<And>

The policy implications for Illinois and other states are obvious. First, by taking away the right to unionize or denigrating the value of collective bargaining, as occurred in Wisconsin, Indiana, and Michigan the state may be removing one of the most important incentives to recruit highly educated people to public service. Second, a weaker or nonexistent unionized government labor force may transform the choice of public service into merely a self-interested financial exchange; labor becomes just another commodity.

Finally and most potentially troubling, if workers are without a collective identity that potentially facilitates their quest for meaningful work and subsequently, they perceive their employment as primarily or solely as a way to earn living, then public service itself loses a significant portion of its service dimension. Ironically, weakening the institution that is unjustifiably characterized as imposing a financial burden on citizens may produce a workforce that labors for little more than a paycheck. Fair compensation should be a minimum requirement for government employees, but so should a commitment to preserving the people’s common assets.

Our study challenges the claim that public sector unions act contrary to the common good. We found evidence that not only do workers who choose to pursue careers in the public sector do so in spite of the comparative lower wages that they earn, but that the unions they belong to strongly related to their desire to accomplish more thorough work than earning an income. Work in the public sector serves as a vehicle to fulfill, at least in part, a personal need to experience a meaningful life and job.

#### And…

Andrea Hsu 25. Journalist. "How Trump is decimating federal employee unions one step at a time." NPR. 8/31/2025. npr.org/2025/09/01/nx-s1-5515633/trump-federal-workers-labor-unions-va

Fears of a brain drain

Across the federal government, some workers aren't waiting around to see what happens. They're quitting now, having decided a government job just isn't worth it anymore. Many workers fear with unions gone, they won't have a say in matters such as telework or family leave policies that make a difference to their quality of life.

"Although they came to the federal government because of their passion for public service, they also came because of the flexibility of the government, and those flexibilities are just being wiped away," says Anthony Lee, a longtime Food and Drug Administration employee who's also president of NTEU Chapter 282, representing some 9,000 FDA employees across the Mid Atlantic.

Although the FDA has not yet terminated the union's contract, it has ordered the union to pack up its offices.

Lee says the government is losing chemists, toxicologists, engineers and others who ensure drugs and medical devices are safe and effective and food ingredients aren't poisonous.

"It is already, in my view, harming the public because we're losing that institutional knowledge. We're losing that subject matter expertise," Lee says. "As much as the current administration thinks that everyone is just quickly replaceable, they're not."

#### b) Publicity. Unions influence policy bring attention to important issues, ensuring compliance from both Trump and the private sector. That’s Handler.

<For Reference>

Third, and finally, by enabling the formation of unions, the CSRA allows civil servants to pool resources and organize effectively around a range of issues related to the federal workforce. Unions, for example, cultivate a sophisticated bar of labor attorneys that litigate both labor issues and a wide range of other issues that arise under civil service laws, anti-discrimination laws, and the U.S. Constitution. In addition to litigation, unions also have publicity and lobbying operations, bringing to public attention presidential tactics for influencing federal policy. As research has shown, formal rights have value—but they have much more value when they are vested in well-organized, well-resourced groups with the means to vindicate them. Unions provide such rights for federal workers, who often wield them in ways in that protect public services and help to protect congressional initiatives from presidential subversion.

### --Bargaining Key---2AC

#### The CP ensures political retaliation.

Kenneth Quinnel 25. AFL-CIO. March 28, 2025. “Working People Respond to Executive Order Attacking Federal Worker Collective Bargaining Rights”. https://aflcio.org/2025/3/28/working-people-respond-executive-order-attacking-federal-worker-collective-bargaining

In the Labor Movement we often ask the question, “Which side are you on?” If his previous actions didn’t already show where he stands, President Trump’s Executive Order to take away federal workers’ fundamental right to union representation and a voice on the job shows he stands in direct opposition to every working person in our nation.

Collective bargaining for federal government workers has enjoyed support for decades from Presidents of both parties. Without union representation, federal employees—especially whistleblowers and veterans—lose vital protections from retaliation and political interference.

If President Trump is allowed to get away with rampant union busting, it means he can take away union rights from working people in Minnesota and across the nation. It’s time for Minnesota’s Republicans to decide whether they stand with union busters like Donald Trump and Elon Musk or working Minnesotans. We are watching.

### Midterms DA---2AC

#### 1. It is way too early.

LW 25. Liveable World, 5/29/25, <https://livableworld.org/an-early-look-at-the-2026-house-of-representatives-elections/>

Races We Are Watching

It is much too early to have a clear idea about the key House races. These contests are slower to develop than the higher-profile Senate races. Many candidates will wait until 2026 to decide whether to run. It will not be clear for many months who will win the many contests. But one early tipoff are House races that leading political analysts at Larry Sabato’s Crystal Ball and the Cook Political Report label toss ups or only leaning in one direction at this early stage.

#### 2. Black swans like foreign crises and other policy issues thump.

#### 3. Democrats lose. GOP cheating guarantees House majority

Will Bunch 25. National columnist @ The Philadelphia Inquirer. “Trump actually is ‘canceling’ the 2026 midterms, starting in Texas.” The Philadelphia Inquirer. 8-7-2025. https://www.inquirer.com/opinion/texas-redistricting-trump-2026-midterms-20250807.html

But Trump 2.0 has worked hard at perfecting the art of what the experts call “competitive authoritarianism,” in which an ostensibly democratic opposition is allowed to exist, as long as it’s guaranteed they can never succeed. The CBS Evening News still comes on at 6:30 p.m. and the Washington Post is still sending you push alerts, but pro-Trump billionaires have made them zombie newsrooms. The federal courts still rule against the White House’s accelerating erasure of the Constitution, but the regime just hides its secret police in a Penske rental truck and ignores them.

But everything is bigger in Texas, including the assaults on democracy. The Trump-driven redistricting scheme there is a way to hold the 2026 midterms yet effectively cancel them, by canceling out your vote. As the gerrymandering war goes nuclear and spreads uncontrollably like a Canadian wildfire from state to state, millions of Americans will cast votes on Nov. 3, 2026 that won’t mean a dadgum thing, because the outcome of the election would have basically been predetermined by a computer.

That’s right. This plan will essentially replace the human intelligence of a functioning U.S. democracy with artificial intelligence, or AI.

Let’s walk through this. In June, or around the time Trump’s approval started nosediving, the White House began lobbying Texas GOP leaders — including Gov. Greg Abbott, a close ally— to redraw the map of the state’s House districts, where Republicans currently hold a 25-13 edge. The new Trump-driven map would put more GOP voters in five current Democratic districts — seats held by notable critics of the regime like Rep. Al Green, who has sought to impeach Trump and caused a commotion during his address to Congress earlier this year.

But the names are arguably less important than the numbers. A gain of five seats in the Lone Star State could help Republicans cling to their narrow House margin in the second half of Trump’s term. Remember, when American democracy was reasonably functioning, states only drew new congressional maps every 10 years, right after a new census — as required under the Constitution.

In a reminder that the GOP war on democracy didn’t begin with Trump coming down his gilded escalator in 2015, this norm was first twisted, also in Texas, in 2003 during the George W. Bush-Karl Rove years. Like today, that mid-decade redistricting was a thinly disguised conservative power grab and, like today, Democratic legislators sought to stop the gerrymander by fleeing the state. But not only was the opposition worn down by endless political maneuvers, ultimately a conservative Supreme Court ruled that mid-decade redistricting is OK, as long as it complied with the Voting Rights Act (heh...more on that issue in a moment).

What’s happening today is a much more cataclysmic sequel. Armed with a letter from Attorney General Pam Bondi’s Justice Department that the current map is discriminatory because of the majority Black or Latino districts that elected Green, Progressive Caucus leader Rep. Greg Casar and others, Republicans created a stacked panel to address redistricting, Abbott called a special session, and Democratic lawmakers started raising money to flee, despite a new GOP-enacted law that potentially makes this a state crime. Aided by billionaire Illinois Democratic Gov. J.B. Pritzker, many Dems ultimately did fly to Chicago or elsewhere, and now the plan is in limbo.

The massive erosion of democracy in the 22 years since that first Bush-era Texas ploy is on full display. The serious threat of deploying the FBI to forcibly grab the Democratic refugees and return them to Austin is very much of a moment when masked secret police chase brown people through American cities. Now, Abbott has filed a lawsuit with the (GOP-dominated, of course) Texas Supreme Court seeking to have the Democratic leader, Rep. Gene Wu, removed from office — because once you inject a cancer into the American body politic, it metastasizes quickly.

Think about that when it comes to our thoroughly corrupted U.S. Supreme Court, which essentially OK’ed the current insanity with its 2006 ruling. In a news dump late Friday going into an August beach weekend, the High Court announced it will take up a race-related House-district gerrymandering case out of Louisiana that many experts see as its excuse to gut the remainder of the already weakened 1965 Voting Rights Act. That would be a green light for states across the former Confederacy to join Texas in redrawing their own maps and purging Black and Latino Democrats.

In yet another painful irony, this plot twist was unveiled just before the 60th anniversary of Lyndon Johnson signing the VRA, the law that was forged in the racist violence of 1965’s “Bloody Sunday” in Selma. The Texas redistricting, and the others that may follow it, would erase the greatest of the civil rights victories of the 1960s, the story about a working democracy we tell ourselves in order to live.

But the Texas scenario is even worse than that, because it is triggering a new War Between the States which could have the impact of rendering Congress into a meaningless vestigial organ. That would destroy the body that the Founders saw as the cornerstone of a representative democracy. Trump knows that he’ll likely need to steal more than just five House seats to ward off his 2027 impeachment, and so this crusade isn’t just confined to Austin. On Thursday, Vice President JD Vance flew to Indianapolis to lobby Indiana Gov. Mike Braun on a pro-GOP remapping there, and other states are on the table.

#### 4. Court action is politically detached and would be a Democrat win if anything.

Scott Budow 21. J.D. from Fordham University Law School. "How the Roberts Court Has Changed Labor and Employment Law." University of Illinois Law Review. 9/13/2021. illinoislawreview.org/online/how-the-roberts-court-has-changed-labor-and-employment-law

If all cases were of equal importance, the justices would have a point. Decisions that are 7-2, 8-1, or unanimous make up approximately half of all cases decided by the U.S. Supreme Court; by contrast, only about twenty percent of decisions are 5-4.4 But all cases are not equally important. Indeed, a remarkably consistent trend emerges if one examines the Roberts Court’s most significant labor and employment decisions. In all but one case, each of the conservative justices voted for outcomes that favor employers while each of the liberal justices voted for outcomes that favor employees.

#### 5. No link: only half of federal workers are in unions, and some don’t like them.

Mike Causey 22. Senior Correspondent for Federal News Network. “Feds and politics: Are both parties missing the point?” 7/18/22. https://federalnewsnetwork.com/federal-report/2022/07/feds-and-politics-are-both-parties-missing-the-point/.

In fact, the American Federation of Government Employees is currently in the process of divorcing its members in the union’s Local 118, which represents thousands of ICE workers in the Department of Homeland Security. AFGE represents 700,000 feds. But only about half that number are actually dues-paying members. And that’s true in most non-postal federal unions. Outside the U.S. Postal Service, the vast majority of federal workers are not union members. Some because they don’t like the unions tactics or politics. Some because they don’t think they should have to pay dues to be represented by the union. Either way, that’s a fact Democratic and Republican candidates should consider when deciding whether to attack, support or ignore feds.

#### b) No ag impact. Lack of science-based civil servitude is an alt cause.

Kent Robin Hessellund Pedersen 25. Independent researcher, AI specialist. “Trump’s 2025 Anti-Science Policies: An Empirical Assessment of Deregulation, Censorship, and Corporate Influence on U.S. Scientific Integrity.” Academia. 10/3/2025. academia.edu/128125645/Trump\_s\_2025\_Anti\_Science\_Blitz\_How\_Deregulation\_Censorship\_and\_Corporate\_Ties\_Threaten\_America\_s\_Future

Economic and Technological Consequences: Undermining science doesn’t just harm health and the environment; it also carries significant economic costs and threatens U.S. leadership in innovation. America’s research enterprise – from biotech to clean energy to aerospace – has long been an engine of economic growth. The administration’s budgetary and policy choices risk stalling that engine. For example, the freeze and uncertainty around federal research grants early in 2025 sent a chilling signal to scientists and entrepreneurs. Labs that rely on NIH, NSF, or Department of Energy funding faced chaos when a blanket grant pause was announced. Although the broad freeze was lifted, targeted bans remain on climate and clean energy research spending, and a comprehensive spending review is underway to strip out programs disfavored by the administration. Research fields with any connection to “climate” or DEI have effectively become radioactive in terms of funding. Academics have described an “outcry” as projects are cancelled or need to be rebranded to avoid forbidden terms. This disruption can drive scientists to either switch fields, seek state/private funding, or leave the country – a potential brain drain that would weaken the U.S. innovation ecosystem. The United States also risks ceding leadership in emerging industries. Clean energy is a prime example. Trump officials insist their rollback of climate policies will not derail the clean tech transition, because of market and state-level momentum. However, even a “slowdown could be costly”. The Inflation Reduction Act’s clean energy investments, which Trump has pledged to repeal or defund, are credited with spurring manufacturing jobs and competitive advantage in batteries, electric vehicles, and renewable power. If those incentives are dismantled or confidence in them shaken, companies may scale back U.S. projects or move them abroad. Competing nations – from China to EU countries – are eager to attract green industry. The World Resources Institute warned that while many U.S. states and businesses remain committed to clean energy, federal rollback might “slow America’s push to gain a competitive advantage over China on future green technologies”. In concrete terms, fewer R&D dollars for solar, wind, or energy storage means fewer breakthroughs and potentially that foreign firms end up dominating those markets. Technologically, the administration’s hostility to certain science could hamper not just environmental tech but broader innovation. The DOE plans outlined in Project 2025 would eliminate many applied research programs (e.g. ARPA-E for advanced energy tech) as “market interference”. Such shortsighted cuts ignore the history that government-funded science often yields transformative inventions (the internet, GPS, mRNA vaccines, etc.). Similarly, restricting international scientific exchange – such as drastically reducing visas for researchers from countries like China – could hurt U.S. universities and high-tech industries. American labs and companies might lose top talent, and collaborative projects (from basic physics experiments to biomedical trials) could suffer. A former NASA official noted that deprioritizing Earth science at NASA would be a “major blow” to climate researchers worldwide, but it also means the U.S. could fall behind in satellite technology and data analytics that have commercial applications. Another economic impact is on agriculture and natural resource sectors, ironically ones the administration aims to help. By censoring climate adaptation science, the USDA is making it harder for farmers to adjust to changing conditions, which can “directly threaten their financial stability”. In 2023 alone, extreme heat and wildfires caused over $16.5 billion in U.S. crop losses. Ignoring such data and cutting off access to “climate-smart” farming knowledge leaves farmers more vulnerable to crop failures – meaning more uninsured losses, higher food prices, and hits to the rural economy. Indeed, fewer farmers will have access to best practices for soil health and water management at a time when droughts and floods are worsening. This jeopardizes long-term agricultural productivity and America’s food security. More broadly, the sidelining of science erodes the foundations of evidence-based decision-making that underpin a stable economy. Markets and businesses rely on government data – whether it’s public health statistics to plan workforce safety, or climate risk maps to guide infrastructure investment. If such data are suppressed or politicized, it introduces uncertainty and risk. For example, if pandemic data are not trusted, businesses might either overreact or underreact in ways that harm economic activity. If climate risk is hidden, investments may flow into projects doomed to fail in a changed climate (like coastal developments not built for sea-level rise). Over time, the loss of U.S. credibility in science can even affect trade: allies have hinted at carbon border taxes on U.S. goods if America shirks climate responsibility, which would hurt exporters. In summary, the antiscience agenda carries significant economic opportunity costs (missed innovation and jobs in future industries) and heightened risks (from agriculture losses to public health crises) that can damage the nation’s prosperity. The United States’ decades-long scientific dominance – a pillar of its economic strength – could be permanently diminished if research is starved and young scientists lose trust in public institutions.

### MQD Good DA---2AC

#### Rehiring fails.

#### a) Whiplash. It doesn’t look credible at all, so nobody takes the job.

Daniel Arkin 25. Reporter. “Fired, rehired and baffled: Confusion reigns for thousands of reinstated federal workers.” 3/21/25. https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/fired-rehired-baffled-confusion-reigns-thousands-reinstated-federal-wo-rcna197235.

Raphael Garcia, an analyst at the Department of Veterans Affairs who was abruptly fired last month amid President Donald Trump’s sweeping push to shrink the federal workforce, learned this week that he was being reinstated following court orders from two federal judges.

But that news did not end the professional limbo that has defined Garcia’s life for over a month. He is not actually back on the job. Instead, he has been placed on administrative leave while the Trump administration appeals rulings from those two judges.

Garcia has received verbal reassurance that he’ll get back pay while he’s on leave, but the whiplash of Trump’s first 100 days in office has not exactly left him in a trusting state of mind. “I’ll believe it when I see it,” Garcia told NBC News in an interview this week, adding that he won’t know whether his salary has restarted until the end of the pay period in late March.

Garcia is one of 24,000 probationary federal workers who have been on a career roller-coaster ride as Elon Musk’s Department of Government Efficiency attempts to reshape the federal bureaucracy. These workers have been unceremoniously fired and rehired, but some remain in the dark about what comes next.

In many cases, the rehired probationary workers — meaning people who have held their positions for less than two years — were immediately placed on administrative leave, a temporary suspension with pay intact. Meanwhile, civil servants still face the looming prospect of more rounds of firings in the months and years ahead.

“Honestly, I don’t fully trust this administration and its appointees on whether or not I’ll get to go back to work,” said a Federal Emergency Management Agency employee who was fired, rehired and placed on leave. “I’ve been out of work for a full month.”

In an email notifying him that he had been temporarily reinstated, the FEMA employee was told he would get a call this week from his agency’s human capital department to discuss benefits and paperwork for getting him back on the job. But he said he hasn’t heard from anyone yet.

The employee, who spoke on the condition of anonymity due to fear of reprisal, said he has had no choice but to start looking for other jobs.

“I’d rather continue my work for FEMA and the American people,” he said. But “if I pass on another opportunity, but then get terminated again in a couple weeks, it could make a bad situation even worse.”

The employee took a skeptical view of Trump’s political appointees. “They have already broken my confidence and trust. It’s hard to know where we go from here. … It’s so confusing and so chaotic.”

In interviews, federal employees said they had found that agencies subject to the judges’ orders were not communicating the latest developments to their workers in a uniform way. In some instances, reinstated probationary workers have received email notifications; in other instances, they’ve gotten phone calls from managers or supervisors.

Sarah Boim, a probationary employee at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention who was fired in February, said she had not received a reinstatement notice as of Thursday. She now finds herself in an employment Catch-22, wondering if her reinstatement notice was sent to a CDC email account she lost access to after she was fired.

“We need transparency. We’re being lied to. It’s unacceptable,” she said.

#### b) Sabotage. Civil servants on their own can’t shape policy. Unions are key to check against deregulation and rogue administrators. That’s Handler.

<For Reference>

First, labor law allows unions to push back on what Jody Freeman and Sharon Jacobs have called “structural deregulation”—essentially, attempts by the President to disable agencies whose missions he opposes by imposing burdensome working conditions. Agency heads might change work assignments, require office relocations, or deprive civil servants of needed resources in order to prevent an agency (say, the EPA or the Department of Labor) from carrying out its mission effectively. These day-to-day working conditions are the types of issues that unions bargain over routinely, and as a result, unions often form the last and most important line of defense against presidential sabotage of an agency’s mission. Many unions, for instance, bargain over issues like staffing levels, work hours, and the availability of overtime and backpay, which affect the ability of staff to perform their jobs effectively.

#### 1. There is no conceivable link. The aff strikes down an executive action on the grounds that it violated the will of Congress, which is aligned with the MQD. That’s Perez.

<For Reference>

The second proposed framework centers on the notion that Trump may have acted in contrast to the will of Congress when issuing Schedule F. As a starting point, it is generally accepted that executive orders that conflict with the Constitution or the intent of Congress are invalid.145 This principle stems from Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer, 146 a 1952 case where the Supreme Court invalidated President Harry S. Truman’s executive order authorizing the seizure of the nation’s steel mills during the Korean War.147 Youngstown stands for the idea that “when an executive order conflicts with a statute, the statute preempts the order.”148 In a concurring opinion, Justice Jackson wrote: “When the President takes measures incompatible with the expressed or implied will of Congress, his power is at its lowest ebb . . . . Courts can sustain exclusive Presidential control in such a case only by disabling the Congress from acting upon the subject.”149

#### Trump’s XO was illegal under the MQD.

GIA 25. Governing for Impact, Policy Think-Tank. “Legal Vulnerabilities of Schedule F.” January 2025. https://governingforimpact.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Legal-Vulnerabilities-of-Schedule-F-1.pdf.

One way to think about Schedule F’s illegality is through the lens of the major questions doctrine. The doctrine, which the federal courts have wielded with increased force and frequency in recent years, calls for skepticism when the executive branch purports to newly locate a sweeping, consequential authority in a longstanding statute. The doctrine is based on the inference that Congress does not hide “elephants” (vast new authority) in “mouseholes” (“little-used” or “ancillary” statutes). 35

This mode of reasoning confirms that Schedule F exceeds the President’s statutory authority. 36 For the first time, a President would claim to find in the modest power to designate confidential and policymaking positions—which has only ever been applied to political appointees—the authority to remove civil service protections from many career federal employees with substantive responsibilities. That would topple the CSRA’s merit system principles and unilaterally return the United States to the spoils system of federal employment. President Trump would use a narrow carveout from the CSRA to, in effect, repeal a great deal the Act itself—to “effectuate[] a fundamental revision of the statute.” 37 That is exactly the sort of elephants-in-mouseholes mismatch the major question doctrine addresses.

Indeed, Donald Trump’s allies have not hidden that the purpose of Schedule F is to permit political reprisals and patronage hiring—the precise evils a century and a half of civil service laws have been designed to prevent. It is not possible to believe that Congress hid in the CSRA’s narrow excerption the power to decimate the civil service. Such a view would not comport with “common sense as to the manner in which Congress is likely to delegate a policy decision of such economic and political magnitude.” 38

#### That means normal means of the plan is restriction of A2 powers under the MQD. That solves.

Blaize Shiebler 25. Research Intern at Applied Policy. “Federal Workforce Reform: Revisiting Schedule F.” 1/3/25. https://www.appliedpolicy.com/federal-workforce-reform-revisiting-schedule-f/.

The push to reshape the civil service reflects frustrations among those who argue that unelected bureaucrats have disproportionate influence over federal policy and that changes are needed to increase accountability and reduce costs. However, many opponents criticize this interpretation of the Civil Service Reform Act, stating that it undermines the intent of the Pendleton Act and has no historical precedent. Opponents further contend that Schedule F violates the Supreme Court’s Major Questions Doctrine, a principle that highlights the importance of Congressional authority in widespread policy changes.

#### 2. The MQD is weak now.

Jack Jones 25. Legal Fellow at the Institute for Policy Integrity at NYU School of Law, 2-21-25. "Major Questions, Minimal Consistency: The Erratic Growth of Major Questions Jurisprudence, by Jack Jones", Yale Journal on Regulation, https://www.yalejreg.com/nc/major-questions-minimal-consistency-the-erratic-growth-of-major-questions-jurisprudence-by-jack-jones/

By relying on different sources within West Virginia v. EPA to formulate the test and developing both disjunctive and conjunctive tests, the Fifth Circuit has created a jurisprudence that is highly unpredictable and malleable. These inconsistencies not only complicate agency rulemaking but also offer litigants a wide array of arguments to either invoke or evade the doctrine’s application. Without clearer guidance from the Supreme Court, major questions jurisprudence is likely to remain erratic, continuing to fuel uncertainty in administrative law.

#### 3. The terminal impact is solved by good governance and a robust civil service.

#### 4. 60 years of pro-public sector union jurisprudence thump. They don’t have a card that anyone would bring MQD suits against the plan, which just restores CBR that previously existed before the XO’s. No grounds for a suit, even assuming fiat.

#### Concede terminal

#### aFf solves on adv 2.

### Economy DA---2AC

#### 1. Recession now.

Samuel O’Brient 9-15. Markets reporter, Business insider. “A top economist says there's an 'uncomfortably high' chance that the US is heading into a recession in the next year.” Business Insider. 9-15-2025. https://www.businessinsider.com/us-recession-odds-outlook-building-permits-mark-zandi-rate-cuts-2025-9

Mark Zandi has been ringing the alarm bell for a recession in recent weeks, and now, he says one indicator has pushed the chances of a downturn to an "uncomfortably high" level.

The Moody's Analytics chief economist in August described the US economy as being on the "precipice of recession." Speaking with Business Insider shortly after, he reiterated his call, saying the economy was at the edge of a cliff.

Zandi's newest prediction, though, may be his most dire. Over the weekend, he shared his latest take on concerning economic data in a series of X posts.

Citing data from Moody's Analytics, Zandi said that the risk of the US entering a recession in the next 12 months is currently 48%.

"It's less than 50%, but historically, the probability has never gotten this high, and a recession has not ensued," he wrote in his post.

To support this, Zandi provided further data on slumping residential building permits, considered an important indicator for recession forecasting.

While permits have held up until now, the number of unsold homes is rising due to weak buyer demand, causing builders to scale back. As Zandi noted, this has pushed new permits close to pandemic-era lows.

He added that August permit data is due to be released on Wednesday, September 17, the day of the next Federal Open Markets Committee meeting, advising investors to watch the next report closely.

"They are sure to provide another reason why the Fed should and will announce a rate cut later that day," Zandi predicted.

However, he's said previously that even if the Federal Reserve opts for the expected rate cut, it likely won't be enough to stave off a recession.

#### 2. Trump turns the DA.

#### a) Data. Expertise at the BLS is key to growth and effective monetary policy.

Anne Krueger 25. Former World Bank chief economist, senior researchprofessor of international economics at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies." Lies, Damned Lies, and Donald Trump's Statistics." 8/21/2025. project-syndicate.org/commentary/trump-actions-undermine-reliability-of-us-economic-data-by-anne-o-krueger-2025-08

WASHINGTON, DC – Statistics may seem dull, but they are indispensable. Without them, policymakers – and those tasked with implementing their decisions – would be unable to do their jobs. Reliable data form the foundation of sound governance, playing a central role in shaping monetary and fiscal policy and supporting and forecasting demand for infrastructure, commodities, schools, hospitals, and water.

Similarly, private companies rely on information about population growth, wage trends, and other key indicators to guide investment decisions and production strategies. The more reliable the data, the more valuable they become.

But when the reliability of official figures is in doubt, uncertainty grows, leading to poor decision-making. A census, for example, is useful only to the extent that people trust it to provide an accurate picture of population trends. For this reason, essential statistics should be regarded as public goods: their value increases when they are credible, accessible, and widely shared.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics is one of the United States’ most vital sources of reliable economic statistics, guiding policymakers, businesses, and investors alike. Each month, the BLS publishes data on employment, unemployment, consumer prices, and wages – not just at the national level but also by state, region, and municipality. The accuracy of these numbers has steadily improved over time, making them trusted benchmarks for businesses and governments worldwide. As The Economist recently noted, “trillions of dollars in global assets reprice within moments of a BLS release.”

That hard-won reputation was severely – and perhaps irreparably – damaged when US President Donald Trump abruptly fired BLS Commissioner Erika McEntarfer just hours after the release of the bureau’s July report, which revealed a sharp slowdown in employment growth and revised down earlier job gains. Trump claimed the figures were “phony” and “rigged” to make him and the Republican Party look bad.

These allegations were of course completely baseless. In reality, BLS commissioners do not see the final numbers until shortly before their public release. Moreover, the agency has refined its accounting methods to address problems like underreporting and misreporting.

Even prominent Republican economists have criticized Trump’s actions. Steve Hanke, who served as an adviser to former President Ronald Reagan, dismissed Trump’s claims of political interference in BLS statistics. “Whoever is at the top is pretty much irrelevant,” he told the Financial Times. “The bureaucracy and the template dictate what goes on. The idea that you can blatantly manipulate the data is frankly just rubbish.”

By undermining the BLS, Trump has placed the US in the company of authoritarian governments that regularly manipulate or conceal unfavorable figures. Most notoriously, data from the Soviet Union were widely considered dubious, even by Soviet officials. Over the past two decades, Russian President Vladimir Putin has compromised the reliability of Russia’s economic statistics, echoing Soviet-era practices.

Likewise, despite China’s considerable efforts since opening its economy to enhance the credibility of official data, it remains difficult to imagine any statistician openly defying demands from President Xi Jinping. This was evident in August 2023, when Chinese authorities temporarily stopped publishing youth unemployment figures after the widely used measure hit a record high.

Elsewhere, particularly in developing countries, budgetary constraints and large informal sectors have often limited the reliability of government statistics. The most dependable data tend to come from developed economies like the US, where nonpartisan technocrats generate high-quality estimates that support effective policymaking, business decisions, and research.

Trump’s decision to replace McEntarfer with an ultra-loyalist, E.J. Antoni, poses a serious threat to the ability of the BLS to fulfill its mission. Unsurprisingly, many have questioned Antoni’s qualifications and impartiality. As Jessica Riedl of the conservative Manhattan Institute observed, “no credible economist would take a job in which you’d get fired for publishing accurate data.”

Even if Antoni were qualified (which he is not), serious doubts would remain about whether BLS estimates could be trusted. Loss of confidence in the agency’s data will only deepen the uncertainty facing private and public decision-makers. Worse still, these doubts are likely to extend beyond labor statistics, especially when figures such as inflation rates conflict with Trump’s political agenda. The consequences for the US and global economy, not to mention for democratic governance, could be catastrophic.

#### b) Deregulation. It causes systemic collapse that overturns ability regulate the economy. Extinction from disease, ecological breakdown, and prolif.

George Monbiot 25. Open Scholar at Oxford, Orwell Prize Winner. “There are many ways Trump could trigger a global collapse. Here’s how to survive if that happens.” 2/18/25. https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2025/feb/18/donald-trump-global-collapse-wildfires-pandemic-financial-crisis.

Though we might find it hard to imagine, we cannot now rule it out: the possibility of systemic collapse in the United States. The degradation of federal government by Donald Trump and Elon Musk could trigger a series of converging and compounding crises, leading to social, financial and industrial failure.

There are several possible mechanisms. Let’s start with an obvious one: their assault on financial regulation. Trump’s appointee to the US Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), Russell Vought, has suspended all the agency’s activity, slashed its budget and could be pursuing Musk’s ambition to “delete” the bureau. The CFPB was established by Congress after the 2008 financial crisis, to protect people from the predatory activity that helped trigger the crash. The signal to the financial sector could not be clearer: “Fill your boots, boys.” A financial crisis in the US would immediately become a global crisis.

But the hazards extend much further. Musk, calling for a “wholesale removal of regulations”, sends his child soldiers to attack government departments stabilising the entire US system. Regulations, though endlessly maligned by corporate and oligarchic propaganda, are all that protect us from multiple disasters. In its initial impacts, deregulation is class war, hitting the poorest and the middle classes at the behest of the rich. As the effects proliferate, it becomes an assault on everyone’s wellbeing.

To give a couple of examples, the fires in Los Angeles this year are expected to cost, on various estimates, between $28bn and $75bn in insured losses alone. Estimates of total losses range from $160bn to $275bn. These immense costs are likely to be dwarfed by future climate disasters. As Trump rips down environmental protections and trashes federal responsiveness, the impacts will spiral. They could include non-linear shocks to either the insurance sector or homeowners, escalating into US-wide economic and social crisis.

If (or when) another pandemic strikes, which could involve a pathogen more transmissible and even more deadly than Covid-19 (which has so far killed 1.2 million people in the US), it will hit a nation whose defences have been stood down. Basic public health measures, such as vaccination and quarantine, might be inaccessible to most. A pandemic in these circumstances could end millions of lives and cause spontaneous economic shutdown.

Because there is little public understanding of how complex systems operate, collapse tends to take almost everyone by surprise. Complex systems (such as economies and human societies) have characteristics that make them either resilient or fragile. A system that loses its diversity, redundancy, modularity (the degree of compartmentalisation), its “circuit breakers” (such as government regulations) and backup strategies (alternative means of achieving a goal) is less resilient than one which retains these features. So is a system whose processes become synchronised. In a fragile system, shocks can amplify more rapidly and become more transmissible: a disruption in one place proliferates into disaster everywhere. This, as Andy Haldane, former chief economist at the Bank of England, has deftly explained, is what happened to the financial system in 2008.

A consistent feature of globalised capitalism is an unintentional assault on systemic resilience. As corporations pursue similar profit-making strategies, and financialisation and digitisation permeate every enterprise, the economic system loses its diversity and starts to synchronise. As they consolidate, and the biggest conglomerates become hubs to which many other enterprises are connected (think of Amazon or the food and farming giant Cargill), major failures could cascade at astonishing speed.

As every enterprise seeks efficiencies, the system loses its redundancy. As trading rules and physical infrastructure are standardised (think of those identical container terminals, shipping and trucking networks), the system loses both modularity and backup strategies. When a system has lost its resilience, a small external shock can trigger cascading collapse.

Paradoxically, with his trade wars and assault on global standards, Trump could help to desynchronise the system and reintroduce some modularity. But, as he simultaneously rips down circuit breakers, undermines preparedness and treats Earth systems as an enemy to be crushed, the net effect is likely to make human systems more prone to collapse.

At least in the short term, the far right tends to benefit from chaos and disruption: this is another of the feedback loops that can turn a crisis into a catastrophe. Trump presents himself as the hero who will save the nation from the ruptures he has caused, while deflecting the blame on to scapegoats.

Alternatively, if collapse appears imminent, Trump and his team might not wish to respond. Like many of the ultra-rich, key figures in or around the administration entertain the kind of psychopathic fantasies indulged by Ayn Rand in her novels Atlas Shrugged and The Fountainhead, in which plutocrats leave the proles to die in the inferno they’ve created, while they migrate to their New Zealand bunkers, Mars or the ocean floor (forgetting, as they always do, that their wealth, power and survival is entirely dependent on other people). Or they yearn for a different apocalypse, in which the rest of us roast while they party with Jesus in his restored kingdom.

Every government should hope for the best and prepare for the worst. But, as they do with climate and ecological breakdown, freshwater depletion, the possibility of food system collapse, antibiotic resistance and nuclear proliferation, most governments, including the UK’s, now seem to hope for the best and leave it there. So, though there is no substitute for effective government, we must seek to create our own backup systems.

#### 3. No link.

#### a) State, local, and private sector employees outweigh. The plan only affects one million workers. That’s Finkin.

<For Reference>

Before addressing the AFPI report’s explanation of its findings, there are reasons to be skeptical of its data. It is estimated that there are about 2.3 million full-time federal employees, with over a million—a number that has been increasing—being represented by unions and having access to arbitration. The report notes that, according to OPM records, thousands of federal employees with permanent civil service status are dismissed each year. Only a small fraction of dismissals lead to administrative proceedings. For cases of unacceptable performance, notice and an opportunity to improve typically are required by statute as a pre-condition to discharge, thereby affording employees a means of preserving employment.

#### b) There’s six decades of thumpers and federal workers can’t even bargain over wages or strike.

Andrea Hsu 25. Journalist. "How Trump is decimating federal employee unions one step at a time." NPR. 8/31/2025. npr.org/2025/09/01/nx-s1-5515633/trump-federal-workers-labor-unions-va

Federal employees have had the right to join unions and collectively bargain over working conditions since the 1960s. Unlike private sector workers, government employees cannot negotiate wages or strike. But through collective bargaining, they do help shape disciplinary procedures, parental leave policies, how overtime is managed and much more.

#### Private.

#### Musk inev.

#### NASA.