# 1AR---DRR---R3

## Solvency

### Protections Now

#### Not enough protections cuz they don’t solve autonomy or morale.

#### Schumaker says people are cowering which is the problem bc they cant speak up.

#### Groupthink is solved by the aff DOES answer lofthouse bc the only warrant in the 2NC WAS groupthink!

### AT: Lofthouse 24---1AR

#### Lofthouse is AFF. The benefits of unionization solve the admin state’s deficiencies.

Jordan Lofthouse & Alexander Schaefer 24. Ph.D. in economics from George Mason University. Ph.D. in philosophy from the University of Arizona."Expert knowledge and the administrative state." *Public Choice*, vol. 202, 434.

Many points raised by the advocates of discretionary administrative power are correct, or at least plausible. Even scholars skeptical of administrative power typically admit that democratic decision-making is no substitute for expert judgment (Brennan, 2017; Caplan, 2007; Downs, 1957; Somin, 2013). Nevertheless, defenders of the administrative state employ a premise that has been under-scrutinized. That premise—which we call the expertise claim—asserts that good governance requires politically empowered experts. The truth of the expertise claim, we argue, is contingent because the reliability of expertise is institutionally sensitive. By drawing attention to the institutional context of expert decision-making, we assess the expertise claim in light of Vernon Smith’s (2003: p. 470) notion of “ecological rationality” and the humanomics framework more broadly. That approach recenters the object of analysis away from the maximizing individual expert and towards the context in which such an individual deliberates and makes proposals.Footnote3

The contingency of the expertise claim, we argue, raises difficulties for defenders of the modern administrative state. Institutions of public administration that are highly centralized impede the reliable discovery and communication of expert knowledge. The result is that experts are less beneficial than they could be in shaping public policy decisions. The key to overcoming that hurdle is to ensure that the relevant experts reach their judgments in a deliberative context conducive to the discovery and implementation of socially useful knowledge. In other words, experts need to operate in an epistemic ecosystem that mitigates “expert failure” (Koppl, 2018).Footnote4

We argue that the epistemic ecosystem best suited to mitigate expert failure is one of polycentric governance. Within a polycentric system, decision-making is not centralized or hierarchical. Instead, decisions are made at multiple, autonomous, and interdependent nodes (Ostrom, 2005, 2010). Polycentric systems are characterized by contestation and cooperation among the various nodes at different scales. A polycentric governance system can facilitate a type of ecological rationality in which various types of expert knowledge can be combined synergistically. Polycentric systems allow expert knowledge of diverse kinds to complement one another, while flawed ideas are challenged and revised. When decision-making is increasingly centralized, the epistemic ecosystem is artificially constrained. Thus, a well-constituted system of polycentric governance does not eschew expert knowledge; it incorporates many kinds of expert knowledge into complex decision-making processes (Ostrom, 1971, 1973, 1991, 1997). Just as Smith (2008) argues, rational outcomes in public administration do not require top-down expert control. Instead, workable public administration can emerge from the complex interactions among a variety of experts.

#### Beek is abt states during covid.

## Bureaucracy

### Civil Service---1AR

Civil service outweighs:

It caps cascading risks across a raft of policy domains and weakens societal resilience.

Prefer magnitude: natural buffers and intervening actors check individual scenarios, but not a confluence of risks.

Turns the DA. Global economic collapse is structurally inevitable in a world with weak governance.

That’s Shulman, Farrell, and Earle.

#### Yes brink. Insufficient irrel bc new solutions are only a function of the bureaucracy

#### No interventing actors 1AC earle says us is specifically key and deregulation creates safe havens.

#### States cant solve diplomacuy or the enforcement of federal programs and red states are worse.

#### Public doesn’t need to lsten cuz its about regs

#### Yes impact. No more solutions. They extended drezner who not in 1NC.

#### Kluth card is like an epistemological indict that we’ve known abt it for a while, but trumpo is recently trying to actively unsolve it.

### Terror---1AR

Terror causes nuclear war. It draws in great powers and escalates. That’s Clarke. Defense doesn’t assume low barriers due to emerging tech. Another DA to the alt since the transition collapses preparedness.

#### We solve regulatory changes and dropped perception IL.

#### Mueller extension was terrible and they dropped that AI makes it more liekely.

### Diplomacy---1AR

Diplomacy solves extinction. It caps escalation in Ukraine and Taiwan AND externally enables cooperation over existential risks. That’s Kimmage.

#### They just have solvency defense which is classic try or die.

## Consolidation

### Democracy---1AR

Kick concede defense.

#### Concede the sentence “Russia and China have to balance domestic concerns which takes out probing.” That deletes their DA. The entirety of mueller is aff. It deletes the first half of then impact because there’s no impact to “undermining power projection’ becuaser they have said adversaries will never probe. The aschenbrenner half wll be answered on the other page.

## T

## AFL Cio

### Add on---1AR

#### Dropped plan alone solves warming. Conceded its extinction. Com

## K

### Kick---1AR

#### Dropped last thing in 2AC sustainability means growth collapse inev.

## PROA

### Perm---Do Counterplan---1AR

#### Perm do the counterplan. 2NC cx results in the plan.

#### Should isn’t immediate that’s Eisen from the 2AC. Their interp makes the delay cp compete and they didn’t say competition is only mandate which means it’s a plausible reading to permute effect.

#### New explanation also means l2nb since it eventually includes courts.v

### Deficit---1AR

#### The counterplan solves nothing. 3 cuts.

#### 1. Trump ignores. 2AC sen says he’d just continute on and seek other remedies outside the strict scope of the injuncton. Worse, tort remedies arent sufficient and he believes hes immune post supreme court ruling, so theres no chance at solving. Its not irrel. It doesn’t result in bargaining rights. That dovetails with

#### 2. Which is 2AC bednar. Constitutional tort provisions are uncertain and fail. Encourage avoidance and executiver crreep.

#### 3. PROA fails. 2AC Brennan is insane and a deficit to the cp. Rights of action are insufficient to guid policymaking, they QUOTE replace expert poilicymakers with plantiffs lawyers, resulging in hugely expensive litigation costs. They also dropepd that individual cases are uncertain, which links to the dropped certainty key deficit from the 1AC.

#### It answers all the overview stuff. Sure unions might lost sometimes, but it’s coordinated.

#### Reversing firings would be the worst every cuz t relies on individual torts.

#### Newhouse is nothing. They COULD move to a civil court, but our ev says doing that is bad.

#### Our card is about privacy rights and its not high settlements its high litigation costs!!

#### Yes vulnerable to sabotage bercause it encourages trump to violate.

### Condo---1AR

Condo is bad. MSU mishadles dispo: They can kick if we read perms or theory which solves arbitrariness, but you have to reject the team for deterrence since rejecting the argument IS conditionality. 2 imapcts:

1. Research. The neg kicks counterplans instead of researching straight turn answers, inflating contrived positions. Education outweighs. It’s the only external benefit of debate.

2. Skew. They fleece coverage, make offense a waste of time, and force unwinnable contradictions with inequality Advantage CPs that force econ links.

#### What we did is arbitrary, greenlighting infinity. Dispo, multiple rounds, and the preround solve neg flex and force info processing. New plans are good for innovation and getting coaches out of the room so this is extra bad. Tactical decisions and innovation are inevitable given the structure of debate. Debate and condo are illogical, so there’s no terminal. Aff choice and natural limits disprove condo inevitable. DMU is backwards because new 1NC utility is high, which answers skew inev. Apply offense defense: it’s about models, anything else is circular and ensures shameless judge intervention.

#### No 2AC determine and yes comm consensus.

## Tariffs

### Tariffs Inev---1AR

The DA is at zero percent.

#### Tariffs are inevitable. The current case is only about IEEPA---Trump could cite an infinite set of statutes to reimpose them immediately. That’s Brusuelas.

#### We ‘tariffs inevitable’ in the tag!

<FOR REFERENCE>

It’s unlikely, though, that the administration would simply fold its tent on its desire to use tariffs as cudgel in trade policy, and boost the government’s coffers.

We took Treasury Secretary Scott Bessent at his word when he recently said that he “was confident in the ability to reconstitute any lost tariff revenue by imposing duties under other legal authorities.”

Under this scenario, the administration could still seek to impose tariffs under Section 232 of the 1962 Trade Expansion Act, Sections 122 and 301 of the 1974 Trade Act or Section 338 of the 1930 Tariff Act.

If that happens, the probability of a sustained market reaction following any decision against the administration is low.

### Impact---AT: Aschenbrenner---1AR

#### No war impact deleted on the case.

#### No risk mitigation. Their authors are dumb.

Dr. David Thorstad 23. PhD, Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Vanderbilt University, Senior Research Affiliate at the Global Priorities Institute, Oxford, and Research Affiliate at the Machine Intelligence and Normative Theory Lab, ANU. "High Risk, Low Reward: A Challenge to the Astronomical Value of Existential Risk Mitigation.” Philosophy & Public Affairs, 51(1).

I think this is among the best arguments for the time of perils hypothesis. At the same time, I have two doubts about this form of the argument. First, the Aschenbrenner model treats consumption as the driver of existential risk. But most pessimists do not think that consumption is even the primary determinant of existential risk. In the special case of climate risk, consumption does indeed drive risk by emitting fossil fuels and causing other forms of environmental degradation. But pessimists think that the lion’s share of existential risk comes from risks such as rogue artificial intelligence and sophisticated bioterrorism. These risks are not caused primarily by consumption, but rather by technological growth. Risks from superintelligence grow with advances in technologies such as machine learning, and bioterrorism risks grow with advances in our capacity to synthesize, analyze, and distribute biological materials. So a reduction in existential risk may be largely achieved through slowing growth of technology rather by slowing consumption.

We could revise (3) to let technologies A and B replace consumption outputs C as the main drivers of existential risk. But technology occupies a very different role from consumption outputs in the Aschenbrenner model. One difference is that technology is an input rather than an output to production in (1) and (2). In general we have no reason to expect symmetrical results to govern inputs and outputs in mathematical models, hence we have no good reason to expect results proved for consumption outputs to generalize to technology.

Another difficulty is that technology governs both the safety and consumption sectors, whereas consumption outputs have no direct bearing on safety outputs. This is important, because the proofs of Aschenbrenner’s main results rely on the idea that societies can sharply curtail existential risk by devoting increasing amounts of labor and scientific research to the safety sector. But increased labor alone is often insufficient to guarantee safety given current technologies, and new safety technologies may themselves carry risk. When this is the case, it is not so clear that we can significantly reduce risk by shifting labor and research from the consumption sector to the safety sector.

For example, one risk discussed by pessimists is the risk of asteroid impacts.34 There is mounting evidence that an asteroid impact during the Cretaceous period wiped out every land-dwelling mammal weighing more than five kilograms,35 and a similar impact could well extinguish humanity. It is widely accepted that increased labor, given current technology, cannot eliminate risks from asteroid impacts. Although there are some things we can do to promote safety given current technology, such as stockpiling food, full safety would require the capacity to deflect large incoming asteroids. Developing this capacity would require research into deflection technologies. But in fact, leading pessimists think that researching asteroid deflection technologies would be a bad idea.36 Deflection technologies are likely to be used for mining and military applications, and those applications carry a higher risk of deflecting asteroids toward Earth than away from Earth. Here, we have a case where existential risk cannot be substantially reduced by reallocating labor to the safety sector and in which safety research may increase rather than decrease existential risk. Cases such as this one put pressure on the idea that we can produce a manyfold reduction in existential risk by reallocating labor and technological research from the consumption to safety sectors.

### Turns Case---1AR

No turns case. The civil service constrains the effects of decline and makes the govenrment resilient to exogenous shocks.

Concede that it’s a “can only check trump once DA.” That means the court uses it on tariffs and won’t cause the plan or check him later, which gets rid of turns case.

Dropped court is activist and cosnervative from 2AC Dodson. That means no future liberal rulings.

### Gradualism---1AR

#### Reversing tariffs now upends the market. It injects billions of cash quickly, spiking interest rates and collapsing the dollar. That’s Brusuelas.

#### Companies are happy with current tariffs. Ruling against Trump starts from scratch and ruins the economy.

Joseph Adinolfi & Victor Reklaitis 25. Markets reporter at MarketWatch. “What’s at stake for markets as the Supreme Court gets ready to hear Trump tariff arguments.” https://www.marketwatch.com/story/whats-at-stake-for-markets-as-the-supreme-court-gets-ready-to-hear-trump-tariff-arguments-f12aec6e?mod=article\_inline.

“If the oral arguments generate expectations that the tariffs will simply be ruled illegal, we expect U.S. yields to go up and the [dollar] to fall, perhaps significantly,” said Steve Englander, head of global G-10 currency research and North America macro strategy at Standard Chartered, in a report shared with MarketWatch.

Crit Thomas, a global market strategist at Touchstone Investments, told MarketWatch that he was surprised at how calm the equity market has been given the risk that the tariffs could be struck down. He said stocks could see a pullback — perhaps a significant one — if the Supreme Court appears to be leaning in that direction.

Manish Singh, chief investment officer at Crossbridge Capital Group, expanded on Thomas’s point. While Trump’s original round of tariffs announced in April was anathema to investors, the subsequent reductions and deals struck with foreign governments have helped to ease their concerns. The fact that tariffs have started bringing in revenue for the government without stoking a big acceleration in inflation has helped make investors more comfortable with them, he noted. To toss them out now would usher in more uncertainty, which could be bad for business and the market.

“Tariffs have been reduced from a high level to a manageable level; nobody’s complaining about them now, and the U.S. is collecting money. To disrupt this whole thing and restart the whole process, that would probably cause some volatility in the market,” Singh told MarketWatch during an interview.

Tariffs dob’t hur thte economy. Liberaiton day thumps.

#### No impact!

Jim Edwards 1-14. Executive editor of global news at Fortune. "The longer the Supreme Court delays its tariff decision, the better it is for President Trump." Fortune. 1-14-2026. fortune.com/2026/01/14/us-supreme-court-tariff-ruling-trump

The court could issue a ruling as soon as today. It had been expected to rule last week. It is not clear why the court is delaying.

But Wall Street analysts are increasingly sanguine about the ruling. As time goes by, many say, the tariff issue becomes less and less dramatic. And in the bigger macro picture, the tariffs are less significant than predicted.

The longer the delay in the ruling the more likely it is the court is leaning toward Trump, according to JPMorgan.

#### Trump has backup plans AND downsides are already priced in.

Ariel Zilber 12-30. Reporter. "Trump admin has plan B to keep tariffs going if Supreme Court deems current approach unconstitutional: report." New York Post. 12-30-2025. nypost.com/2025/12/30/business/trump-admin-has-plan-b-to-keep-tariffs-going-if-supreme-court-deems-current-approach-unconstitutional-report

President Trump is reportedly preparing to unleash a fresh wave of tariffs under alternative trade laws if the Supreme Court strikes down the levies he imposed using emergency powers.

The administration is expected to use decades-old trade statutes to keep its tariff regime going if the high court rules against the president as soon as January — potentially reissuing levies under different legal rationales, according to the Financial Times.

Markets are already bracing for turbulence, with traders warning a ruling against the tariffs could leave the federal government on the hook for billions of dollars in repayments and force the White House to move quickly to reissue levies to avoid a sudden revenue hit.

The contingency plans include expanded use of arcane laws like Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act, which allows tariffs on national security grounds and has already been used to target steel, aluminum, autos, copper and lumber.

The White House is weighing additional statutes that give the president broad authority to penalize foreign trade practices.

“Nobody thinks the tariffs are going away,” Ted Murphy, a trade lawyer at Sidley Austin, told the FT.

“They are just going to be reissued under a different umbrella. They will reissue tariffs the same day.”

### BLS---1AR

#### BLS kills the DA. 2AC cx. Causes long term fiscal miscalibration.

#### Shutdown doesn’t thump nor does no cbrs since its about the sustained impact of inaccurate data. Their IL isnt prior bc of our IL defense above AND growth destruction is extincton on its own.

#### No filling in since BLS measurment of private sector is key and cassleman is before massive RIFs during the shutdown. Its not abt agency heads the 2AC is explciitly abt that.