# Chained CPI/Delay CP

## 1NC

### CP Shell

#### CP Text: The living wage policy that the aff advocates should be phased in over the course of five years starting in 2015, and the chained CPI-U should be used rather than the Consumer Price Index.

#### ZANDI 14 [Mark Zandi, Chief economist of Moody’s Analytics[[1]](#footnote-1) where he directs economics research, A trusted adviser to policymakers and an influential source of economic analysis for businesses, journalists and the public, Dr. Zandi frequently testifies before Congress on topics including the economic outlook, the nation’s daunting fiscal challenges, the merits of fiscal stimulus, financial regulatory reform, and foreclosure mitigation- Dr. Zandi conducts regular briefings on the economy for corporate boards, trade associations and policymakers at all levels. He is on the board of directors of MGIC, the nation’s largest private mortgage insurance company, and The Reinvestment Fund, a large CDFI that makes investments in disadvantaged neighborhoods. He is often quoted in national and global publications and interviewed by major news media outlets, and is a frequent guest on CNBC, NPR, Meet the Press, CNN, and various other national networks and news programs. “In Support of Raising the Minimum Wage”, https://www.economy.com/getlocal?q=DFF228B2-8D70-4B2B-B55D-11D4247B6E28&app=eccafile, February 2014, DDA]

Given the difficult economy and job market, the [Fair Minimum Wage Act] FMWA provides for too large an increase in the minimum wage too quickly. Many small businesses would struggle to adjust to such a sharp increase in their wage costs. More economically palatable, and also comparable to other OECD countries, would be to phase in the increase to $10.10 per hour over five years. The minimum wage should be indexed to inflation, but Congress may want to consider indexing it to the chained consumer price index—the most ac- curate inflation measure. The subminimum wage should also be increased to 50% of the minimum wage, about the level when it was first introduced.

#### B. Competition:

1. Functional-

1. CP increases the phase-in rate from three years to five years.
2. CP uses a different measure to index inflation.
3. Plan starts phasing in living immediately, but under the CP living wage starts to be phased in in 2015.

2. Net benefits- CP doesn’t link to the disads.

*avoids politics DAs*

#### C. Solvency: Counterplan is better for businesses, which increases employment, better maintains real purchasing power of minimum wage, and allows for economic recovery.

#### ZANDI 2

The Fair Minimum Wage Act is a reasonable starting point for debate over increasing the minimum wage. It would result in wage increases for some 16.5 million workers and lift almost 1 million workers above the poverty line by 2016.5 Yet FMWA is overly aggressive given the halting economic recovery. The law would increase the minimum wage almost 40% three years after enactment, equaling an increase of 13% per year. Although this is roughly equivalent to the increase in the minimum wage between 006 and 2009, the minimum wage was much lower on a real basis at that time. Thus, despite the sizable increase, market wages were still clearly higher in most parts of the country. Given the damage done to the job market in the Great Recession and the stagnant real wage growth since then, the FMWA’s proposed increase will be meaningfully harder for businesses and the job market to digest gracefully. The law would decrease employment by an estimated 420,000 jobs by year-end 2016. To help with the adjustment, the minimum wage should be increased to $10.10 per hour as proposed by FMWA, but over five years beginning in 2015. This would translate into an 8% per year increase in the minimum wage— still a significant increase but manageable, especially if the job market improves as expected. At the current pace of improvement, unemployment and labor force participation will return to near levels consistent with full employment by 2017. Real market wages should be rising consistently by then. Pushing the first increase in the minimum wage to 2015 would also provide businesses more time to prepare and adjust.At $10.10 per hour, the minimum wage at the start of 2020 would also make it comparable to the minimum wage in the average OECD country. Under reasonable assumptions about future U.S. and global wage growth, the U.S. minimum wage would be approximately equal to 45% of the average U.S. wage for production and nonmanagerial workers. This would be squarely in the middle of the distribution of OECD countries. After 2020, the minimum wage should be indexed to inflation. This would provide some certainty both to employers and workers. It would also reduce wage volatility, preventing real wages from falling over long periods until lawmakers act to raise them sharply. Indexation would make the adjustment process predictable and thus less costly. Lawmakers should also consider using the chained consumer price index to adjust the minimum wage. While controversial, given recent failed legislative efforts to adopt the chain index to calculate increases in Social Security benefits, it is a more accurate inflation measure than the conventional CPI. The chained index increases at a pace more [consistently] consistent with the prices businesses are able to charge. Using it to index the minimum wage will thus ensure that the minimum wage maintains real purchasing power but does not cut into businesses’ profit margins and their ability to hire. Fixing the subminimum wage for workers to 50% of the minimum wage would also bring it back near its original level in real terms. This is less than the 70% wage proposed in the FMWA, but well above the current 35%.

### Small Businesses NB

#### US economic recovery relies on the strength of small businesses and a consistent and stable increase in jobs.

#### STIBEL 13 [Jeff Stibel, Jeff Stibel is chairman and CEO of Dun & Bradstreet Credibility Corp. and author of “Wired for Thought” and the forthcoming book “Breakpoint.”, “No Economic Recovery Without Small Businesses”, http://www.rollcall.com/news/no\_economic\_recovery\_without\_small\_businesses\_commentary-224803-1.html, Mary 15th, 2013, DDA]

By some measures, the economy is fantastic. Interest rates are low. The Dow has been hitting record highs, only to exceed them the next day. The S&P 500 just topped its previous high from October 2007, well before the recession started, and home prices are rallying. The New York Times has called it a “golden age for corporate profits.” Indeed, profit margins are at an all-time high. Yet by other measures, the economy is still in peril. The March and April jobs reports showed barely enough jobs created to keep up with population growth and well less than the 250,000 needed monthly for a thriving economy. While there are signs of slightly decreasing unemployment, from 7.7 percent to 7.6 percent, that is largely because people have stopped looking for work. It is estimated that half a million people quit looking for work in the past year alone. The Center for Economic and Policy Research calculated that at current job growth rates, it will take until the year 2020 to reach stable employment. What is happening is that we are in the midst of a false recovery — the economy may have gotten out of the recession and into second gear, but it’s stalling in third. That is because economic recoveries, irrespective of any other economic indicators, always come down to jobs. Recoveries are not about corporate profits nor are they about stock market rallies. The current recovery has depended far too much on federal stimulus, government bailouts and unprecedentedly cheap money from the Fed. These cannot persist. There is simply no such thing as an economic recovery without a jobs recovery. And historically, there has never been a jobs recovery without small-business growth. Small businesses typically employ more than half the workforce and create a full two-thirds of the new jobs in the United States. Small businesses provide investment, innovation, competition and entrepreneurial energy so essential to long-term, sustainable growth. So it presents a big problem that the National Federation of Independent Business’ Small Business Economic Trends report for April 2013 showed that a net zero percent of small-business owners plan to hire in the near future. This is a huge blow to the economy. May is small-business month, so there is no better time to act than now. We should commemorate it by enacting measures to help small businesses grow. Without small businesses, our recovery will be a false one, creating a widening gap between corporate profits and middle-class income.

#### Small businesses are essential to US economic recovery—primary driver of jobs and business. The USFG must ensure certainty for small businesses as uncertainty stifles growth.

#### GRAVES 11 [Rep. Sam Graves, chairman of the House of Representatives Small Business Committee, 14 year congressman from Missouri, on the Committee on Transportation and INfrastruture “Graves: Small Businesses Key to Economic Recovery”, Roll Call- main news source for news on Capitol Hill, http://www.rollcall.com/issues/56\_136/small\_businesses\_key\_economic\_recovery-206285-1.html?pg=1&dczone=opinion, June 9, 2011, DDA]

On Friday it was announced that once again many Americans were handed a pink slip instead of a paycheck. May’s disappointing unemployment numbers are more proof of the failed big-government policies of the Obama administration and are why we must do a complete 180 to get our economy on track and Americans back to work. This recovery has been weak because of the uncertainty that persists among our nation’s primary job creators — small-business owners. Our nation’s small firms create seven of every 10 new jobs, and they employ more than half the country’s private-sector workforce. If we want to successfully address our nation’s unemployment crisis, we must promote policies that provide confidence to small businesses. Last month, during a town hall event, President Barack Obama encouraged businesses to “step up” and hire workers. In reality, businesses haven’t been sitting on revenues because they want to. It’s because they are nervous about the uncertainty that this administration has created. Small-business owners are continually burdened by the possibility of tax increases, the inconsistent flow of credit, an outrageous national debt, high energy costs, overreaching federal regulations and the looming Obamacare mandates. Providing certainty for America’s small businesses should be the No. 1 priority for Washington, considering they are the backbone of our nation’s workforce and the engine of our economy. According to the Small Business Administration, small firms have generated 64 percent of net new jobs over the past 15 years. If the president and Senate leadership want to try new strategies to address the unemployment crisis, they must look at providing certainty for small businesses first.

#### US key to world economy

IMF 13 [International Monetary Fund, international economic organization that works to improve the economies of its 188 country members “Strong U.S. Economy, Strong Global Economy—Two Sides of Same Coin.” September 19, 2013. http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/survey/so/2013/new091913a.htm]

In a world of increasing economic interconnections, the United States’s stake in the global recovery is greater than ever, IMF Managing Director Christine Lagarde said in a speech to business leaders at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in Washington, D.C. “What happens elsewhere in the world—be it the success of recovery in Europe or the continued smooth functioning of supply chains in Asia—matters increasingly for the United States,” Lagarde said. “The converse is also true. What happens here matters increasingly for the global economy.” Her remarks, which focused on the interplay between the global economy and the U.S. economy, also highlighted the need to find joint solutions to secure a lasting, balanced and widely shared global recovery. “Job creation is a critical ingredient of any economic recovery, domestic or global,” she emphasized. Businesses have a key role to play, Lagarde said, but at the same time, policymakers have an important responsibility to help “shape the environment in which businesses and citizens can thrive—and jobs can be created.” Changing global picture Lagarde said that global growth remains subdued, while acknowledging that the global economic environment is changing. She emphasized that economies are moving at different speeds and that the fruits of growth are not evenly shared, both in the United States and other countries. The U.S. economy is growing and, after a long time, so is the Euro Area. In Japan, aggressive policy support and the ongoing reform process is helping to spur growth. The emerging market economies, on the other hand, are slowing. “For some, this may be a shift toward more balanced and sustainable growth,” Lagarde told the audience. “For others, it reflects the need to address imbalances that have made them more vulnerable to the recent market turbulence.” Reinforcing the point about global interconnections, Lagarde cited the IMF’s recent “spillover” analysis, which suggests that if the world’s five major economies were to work together to adopt a more rigorous, comprehensive, and compatible set of policies, it could boost global GDP by about 3 percent over the longer run. U.S. recovery gaining strength Lagarde noted that the U.S. economy is gaining strength, calling this good news for America—and good news for the world economy. Although growth is still modest—well under 2 percent—it should accelerate by a full percentage point next year, Lagarde said, adding that the private sector is playing a key role as the engine of growth and job creation. Despite signs of strengthening, the latest jobs data present a mixed picture, with employment remaining well below pre-crisis levels. “The issue of jobs remains paramount,” said Lagarde, noting that jobs and growth is an increasingly important component of the IMF’s policy advice. Lagarde highlighted three key recommendations for U.S. policymakers, drawn from the IMF’s most recent assessment of the U.S. economy. • Fix public finances. Fiscal consolidation could be slower in the short run, but more action is needed to reduce long-run pressures on the budget. Lagarde also warned that political uncertainty over the budget and debt ceiling were not helpful to the recovery. “It is essential to resolve this, and the earlier the better,” she said, “for confidence, for markets, and for the real economy.” • Appropriately calibrate monetary policy. When the time comes, exit from unconventional monetary policy should be gradual, tied to progress in economic recovery and unemployment, and should be clearly communicated and in a dialogue. • Complete financial sector reform. While there has been progress on this front, attention needs to focus on the outstanding “danger zones,” such as derivatives and shadow banking. Global interconnections and role of IMF Lagarde underscored the unique role of the U.S. in the global economy, noting that the economy accounts for 11 percent of global trade and 20 percent of global manufacturing. The country’s global financial ties run deep too, she said. Foreign banks hold about $5.5 trillion of U.S. assets, and U.S. banks hold $3 trillion of foreign assets. While these interconnections have great benefits for the United States, they are not without risks, Lagarde cautioned, referring to the collapse of Lehman Brothers five years ago that ushered in “a harsh new reality” across sectors, countries, and the world. That is why an effective IMF is important for the global membership. “Our policy advice, for example—including in core areas like exchange rates or external imbalances—has helped to prevent or to ease the hardship of crises around the world,” said Lagarde. “That, in turn, has helped reduce the possible negative fallout for the U.S. and for all countries.” An effective IMF must also continue to evolve and anticipate what lies ahead. In this connection, the IMF has placed greater emphasis on global interconnections—the economic spillovers between countries and the financial sector. Lagarde also highlighted the set of governance reforms that the IMF is working toward that will help strengthen its capacity to prevent and resolve crises, and at the same time, help broaden its representation to better reflect the changing dynamics of the global economy. “These quota reforms need the support of all our member countries—including the United States,” she said. The IMF is grounded in the principle of good global citizenship. “If countries work together to serve the common interests, everybody wins,” she concluded. “We all have a large stake in these interconnections.”

#### Economic collapse causes competition for resources and instability that triggers hotspots around the globe – co-opts all other causes of war

#### HARRIS AND BURROWS 9

Mathew, PhD European History @ Cambridge, counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer is a member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” <http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f_0016178_13952.pdf> Increased Potential for Global Conflict

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks\_and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.

#### Small businesses key to US economy.

#### USTR 14 [Office of the United States Trade Representative, “Small Business”, http://www.ustr.gov/trade-topics/small-business, 2014, DDA]

Small businesses are the backbone of the U.S. economy, and the primary source of jobs for Americans. Small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) also account for the largest group of U.S. exporters and are a major user of imported goods. In October 2009, USTR launched a new trade policy initiative to enable SMEs to grow their businesses and generate jobs through international trade. An agency-wide working group is ensuring that policymaking and enforcement better serve small- and medium-sized enterprises. USTR has also requested an investigation by the International Trade Commission on the role of small- and medium-sized exporters, to inform trade policy efforts

### Chained CPI NB

**CPI leads to greater employer spending because it overestimates cost of living, which harms the strength of local businesses.**

**CBO 10** [Congressional Budget Office, Since its founding in 1974, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has produced independent analyses of budgetary and economic issues to support the Congressional budget process. The agency is strictly nonpartisan and conducts objective, impartial analysis, which is evident in each of the dozens of reports and hundreds of cost estimates that its economists and policy analysts produce each year, “Using a Different Measure of Inflation for Indexing Federal Programs and the Tax Code”, http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/ftpdocs/112xx/doc11256/cpi\_brief.pdf, February 24, 2010, DDA]

Although the CPI is not a true cost-of-living index, BLS’s goal in computing it is to estimate[s] the growth in the cost of living by measuring the change in the cost of a “market basket” of goods and services that represents average consumer spending.2 The market basket is based on data from BLS’s Consumer Expenditure Survey, in which thousands of families report what they actually bought. BLS divides those purchases into 211 categories—such as breakfast cereal, rent on a primary residence, women’s dresses, and wireless telephone services—and assigns a percentage weight to each category based on its share of consumer spending in a base period. To measure price changes, BLS chooses about 80,000 specific items (several hundred for each category) and checks their prices every month at selected stores and other establishments in 87 urban areas. BLS uses those price data to compute various versions of the CPI, two of which are currently used to index federal programs. The consumer price index for all urban con- sumers (CPI-U) is based on the average spending of almost all residents of urban or metropolitan areas— about 87 percent of U.S. residents. The consumer price index for urban wage earners and clerical workers (CPI- W) focuses on a subset of the CPI-U population: house- holds that include clerical workers, sales workers, labor- ers, or certain other types of nonprofessional employees. The CPI-W population represents about 32 percent of U.S. residents. The two versions of the CPI produce similar estimates of inflation. Over the past 20 years, CPI-W inflation has averaged 2.65 percent a year, and CPI-U inflation has averaged 2.69 percent. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) expects that the two measures will grow at about the same rate in the future. Every two years, BLS uses new survey data to update the share of consumer spending devoted to each of the 211 categories in the market basket. As a result, at any given time, the CPI is based on spending patterns from two to four years earlier. For example, the monthly values of the CPI computed in 2008 and 2009 were based on spending data reported in the Consumer Expenditure Survey in 2005 and 2006. For the monthly values begin- ning in January 2010, BLS used new data to update the market basket to reflect purchases made in 2007 and 2008. Because the CPI is based on spending patterns from a point in the past, it does not fully incorporate the effects of economic substitution. Therefore, the CPI grows faster than the cost of living does. That substitution bias would exist whether the market basket was from one month ago or five years ago. However, greater periods of time between updates to the basket tend to magnify substi- tution bias and to cause an even larger gap between the increase in the CPI and growth in the cost of living. BLS’s procedures account for the effects of substitution within most basic categories of goods and services in the market basket—such as when some consumers who pre- viously bought large grade-A eggs switch to medium- sized eggs when the latter go on sale.3 However, the index does not take into account shifts that occur between one category and another. For instance, if the price of apples rises by 50 percent and the price of bananas goes up by only 10 percent, consumers will tend to buy fewer apples and more bananas. Because apples and bananas are separate categories in the CPI market basket, the index does not account for the effects of such substitution. As a result, it overstates the amount by which consumers’ well-being declines when prices rise and understates the benefit of price reductions.

**Chained CPI solves for goods substitution bias.**

**CBO 2**

In reality, however, inflation as measured that way is generally higher than the annual growth in the cost of living [because]—that is, than the amount of additional resources someone would need to maintain the same standard of living this year as last year in the face of rising prices. The reason for the difference is that many people can soften the impact of inflation on their standard of living by shifting some of their purchases away from goods or ser- vices that have risen in price toward ones that have not risen or have risen less. Even with such economic substitution, an increase in the price of a good lowers consumers’ standard of living (unless they value the old good and the new good equally). But the resulting decline in their standard of living is usually smaller than it would be if substitution were not possible. Thus, measures of inflation that do not account for such substitution overstate growth in the cost of living, a phenomenon known as substitution bias.One way to account for the effects of economic substitution would be to use a market basket of purchases from a period after the price changes being measured. However, the resulting measure of inflation would be biased down- ward, just as the current CPI is biased upward. Another approach [that] would avoid both types of bias. Since August 2002, BLS has published an alternative index, the chained CPI-U, that attempts to fully account for the effects of economic substitution on changes in the cost of living.4 The chained CPI-U provides an unbiased estimate of changes in the cost of living from one month to the next by using market baskets from both months, thus “chaining” the two months together.5

#### Chained CP reduces spending--- accounts for changes in spending patterns and doesn’t overstate the cost of living *[summary card for 2NR]*

**CBO 10**

Federal laws try to protect taxpayers and recipients of government benefits from the effects of rising prices by specifying that dollar amounts in many parts of the tax code and in some programs be automatically adjusted— or indexed—for inflation. Without such indexing, a rise in the general level of prices would alter the effects of federal policies even in the absence of action by lawmakers. For example, if the dollar amounts that delineate the different tax brackets in the individual income tax were not indexed, inflation would push many people’s income into higher brackets and boost average tax rates over time, even if income did not grow faster than prices. Many federal programs and parts of the tax code are currently indexed to increases in the consumer price index (CPI), a measure of inflation calculated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).1 According to many analysts, however, the CPI overstates increases in the cost of living because it does not fully account for the fact that consumers generally adjust their spending patterns as some prices change relative to other prices. One option for law-makers would be to link federal benefit programs and tax provisions to another measure of inflation—the chained CPI—that is designed to account fully for changes in spending patterns. The chained CPI grows more slowly than the traditional CPI does: by an average of 0.3 per- centage points per year over the past decade. As a result, using that measure to index benefit programs and tax provisions would reduce federal spending (especially on Social Security and federal pensions) and increase revenues.

## 2NR

### Substance

#### AT- It worked in 06: FMWA kills jobs and minimum wage was lower in 06 in real dollars.

#### ZANDI 14

Although this is roughly equivalent to the increase in the minimum wage between 2006 and 2009, the minimum wage was much lower on a real basis at that time. Thus, despite the sizable increase, market wages were still clearly higher in most parts of the country. Given the damage done to the job market in the Great Recession and the stagnant real wage growth since then, the FMWA’s proposed increase will be meaningfully harder for businesses and the job market to digest gracefully. The law would decrease employment by an estimated 420,000 jobs by year-end 2016.

## Theory

### Delay CPs Good

#### I Meets:

1. I don’t advocate for the plan- the counterplan makes other modifications to the aff aside from the date of implementation.

#### Delay Counterinterp

**A. COUNTER-INTERPRETATION:** The negative may advocate for living wage to be implemented at a later date.

**C. STANDARDS:**

**part a- Offense:**

**1. Critical thinking-**

a) My argument is key to real world decision making- every policymaker or person has to decide when to execute an action and what conditions need to be in place for the action to succeed.

b) a delay CP is a unique argument that people usually don’t engage in- this increases critical thinking because it’s an uncommon strategy that makes the aff think about a new issue surrounding their advocacy.

**2. Prep Time-** The aff has infinite prep time for their advocacy so theneg needs core generics for unpredictable affs, otherwise neg has an infinite research burden. Delay CPs check back on the skew because they apply to any aff.

**3. Ground**-

a) Real policymakers decide when to enact policy, so this position is core neg ground since it contests a fundamental question of temporality that is necessary for any policy. Solvency advocate proves that whether the aff actor should implement living wage RIGHT NOW is a key implementation concern.

**They kill education- 90% of policymaking is implementation rather than analysis.**

ELMORE

[Richard F. Elmore, Professor of political science at University of Washington, Political Science Quarterly, Vol. 94, No. 4, 1980, DDA]

The emergence of implementation as a subject for policy analysis coincides closely with the discovery by policy analysts that decisions are not self-executing. Analysis of policy choices matters very little if the mechanism for implementing those choices is poorly understood. In answering the question, "What percentage of the work of achieving a desired governmental action is done when the preferred analytic alternative has been identified?" Allison estimated that, in the normal case, it was about 10 percent, leaving the remaining 90 percent [of the work of achieving a desired governmental action is done] in the realm of implementation. Hence, in Nelson's terms, "the core of analysis of alternatives becomes the prediction of how alternative organizational structures will behave over . .. time." But the task of prediction is vastly complicated by the absence of a coherent body of organizational theory, making it necessary to posit several alternative models of organization.

Their aff avoids *all questions of implementation* and instead focuses on the macro-level idea of presumed consent, whereas operational factors are significant in the success of presumed consent policies.

b) Aff gets the plan text and neg gets competitive counterplans- ad hoc restrictions on neg advocacy are unfair because they kill predictable ground for the neg.

c) any reason why the aff is good can be framed as a disad to the CP- all the time that we aren’t doing the aff, but the harms are occurring is bad.

d) Every study says minimum wage is good for the economy, so the only way for the neg to generate offense is through a CP that incorporates presumed consent.

Ground is key to fairness because it determines offensive capabilities and offense is how we access the ballot.

**4. Research Burdens**- My interp forces the aff to research more of their plan, specifically how it relates to real world political, social, and cultural factors of the US, which increases education because aff has to read more topic literature. Presumed consent may sound good in a vacuum, but practical aspects of implementation are important education.

**D. VOTER:**

1. Education is a voter- debate is an educational activity founded on the basis of teaching debaters valuable skills for the rest of their lives so they detract from the only long-term goal of debate. Vote on education because a) the substance they chose to run destroys any potential value of debate, b) you have a role as an educator to discourage uneducational practices

**2. Education outweighs fairness:**

1. It’s the only terminal impact debate. Substance doesn’t matter unless there’s an educational benefit to discussing it. Education is universally valuable to our lives rather than just this debate round.
2. Schools will stop funding debate if debate is no longer educational, so education is a pre-requisite to being able to debate at all.
3. Fairness questions who did the better debating, but education is a pre-requisite because it tells you what good debate is. It could be fair for the round to be decided through a coin flip, but that’s not “good debating” so there’s no link to the ballot. It could be fair for us to both blitz 60 a prioris but that shows who’s better at spreading, not who’s a better debater. This means education comes first because it answers the prior question of what good debating is, so links to fairness have no impact if the round isn’t educational.
4. Fairness can’t be determined- there are 100 factors determining who has an advantage such as having more coaches or experience. Absent knowing who starts at an advantage, we don’t know if fairness skews are good or bad because they might just rebalance the scales. However, education is always valuable so it comes first because you’re 100% certain voting for my interp is good.
5. Fairness only has instrumental value in achieving ends, but isn’t intrinsically valuable. Education provides an actual reason for an activity existing, as opposed to just being a possible useful feature of that activity. This comes before other voter arguments because if the activity is useless, there’s no reason to care about ruining it.

**3. Reasonability-** Evaluate theory through a reasonability paradigm with a brightline of **a 1-1 structural burden structure-** this means don’t exclude my arguments or drop me as a debater unless I distort the burden structure of the round **a)** Theory crowds out substantive education, affs can cry abuse every round because the 1AR is too hard. **b)** as long as both sides have one route to the ballot, the round is fair- arguments about the quality of that route to a ballot are inherently subjective and require judge intervention. Preventing intervention is the biggest fairness impact because It shifts the evaluation away from who’s doing the better debating.

**4. Err neg on 1AR theory: a)** Aff gets 7-6 minute skew after initiating the theory debate, **b)** aff gets the final word on the theory debate which is a major advantage, **c)** aff get infinite prep time to choose the focus for the debate, so neg needs the advantage on one layer to check back aff advantages. These arguments all mean evaluate theory at the end of the 2NR, not the 2AR.

**5. Neg gets RVIs** if they don’t read offensive theory in the 1N and prove their interp is legitimate through offense back to an interpretation.

**a)** reciprocity- theory is a no risk issue for the aff so RVIs make it a fair two way street. Outweighs all other fairness links because my opponent has more avenuese to the ballot.

**b)** time skew- I have to spend time answering theory, so double bind: either 1. I spend too much time and lose because I undercover substance or 2. I overcommit on substance and lose on theory **c)** education- RVIs checks abusive theory proliferation since it deters those no risk issues.

#### *if pre-empting 1AR theory:*

**UNDERVIEW:** I reserve the right to make new theory arguments in the 2n because it’s unpredictable what the 1ar theory strat will be- he can adapt to my NC, so I need the same adaptability to prove the legitimacy of my arguments.

#### OFF HIS INTERP:

**AT Time skew (1ac wasn’t about temporal decision)**

1. It’s your fault you didn’t defend the temporality of your plan in the AC
2. Wiki disclosure solves abuse- you knew you had to beat this cp so you could pick an aff that should be implemented now.
3. the CP evidence indicates that the current feasibility of presumed consent is a huge question in the topic lit- it’s not my fault they didn’t defend it in the AC
4. purpose of debate strategy is getting a time advantage- only unfair divisions of time change the burden structure- if 1-1 burden structure then time is even
5. generic aff time skew args are non-unique to my strategy
6. reduction ad absurdum- this would mean the neg has to spend time answering every one of the aff’s arguments- kills fairness because they get to choose arguments to extend in the 1AR and make parts of the NC irrelevant- kills education because we can never go in depth on the topic if I have to rebut every part of the case and can’t agree on any starting points for discussion
7. TURN- 1AR only has to justify one minute part of their aff because the neg concedes the majority of their case

**AT Predictability**

1. predictability claims are unverifiable- they could have blocks on the issue but just don’t want to read them- don’t vote off unverifiable arguments- if you accuse somebody of abusing you the onus is on you to show that you were abused- impossible for you to do
2. Topic Lit controls predictability: A) I have a solvency advocate which proves there is topic lit. The institute of Medicine is nationally recognized body of health care experts that was founed by the United States Federal Government. The CP cards express the composite opinions of 14 top professors from different universities distributed around the country. B) policymakers discuss all the time when to enact the plan

**AT Ground**

1. **1-1 division of quantity of ground:** aff gets plan now, neg gets plan later
2. No link to fairness- all ground harms are entirely self-imposed because he chose to defend a plan, rather than truth-testing or a general principle aff.
3. Predictability controls quality of ground- if you knew I was reading this, and there’s literature, you should be able to debate it
4. Quality of ground is an inherently subjective metric- some people thinks util is good ground, and others think philosophy is good ground- impact is it’s ridiculous to vote people down for not abiding by our subjective preferences about what is good debate
5. TURN- you get great quality of round- I conceded entirety of link and impact stories and you just need to beat back this one argument
6. TURN- very few 1n strategies allow the aff to know the 1ar will be relevant in the 2ar, but delay cps ensure the 2ar is relevant in that there’s one issue for debate.

1. Moody's is an essential component of the global capital markets, providing credit ratings, research, tools and analysis that contribute to transparent and integrated financial markets. Moody's Corporation (NYSE: MCO) is the parent company of Moody's Investors Service, which provides credit ratings and research covering debt instruments and securities, and Moody's Analytics, which offers leading-edge software, advisory services and research for credit and economic analysis and financial risk management. The Corporation, which reported revenue of $3.0 billion in 2013, employs approximately 8,500 people worldwide and maintains a presence in 31 countries. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)