# AC

### Fwk

#### I affirm the resolution resolved: a just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

Resolved is defined as[[1]](#footnote-1) **firm in** purpose or **intent; determined.**

**The standard is maximizing expected well-being. – we will spec – Hedonistic act Utilitarianism**

**Prefer:**

**1] Actor specificity:**

**A] Governments must aggregate since every policy benefit some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action.**

**B] States lack wills or intentions since policies are collective actions. Actor-specificity comes first since different agents have different ethical standings. Link turns calc indites because the alt would be *no* action.**

**2] Lexical Prerequisite – suffering creates lifelong conditions and threats on life that preclude the ability of actors being able to engage in other evaluations ethical since they are in a constant state of crisis.**

**3] TJF – Ethical frameworks must be theoretically legitimate. All frameworks are functionally topicality interpretations of the word ought so they must theoretically justified. Prefer our standard – a] Ground: Both debaters are guaranteed access to ground – Aff gets plans and advantages, while Neg gets disads and counterplans. Additionally, anything can function as an impact as long as an external benefit is articulated, so all your offense applies. b] Weighing ground: consequences lets us weigh the probability a scenario, its risk, scope, severity, etc. and we can even weigh between these standards. We can still run side constraints but they are compared to other impacts while other frameworks prevent weighing by making them absolute. Ow on resolvability because if there is framing mechanism that we don’t know what offense matters. That’s an independent voter: because the judge literally cannot make a decision.**

**4] Extinction outweighs –**

**a] Moral Uncertainty and Magnitude –**

**Pummer 15** [Theron, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. “Moral Agreement on Saving the World” Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] AT

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But **that is a huge mistake.** Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; **it is not the view that the latter don’t matter**. Even John Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” **Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good**, from an impartial point of view. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. **We should also take into account moral uncertainty.** What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, **all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world**. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

**b] Forecloses future improvement – we can never improve society because our impact is irreversible**

**c] Turns suffering – mass death causes suffering because people can’t get access to resources and basic necessities**

**d] Moral obligation – allowing people to die is unethical and should be prevented because it creates ethics towards other people**

**e] Objectivity – body count is the most objective way to calculate impacts because comparing suffering is unethical**

### Overview

#### [1] It is important that it’s unconditional because corporations can manipulate those conditions to put down every single strike. Any conditions open the door for companies and governments. People in power aren’t determining if a strike is good. That is for the people who are striking to determine.

#### [2] You have to win that unconditional means bad and prove that every instance of unconditional strikes is bad.

### Prison Strikes

#### Prisoners are dehumanized through poor working conditions and extremely underpaid labor.

Barron 18 – Laignee Barron August 22, 2018 “Here's Why Inmates in the U.S. Prison System Have Launched a Nationwide Strike” [https://time.com/5374133/prison-strike-labor-conditions/] AHS//JW Accessed 10/24/21

What may shape up to be one of the largest prison strikes in modern U.S. history began Tuesday, with inmates across the country protesting what they call “modern day slavery.” The nearly three-week strike targets poorly paid prison labor, prison conditions and life-long sentencing, and was spurred by deadly riots earlier this year at the Lee Correctional Institution where seven inmates were killed. Through labor strikes, hunger strikes and sit-ins staged from Aug. 21 to Sept. 9, protest organizers are demanding an end to what they see as exploitation and racism in the world’s largest incarceration complex. “Prisoners understand they are being treated as animals. We know that our conditions are causing physical harm and deaths that could be avoided,” Jailhouse Lawyers Speak, a nationwide inmates’ collective, said in a pre-strike statement. “Prisons in America are a warzone,” it added. It’s unclear how many of the almost 2.3 million people serving time in America’s vast incarceration system will risk substantial penal retaliation to join the protest. But the movement has the potential for massive operational disruption as correctional institutions rely on prison labor, from cooking and serving the meals, to washing the laundry, to maintaining the grounds. As correctional facilities from coast to coast are hit with strikes, here’s what to know. Who is protesting and why Led by inmate organizations like Jailhouse Lawyers Speak and Incarcerated Workers Organizing Committee, the 19-day strike has countrywide reach with at least 17 states reportedly participating so far. The strike comes in response to bloodshed at the Lee Correctional Institution in South Carolina, which was deemed one of the deadliest prison brawls in recent memory. At the April 15 uprising, sparked in part by gang-related violence, at least seven inmates bled to death from stab wounds, while 22 others suffered injuries. “South Carolina is only a reflection of the issues facing other states and governmental buildings of confinement. This is a systematic problem born out of slavery that this nation must come to grips with and address,” Jailhouse Lawyers Speak said in its strike manifesto. Strike organizers have spelled out 10 demands, including improving living conditions to “recognize the humanity of imprisoned men and women” and ending racialized sentencing that discriminates against “black and brown humans.” They are demanding an end to “death by incarceration,” or sentences without parole, and calling for increased spending on rehabilitation support. The strike also hinges on prison labor, which is often compulsory and remunerated in just pennies. Thousands of captive laborers go to work each day for the multi-billion dollar, for-profit prison industry, yet some reportedly earn as little as 4 cents an hour. David Fathi, director of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) National Prison Project, points out that even in states that do not operate compulsory labor schemes, the power discrepancy between the inmates and those who guard them leads to possibly coercive scenarios. Prisoners are in “a situation where the usual checks on employer exploitation and abuse simply don’t operate,” he told the BBC. Prison labor captured a national spotlight amid the devastating wildfires in California, when it was revealed that many of the volunteers risking their lives are inmates getting paid just $1 an hour.

#### Underpaid laborers fuel an increasing wealth gap that causes economic collapse.

Lansley 12 – Stewart Lansley February 4, 2012 “Why increasing economic inequality leads to collapse” [https://www.theguardian.com/business/2012/feb/05/inequality-leads-to-economic-collapse] AHS//JW Accessed 10/25/21

During the past 30 years, a growing share of the global economic pie has been taken by the world's wealthiest people. In the UK and the US, the share of national income going to the top 1% has doubled, setting workforces adrift from economic progress. Today, the world's 1,200 billionaires hold economic firepower that is equivalent to a third of the size of the American economy. It is this concentration of income – at levels not seen since the 1920s – that is the real cause of the present crisis. In the UK, the upward transfer of income from wage earners to business and the mega-wealthy amounts to the equivalent of 7% of the economy. UK wage-earners have around £100bn – roughly equivalent to the size of the nation's health budget – less in their pockets today than if the cake were shared as it was in the late 1970s.In the US, the sum stands at £500bn. There a typical worker would be more than £3,000 better off if the distribution of output between wages and profits had been held at its 1979 level. In the UK, they would earn almost £2,000 more. The effect of this consolidation of economic power is that the two most effective routes out of the crisis have been closed. First, consumer demand – the oxygen that makes economies work – has been choked off. Rich economies have lost billions of pounds of spending power. Secondly, the slump in demand might be less damaging if the winners from the process of upward redistribution – big business and the top 1% – were playing a more productive role in helping recovery. They are not. Britain's richest 1,000 have accumulated fortunes that are collectively worth £250bn more than a decade ago. The biggest global corporations are also sitting on near-record levels of cash. In the UK, such corporate surpluses stand at over £60bn, around 5% of the size of the economy. This money could be used to kickstart growth. Yet it is mostly standing idle. The result is paralysis. The economic orthodoxy of the past 30 years holds that a stiff dose of inequality brings more efficient and faster-growing economies. It was a theory that captured the New Labour leadership – as long as tackling poverty was made a priority, then the rich should be allowed to flourish. So have the architects of market capitalism been proved right? The evidence says no. The wealth gap has soared, but without wider economic progress. Since 1980, UK growth and productivity rates have been a third lower and unemployment five times higher than in the postwar era of "regulated capitalism". The three post-1980 recessions have been deeper and longer than those of the 1950s and 1960s, culminating in the crisis of the last four years. The main outcome of the post-1980 experiment has been an economy that is much more polarised and much more prone to crisis. History shows a clear link between inequality and instability. The two most damaging crises of the last century – the Great Depression of the 1930s and the Great Crash of 2008 – were both preceded by sharp rises in inequality. The factor linking excessive levels of inequality and economic crisis is to be found in the relationship between wages and productivity. For the two-and-a-half decades from 1945, wages and productivity moved broadly in line across richer nations, with the proceeds of rising prosperity evenly shared. This was also a period of sustained economic stability. Then there have been two periods when wages have seriously lagged behind productivity – in the 1920s and the post-1980s. Both of them culminating in prolonged slumps. Between 1990 and 2007, real wages in the UK rose more slowly than productivity, and at a worsening rate. In the US, the decoupling started earlier and has led to an even larger gap. The significance of a growing "wage-productivity gap" is that it upsets the natural mechanisms necessary to achieve economic balance. Purchasing power shrinks and consumer societies suddenly lack the capacity to consume. In both the 1920s and the post-1980s, to prevent economies seizing up, the demand gap was filled by an explosion of private debt. But pumping in debt didn't prevent recession: it merely delayed it. Concentrating the proceeds of growth in the hands of a small global financial elite not only brings mass deflation – it also leads to asset bubbles. In 1920s America, a rapid process of enrichment at the top merely fed years of speculative activity in property and the stock market. In the build-up to 2008, rising corporate surpluses and burgeoning personal wealth led to a giant mountain of footloose global capital. The cash sums held by the world's rich (those with cash of more than $1m) doubled in the decade to 2008 to a massive $39 trillion. Only a tiny proportion of this sum ended up in productive investment. In the decade to 2007, bank lending for property development and takeover activity surged while the share going to UK manufacturing shrank. While the contribution to the economy made by financial services more than doubled over this period, manufacturing fell by a quarter. Far from creating new wealth, a tsunami of "hot money" raced around the world in search of faster and faster returns, creating bubbles – in property, commodities and business – lowering economic resilience and amplifying the risk of financial breakdown. New Labour's leaders were right in arguing that the left needed to have a more coherent policy for wealth creation. That is the route to wider prosperity for all. But the central lesson of the last 30 years is that a widening income gap and a more productive economy do not go hand in hand. An economic model that allows the richest members of society to accumulate a larger and larger share of the cake will eventually self-destruct. It is a lesson that is yet to be learned.

Millions of people in the prison system have their basic human rights stripped away. Prison systems shut down their voices in order to profit off extremely cheap labor. By voting neg, you allow this modern-day slavery to continue where people are not only discriminated against, but also paid little to nothing.

### Sexual Assault Strikes

#### Sexual harassment in the workplace has existed for decades with a growing fear of speaking out.

The Hans India 14 – The Hans India November 11, 2014 **“47% of Indian women find sexual harassment at the workplace a big issue” [**https://www.thehansindia.com/posts/index/Hans/2014-11-11/47-of-Indian-women-find-sexual-harassment-at-the-workplace-a-big-issue/115699?infinitescroll=1**]** AHS//JW Accessed 10/25/21

For Indian women, sexual harassment is nothing new. Every day they come across stories, or I dare say witness stories of women (including themselves) being stalked, eye raped, or going through verbal and physical attacks. According to one of the recent surveys conducted by Nimbuzz, a cross-platform mobile calling & messaging app, Indian women don't feel safe at their workplace. The survey, titled Nimbuzz - Pulse of the Nation, reveals that "47 per cent of women feel their top issue at work is sexual harassment vis-a-vis inequality in pay and unequal opportunities." Not just women, even men feel that sexual harassment is one of the common problems for working women. "51 per cent of male colleagues feel that their female colleagues have faced sexual harassment in one way or the other," cites the Nimbuzz - Pulse of the Nation report. It could begin with looks, lewd remarks, intentional touching and end up into anything—right from open invitation to have sex to rape, depending on the person involved. Interestingly, the executive stalkers (including others), are now using innovative way to hit on their female colleagues—like forwarding flirtatious texts through WhatsApp, BBM among others. Using social media platforms such as Facebook to stalk female colleagues is also very common. However, Rinku Tyagi, a senior executive with one of the leading IT consulting firms, feels otherwise. She says, "Social media platforms have just come up, while sexual harassment has been a prevailing practice for decades. Yes, texts and social media platforms are being used, but verbal remarks and physical advances still take the cake when it comes to sexual harassment." We couldn't agree less despite seeing the stats put forth by Nimbuzz - Pulse of the Nation report, which reveals that "58 per cent of women claim that most of the cases happen via sms/text." "You can't blame women for not coming out or speaking up," protests Pragnya Pandey, a marketing communications specialist, working with one of the leading Indian IT firms. She further puts across her point, "Though personally I have never faced sexual harassment, but in my over 9 years of experience, I have heard about many cases and personally observed two. In both the cases, the complaints were lodged to higher organizational authorities, but sadly action against the perpetrator was taken. Now, considering that grievances address system of organizations is not strong enough, how do you expect ladies to come out and voice their concerns?" Prangya probably hit the nail on the head. 41 per cent of women, who participated in the Nimbuzz survey, admitted that they fear speaking up against sexual harassment because of lack of confidence in the organization to take cognizance. Rinku Tyagi, also feels that lack of confidence in the organization is the first thing that stop women from putting forth their problems. She further added two more reasons to what stops women from talking about this issue openly. "The strong social taboo of sexual harassment often overwhelms women's thoughts. And then there is the peer pressure that they won't get their due promotions or appraisals if they would raise their voice in the so-far-male dominated hierarchical organizations." Now, this is a major point of concern when you consider that almost 62 per cent of people feel that sexual harassment happens by peers. So, does this mean there is no way out? There sure is. Women only need to start raising their voices, and utilizing the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013, for their benefit. And the role that organizations can play involves: setting up an effective grievance system, and educate women employees about legal actions that they can take against the culprit. A case of sexual harassment has been registered against the Eluru Sub-Registrar in West Godavari District. Going into the details, a woman working as an attendant in the audit section of the registrar's office, approached the Disha police alleging that a man named Jayaraju has been sexually harassing her for the past few days. The woman employee said that she had complained to the district registrar about Jayaraju's harassment while the higher authorities reprimanded him and left the issue. However, the harassment of the registrar had not stopped instead it was intensified. Meanwhile, the victim claimed that the registrar had threatened to kill her if she doesn't compromise his demands. The case is being registered and investigated by the Disha police. On the other hand, the accused working as Sub Registrar in Audit Section was also booked by Anti Corruption Bureau in Jangareddygudam three years ago.

#### Labor strikes hold sexual assault offenders accountable.

Emdon 19 – Erica Emdon July 4, 2019 “Numsa strike against sexual harassment is a ‘powerful moment in labour history’” [https://mg.co.za/article/2019-07-04-numsa-strike-against-sexual-harassment-is-a-powerful-moment-in-labour-history/] AHS//JW Accessed 10/26/21

What does it require to get management to take a sexual harassment complaint seriously? If the recent National Union of Metal Workers of South Africa (Numsa) strike is anything to go by, it takes about 290 striking workers remaining underground without food and clean water for nine days. From June 19 to 27, an underground strike was staged at the Lanxess chrome mine near Rustenburg in North West, during which workers demanded that management immediately suspend and discipline an alleged perpetrator of sexual harassment. It took nine days for an agreement to be reached and for union members to return to work. This is a most extraordinary show of strength, and a moment of exceptional unity, by workers in support of a comrade who experienced sexual harassment. The workers, both men and women, were demanding that a longstanding sexual harassment matter be dealt with by the mine management. The matter had been reported in August 2018, but had not been resolved by June this year. The complainant, an underground mine worker, was subjected to sexual harassment by a manager, a mine captain with whom she worked. The woman lodged a grievance, but management, through an HR manager and two other senior employees, put pressure on her to withdraw the case. It appeared to complainant and the union that the HR manager and his two colleagues were colluding with the alleged perpetrator. To add to the pressure the woman was under to not continue with the grievance, the union alleges that she was forced to sit in the same room with the alleged harasser and encouraged to resolve the issue through dialogue. The union complained about the HR manager’s behaviour and his apparent support for the perpetrator. Only after this was the mine captain suspended. However, his suspension was short-lived and he was reinstated without the woman being notified as to why his suspension was withdrawn. She was forced to continue working with him as though nothing had happened. The strike that ensued as a result of the company’s stance was brutal and violent. As national Numsa spokesperson Phakamile Hlubi put it: “It was an extremely difficult time for our members. They slept on the cold hard floor, without blankets … in the middle of winter. They inhaled chrome and, to make matters worse, they were at times denied water by mine management. There were several occasions when mine management refused to allow food to be sent down to workers. Their attitude was that if workers are uncomfortable they must end the strike and then they will receive food. On one of the days of the strike, (June 21), mine management turned off the electricity supply to the mine. This cut off the water and ventilation for workers who were underground. During the course of the strike at least 12 workers were hospitalised for various ailments, most [of them due to] dehydration and hunger; others because they were denied access to chronic medication.” When one considers some of the hard-won advances that have been made in the workplace to prevent and deal with the scourge of sexual harassment, it is astounding that this type of protest was required to enforce a woman worker’s right to safety and dignity. In 2002 the South African Mining Charter introduced quotas requiring mining companies to employ a 10% female staff component. By 2018 this quota had been exceeded in the industry, with the Minerals Council South Africa Facts and Figures 2018 Pocketbook reporting that 15% of employees in the mining sector were women. Asanda Benya, who has undertaken a study on women workers in the Rustenburg mines, indicates that women working in the mines remain predominantly in the lower-paying ranks, with many working underground. Underground female miners are generally managed by male mine captains and shift bosses, which has been identified as a fraught power situation that renders them particularly vulnerable. Power dynamics in the employment context have been recognised by the courts as a critical element of sexual harassment. As the court held in Campbell Scientific Africa vs Simmers and Others, a 2016 case heard in the labour appeal court: “At its core, sexual harassment is concerned with the exercise of power and in the main reflects the power relations that exist both in society generally and specifically within a particular workplace.” Benya reports that even travelling down the cage to reach the underground areas poses risks for female miners. Women she interviewed complained of experiencing inappropriate groping, touching and fondling as they stood packed in with their male colleagues. This particular complainant’s case was not isolated. Last week The Daily Sun quoted Numsa regional secretary Jerry Morulane as saying that management was refusing to address broader, rampant sexual harassment on the mine and that shift bosses and mine captains in particular took advantage of women. In the context of a Constitution that is founded on values of human dignity and the Employment Equity Act, which recognises that harassment of an employee is a form of unfair discrimination, it is astounding that workers had to go to these lengths to be heard. The act places a duty on employers to eliminate unfair discrimination in the work environment. And the Amended Code of Good Practice on the Handling of Sexual Harassment Cases in the Workplace, issued by the minister of labour in 2005 in terms of the Employment Equity Act, takes this even further. The code places an obligation on employers to create a safe environment for female workers, as well as ensure that the workplace respects the dignity of employees and that complainants of sexual harassment will not feel that their grievances are ignored or trivialised or fear reprisals. It states that policies should be in place, employees should know about them, and that these policies should spell out that there are consequences for alleged perpetrators, which can include disciplinary action and dismissal. Employers must clarify procedures for reporting sexual harassment and must take action to eliminate it once a report has been made. In SA Metal Group (Pty) Ltd vs Commissioner, a 2014 case heard in the labour court, the court held that the code has to be used and applied. In PE vs Ikwezi Municipality and another, a 2016 case, the court goes further and says that employers should provide training on the code to their employees. A 2006 case, Piliso vs Old Mutual, draws attention to the situation an employer may find itself in should it fail to take steps to eliminate the alleged conduct. Once a complaint has been brought to an employer’s attention, the employer must take action. “It is accepted and trite that an employer has duty to take reasonable care for the safety of its employees and to provide its employees with a safe working environment.” Management frequently demonstrates a remarkable level of ignorance about how to deal with complaints of sexual harassment in the workplace. A complainant-centred policy on sexual harassment should by now be integrated into all workplaces. This would enable complaints to be made to specifically designated people who are not part of management and would set out procedures regarding how the complaint should be handled. Leaving it up to HR managers to deal with complaints can prove to be problematic, as the possibility exists that they may collude with alleged perpetrators who are their management colleagues. Furthermore, pressuring complainants to sit in the same room as the perpetrators to try to “sort things out” is demeaning and prejudicial to the complainant and undermines their agency entirely. The choice as to whether this is something they wish to do should be left to the complainant. If the complainant decides against doing so, policies should clearly set out other available options. In the case of the alleged sexual harassment at Lanxess mine, management reached a settlement with the union after a harrowing nine-day strike. Management agreed that the alleged perpetrator would be placed on special leave, pending the finalisation of an investigation into the allegations. It also consented to conduct an enquiry into three managers who had allegedly failed to deal properly with the allegations of sexual harassment to determine if they should be disciplined. Finally, it was agreed that all the investigations would be conducted by an outside team to ensure that managers would not interfere. As Hlubi says: “It was a powerful moment in labour history where men and women united and risked their lives to fight against gender-based violence. They were willing to endure unbearable conditions underground, and exposed themselves to extreme discomfort and suffering, in order to make the point that they would not tolerate the abuse and bullying of workers. They want genuine change and they were willing to risk their lives for it. As Numsa, we are immensely proud of them for having been so brave and courageous.”

#### And the AC’s impact spills over. Failing to hold the most powerful accountable causes psychological violence against survivors and demonstrates to abusers there are NO consequences for ruining lives.

Cheung 18 - Kylie Cheung October 18, 2018 “One Year Later, We Face the Limits of #MeToo’s Powers” [<https://www.yahoo.com/lifestyle/one-later-face-limits-metoo-225038208.html>] ///AHS PB Recut AHS//JW Accessed 10/29/21

Kavanaugh’s confirmation left many women and survivors with a visceral feeling of helplessness, despite all the well-meaning but reductive reminders that the next election was just one month away. From Fox executives’ removal of Roger Ailes and Bill O’Reilly shortly before #MeToo, to Netflix’s removal of Kevin Spacey from House of Cards, to , we were forced to realize how #MeToo’s success, insofar as accused men losing professional opportunities and clout, had been facilitated by yet other men in decision-making positions who either felt ashamed, or were simply afraid of PR disasters and boycotts. But as we’ve witnessed recently in politics, when men in decision-making positions, from President Trump to Sen. Mitch McConnell, don’t fear consequences — and certainly don’t feel shame — #MeToo faces an unsettling impasse. The truth is, #MeToo is severely dependent on whether powerful [abusers] men, who are far too often enablers or perpetrators of sexual abuse themselves, have consciences or moral backbones. As a result of severe underrepresentation of women in leadership across all industries, we’re often at the mercy of said powerful men choosing to do the right thing. Kavanaugh’s confirmation, the return of alleged abusers like Louis CK, and an overarching lack of legal consequences for the majority of famous accused men reveal that for all men’s claims of #MeToo ruining their lives, the movement’s power has generally been limited to social repercussions. Contrary to men’s appropriation of victimhood narratives, legal recourse for survivors remains severely limited. And on top of most accused men being untouched by legal accountability, men like Fox News’ Bill Shine, who allegedly helped hide sexual misconduct at Fox for years, have had no difficulty continuing to find work and professional success; just this summer, Shine was hired to the White House communications department. The challenges #MeToo faces are real and can’t be minimized. But progress is a long, often painfully slow arc, paved with lost fights, cruelty, and injustice. In the months and years to come, women and allies [survivors and allies] must continue to develop #MeToo, maintaining its undeniable social and cultural power, and expanding the movement into an electoral force to be reckoned with. The replacement of men like Trump, Pence, McConnell and the other elected officials responsible for Kavanaugh’s confirmation, with women and men who support survivors, would do more than prevent repeat incidents of confirming judges like Kavanaugh. It could also produce key policy change that could result in legal consequences and more meaningful accountability for abusers — in politics, Hollywood, and everywhere.

If you care about half the population, then you affirm. Our mothers, daughters, and sisters are all subject to the abuse of the workplace system that silences women’s voices. Sexual assault isn’t a joke, and it’s certainly not a joke when those people who have hurt our own run free. Companies continue to shut down these voices.

### Global Warming Strikes

#### News outlets bring attention to climate strikes which influence political change for the environment.

Neves 20 - Felipe Schaeffer Neves, political and environmental analyst November 09, 2020 “Climate Strikes: how effective is it to participate in them?” [https://lfca.earth/strikes/] AHS//JW Accessed 11/12/21

The uproar caused by the press is also a major contribution brought about by the strikes. The more people participate, the louder the “buzz” and, consequently, the bigger the interest of the media in the cause. The dissemination of the ideals of the movement is important to raise awareness amongst the population, and having allies in the media is extremely important for this. Major news outlets, such as the Guardian in the UK and the New York Times in the US, regularly publish articles and op-eds about the climate strikes. For instance, during the last climate week of action, in September of this year, the Guardian reported extensively on the protests, covering in detail what was taking place around the globe, the numbers, their demands, and rationale. Politically Striking can have a great effect on policy-making. That is, politicians tend to listen to what is being demanded from the masses, after all, they are the electorate. The bigger the strike, the more of a chance of gaining space in political agendas. Eventually, there will be an election right down the road, which is why politicians take these actions seriously. An example of this is England, where campaigners managed to pressure their government into banning various single-use plastic items, like straws, stirrers, and cotton buds, earlier this year. In Europe, the European Parliament passed a law banning disposable plastic, which will take effect next year, and in the US eight states have already banned it, with the prospect of more states following suit. Moreover, an increasing number of countries are pledging to become carbon neutral in the next few years, ranging from 2030 to 2050. This is much owed to the efforts of climate activists, who use collective action as their weapon for policy-change. As this recent empirical research concluded, climate activism indeed leads to a legislation change in favor of the environment.

#### Climate change leads to extinction.

Specktor 19 - Brandon Specktor writes about the science of everyday life for Live Science, and previously for Reader's Digest magazine, where he served as an editor for five years. He grew up in the Sonoran Desert, but believes Sonoran hot dogs are trying way too hard. “Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims”, Live Science, 06/04/21 [https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html] Accessed 02/11/21 AHS // AP Recut AHS//JW Accessed 10/29/21

It seems every week there's a scary new report about how man-made climate change is going to cause the collapse of the world's ice sheets, result in the extinction of up to [1 million animal species](https://www.livescience.com/65314-human-influence-species-extinction.html) and — if that wasn't bad enough — make our [beer very, very expensive](https://www.livescience.com/63832-climate-change-will-ruin-beer.html). This week, a new policy paper from an Australian think tank claims that those other reports are slightly off; the risks of climate change are actually much, much worse than anyone can imagine. [According to the paper](https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/148cb0_b2c0c79dc4344b279bcf2365336ff23b.pdf), climate change poses a "near- to mid-term existential threat to human civilization," and there's a good chance society could collapse as soon as 2050 if serious mitigation actions aren't taken in the next decade. Published by the Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration in Melbourne (an independent think tank focused on climate policy) and authored by a climate researcher and a former fossil fuel executive, the paper's central thesis is that climate scientists are too restrained in their predictions of how climate change will affect the planet in the near future. [[Top 9 Ways the World Could End](https://www.livescience.com/36999-top-scientists-world-enders.html)] The current climate crisis, they say, is larger and more complex than any humans have ever dealt with before. General climate models — like the one that the [United Nations' Panel on Climate Change](https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/) (IPCC) used in 2018 to predict that a global temperature increase of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) could put hundreds of millions of people at risk — fail to account for the sheer complexity of Earth's many interlinked geological processes; as such, they fail to adequately predict the scale of the potential consequences. The truth, the authors wrote, is probably far worse than any models can fathom. How the world ends What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill many of the trees in the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.livescience.com/57266-amazon-river.html) (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the planet plunges into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions. "Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and 55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of [lethal heat conditions](https://www.livescience.com/55129-how-heat-waves-kill-so-quickly.html), beyond the threshold of human survivability," the authors hypothesized. Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly one-third of the world's land surface turns to desert. Entire ecosystems collapse, beginning with the planet's coral reefs, the rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets. The world's tropics are hit hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than 1 billion people into refugees. This mass movement of refugees — coupled with [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to stress the fabric of the world's largest nations, including the United States. Armed conflicts over resources, perhaps culminating in nuclear war, are likely. The result, according to the new paper, is "outright chaos" and perhaps "the end of human global civilization as we know it." How can this catastrophic vision of the future be prevented? Only with the people of the world accepting climate change for the emergency it is and getting to work — immediately. According to the paper's authors, the human race has about one decade left to mount a global movement to transition the world economy to a zero-carbon-emissions system. (Achieving zero-carbon emissions requires either not emitting carbon or balancing carbon emissions with carbon removal.) The effort required to do so "would be akin in scale to the [World War II](https://www.livescience.com/65025-nazi-massacre-site-artifacts.html) emergency mobilization," the authors wrote. The new policy paper was endorsed with a foreword by Adm. Chris Barrie, a retired Australian defense chief and senior royal navy commander who has testified before the Australian Senate about the devastating possibilities climate change poses to national security and overall human well-being." I told the [Senate] Inquiry that, after [nuclear war](https://www.livescience.com/65603-doomsday-plane-can-survive-nuclear-attack.html), human-induced global warming is the greatest threat to human life on the planet," Barrie wrote in the new paper. "Human life on Earth may be on the way to extinction, in the most horrible way."

The entire human species and all of the other species on Earth would die from global warming. We’ve seen the devastating effects today.

### Imperialism Strikes

#### Relations between the West and Russia are growing tense — political and military tensions are on the rise.

Ham 18 - Peter van Ham December 2018 “Rising Tensions Between Policy Brief the West and Russia: What Role For Arms Control?” [https://www.clingendael.org/sites/default/files/2018-12/PB\_Arms\_control.pdf]

Over the past few years, relations between the West and Russia have hit rock bottom and have spiralled from a political dispute into military tensions. Clearly, this is both undesirable and dangerous. If disputes were limited to the political realm, the risk of escalation would remain modest. However, Moscow’s operations go beyond assertive cyber strategies and ham-fisted spying efforts. Today, Russia is engaged in (what Mark Galeotti has called) “heavy metal diplomacy”: using military means to impress and intimidate the West.1 This Policy Brief offers insight into the most pressing concerns, focusing on areas and issues where matters could escalate fastest. It asks what role can still be foreseen for arms control and concludes with a call for transatlantic unity and a stronger role for NATO to counter Russia’s military and geopolitical gambit. 1 Mark Galeotti, “Heavy Metal Diplomacy: Russia’s Political Use of Its Military in Europe Since 2014”, ECFR Policy Brief (December 2016). 2. Geopolitical Posturing – From the Arctic to the Middle East There are no indications that Russia intends to start military hostilities towards any EU member state, let alone the US. But this is where the “good news” ends. Last September, Russia conducted a large “set of manoeuvres”, allegedly involving 300,000 troops (although the estimate by reliable Western sources is lower, around 75,000 troops), including contingents from China and Mongolia.2 Russia’s Vostok (“East”) exercise underscored Moscow’s growing military ambitions and its willingness to work with China to shape a post-Western world. One region where Russia’s military assertiveness is on the rise is the Arctic. Russia has reopened several Soviet-era bases in the Arctic, building new nuclear icebreakers and vying for regional dominance with traditional rivals such as the US, Canada and Norway, as well as with newcomers like China. According to estimates, the Arctic holds more oil and gas reserves than Saudi Arabia, which explains why Russia is pushing a claim to almost half a million square miles of Arctic territory.3 As the 2014 annexation of Crimea has proved, Russia is prepared to defend its geostrategic interests with military means. This may explain why the UK decided to deploy 800 Royal Marines in Norway in 2019 (on rotation) as part of plans to establish a new military base there. Moreover, for the first time, four RAF Typhoons will patrol Icelandic skies as of 2019. The US already deployed 330 marines in Norway, in early 2017. Next year, double that number of US marines will move their base closer to the Russian border, although still for “training purposes”.4

#### Worker strikes prevent wars from breaking out by promoting peace — Sweden proves.

Hameed 13 - Fatimah Hameed, 22/02/2013 “Swedish workers protest, threaten general strike and mutiny to prevent war against Norway, 1905” [https://nvdatabase.swarthmore.edu/content/swedish-workers-protest-threaten-general-strike-and-mutiny-prevent-war-against-norway-1905\] AHS//JW Accessed 10/28/21

In February 1905, Sweden's Social Democratic Party, a party of the Swedish working class, held a meeting to discuss the union's dissolution and invited the Norwegian Labour Party to speak at the meeting. The Norwegian Labour Party called for the end of the union and for increased collaboration between workers in Sweden and Norway. The Social Democrats released a statement to support Norway's independence without a violent war. This also sparked action within the younger working class. Zeth Höglund of the Young Social Democrats wrote Down Weapons!, a manifesto for the Swedish working class. The labor movement printed the manifesto in newspapers and printed 100,000 leaflets to hand out to supporters. In the manifesto, Höglund declared that the working class would not go to war against Norway and called on the young workers to protest their military duty. The manifesto also threatened that the Swedish laboring class would refuse to work in order to prevent war with Norway. The state took this threat of a general strike seriously, as Sweden had recently seen a growth of the labor movement and the enactment of strikes to support political causes, such as a general strike for suffrage in 1902. On 7 June 1905, the Norwegian Storting declared a resolution to dissolve the union between Sweden and Norway. Right-wing supporters of Sweden called for war against Norway while the labor parties continued to push for peace. The Social Democrats conducted demonstrations opposing violent action by their government and wrote a letter of support to the Norwegian Labour Party. On 20 June, 1905, King Oscar II of Sweden declared that the nation would not use force against Norway, stopping the threat of war.

### Tensions can lead to nuclear war, which creates Ice Age and mass starvation

Steven Starr 15. “Nuclear War: An Unrecognized Mass Extinction Event Waiting To Happen.” Ratical. March 2015. <https://ratical.org/radiation/NuclearExtinction/StevenStarr022815.html> TG

A war fought with 21st century strategic nuclear weapons would be more than just a great catastrophe in human history. If we allow it to happen, such a war would be a mass extinction event that [ends human history](https://ratical.org/radiation/NuclearExtinction/StarrNuclearWinterOct09.pdf). There is a profound difference between extinction and “an unprecedented disaster,” or even “the end of civilization,” because even after such an immense catastrophe, human life would go on. But extinction, by definition, is an event of utter finality, and a nuclear war that could cause human extinction should really be considered as the ultimate criminal act. It certainly would be the crime to end all crimes. The world’s leading climatologists now tell us that nuclear war threatens our continued existence as a species. Their studies predict that a large nuclear war, especially one fought with strategic nuclear weapons, would create a post-war environment in which for many years it would be too cold and dark to even grow food. Their findings make it clear that not only humans, but most large animals and many other forms of complex life would likely vanish forever in a nuclear darkness of our own making. The environmental consequences of nuclear war would attack the ecological support systems of life at every level. Radioactive fallout produced not only by nuclear bombs, but also by the destruction of nuclear power plants and their spent fuel pools, would poison the biosphere. Millions of tons of smoke would act to [destroy Earth’s protective ozone layer](https://www2.ucar.edu/atmosnews/just-published/3995/nuclear-war-and-ultraviolet-radiation) and block most sunlight from reaching Earth’s surface, creating Ice Age weather conditions that would last for decades. Yet the political and military leaders who control nuclear weapons strictly avoid any direct public discussion of the consequences of nuclear war. They do so by arguing that nuclear weapons are not intended to be used, but only to deter Remarkably, the leaders of the Nuclear Weapon States have chosen to ignore the authoritative, long-standing scientific research done by the climatologists, research that predicts virtually any nuclear war, fought with even a fraction of the operational and deployed nuclear arsenals, will leave the Earth essentially uninhabitable.

We already have extremely tense relations. One small argument could lead into a literal nuclear war. Unconditional strikes solve that.

So, judge, I urge you to vote affirmative. This is because the right to strike is key to reducing the exploitation of prisoners, sexual harassment, the effects of climate change, and the growing potential for nuclear war. To secure a better, safer, world, vote affirmative.

1. http://www.dictionary.com/browse/resolved [↑](#footnote-ref-1)