#### **Plan: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike**

**Definitions:**

### 

**Ought means to have a moral obligation**

**https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought**

Leyton **Garcia 17** [Jorge Andres Leyton Garcia, Lawyer with a Law degree from the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile and a Master of Laws from University College London and a Professor of the Department of Labor Law of the Pontifical Catho lic University of Chile, 2017, “THE CONTENT AND LIMITATIONS OF THE RIGHT TO STRIKE, ” Revista Chilena de Derecho,https://orbit.texthelp.com/?file=https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/105e/01a941e55100e55918a29fda93ba33d9e264.pdf

We have dedicated considerable space to analyse the position of the right to strike among the systems under review. To assess the extent and the limits of the right to strike as a fundamental human right is extremely important to know which forms of activi ty (and inactivity) can be considered as a strike according to the legal systems we are analysing, as well as some of the requirements that are accepted as preconditions to be fulfi lled before engaging in lawful strike action. 2.1. ACTIVITIES AND OBJECTIV ES As Pinto de Albuquerque rightly pointed out in his opinion cited above, there is not a single definition of what counts as a strike . Even more, it is not an easy task to find a definition of which activities can be considered as a strike . This can be ex plained by the existence of very diverse systems of industrial relations throughout the world and of different criteria to be applied by national and international legal systems . Nevertheless, a review of the relevant sources can help us to clarify the iss ue. Judge Pinto de Albuquerque himself provides us with certain parameters. He indicates that for the purposes of his analysis of the position o f the right to strike as a Convention right, a myriad of activities can be considered as a form of strike action . He provides what can be considered as a general defi nition of what is a strike. He argues that the **right to strike “encompasses any work stoppage** , however brief and limited, with a view **to defend**ing **and further** ing the **workers’ interests and rights by exerting pressure on employers**, including sympathy or secondary strike in the case of workers who take action in support of colleagues employed by another employer ”33. Pinto de Albuquerque’s definition is a good starting point, since it provides different elements. It contains a certain form of action-inaction (“any work stoppage, however brief and limited”) and an intention behind the action (“with a view to defending and furthering the workers’ interests and rights by exerting pressure on employers”). It may be a restatement of the obvious, but it is important to keep in mind that any form of work stoppage, in order to be a strike, must have a subjective element, which is to defend and promote the interests of workers by exerting pressure. Pinto de Albuquerque’s definition only mentions the employers as the recipients of the pressure, something that may point t o a restriction of the ambit and purpose of the right, but in the same paragraph he acknowledges the fact that certain strikes might be directed against general social issues that affect workers. Let us look at the first element, the activity. The position of the Strasbourg judge is highly influenced, as he recognizes, by the definitions provided by **the ILO** supervisory bodies. One of the cited sources is the Committee of Experts 1994 General Survey on Freedom of Association, where the Committee provided the central argument tak en by Judge Pinto de Albuquerque. The definition, again, refers to any form of work stoppage, without regard t o its duration or impact . This marks a trend in the defi nition of the right to strike provided by the two ILO Committees. Both the Committee of Experts and the Committee on Freedom of Association appear to  **accept a wide range of possible forms of strike action, with the general limitation of being** -and remaining- **pacific** c3435. Under this frame we can include different forms of industrial action. The most obvious is a complete work stoppage of the workers involved in the conflict, b ut the Committee of Experts has considered that other forms, despite their different character, may be considered as a strike: this happens with go-slow strikes (which involves a slowdown in work short of a total stoppage ) and work-to-rule strikes (when the rules in the workplace are applied to the letter ). Mention has also been made to sit-down strikes and wildcat strikes (strikes called by groups of workers without the authorization or command of the union leaders ). Pickets (when workers form groups to promote strike action and conv ince others to engage in it ) are also considered as legitimate form of strike action, and the Committee on Freedom of Association has reminded in many occasions that “the action of pickets organized in accordance with the law should not be subject to inter ference by the public authorities ”36. The ECSR has also recognized the legitimate position of pickets as an essential form of strike action: “ where picketing activity does not violate the right of other workers to choose whether or not to take part in the strike action, the restriction of such activity will amount to a restriction on the right to strike itself, as it is legitimate for striking workers to attempt to involve all their fellow workers in their action”37. Again, with all these actions the lim it set by the ILO supervisory bodies the pacifi c character of the activities38. The ECSR has added, as we have seen, the importance of the rig ht to work of non - strikers as a relevant consideration. Both ILO supervisory bodies admit that limitations and prohibitions are acceptable if any form of strike action ceases to be peaceful. **The ILO constitutes the most important source of definition** in this aspect, and  **most of the references made by other bodies can be traced back to the two supervisory Committees**39. The second element, the intention or purpose, leads us to the issue of the objective of a strike. A useful classifi cation has been provided by Gernigon, Odero and Guido40. According to these authors, strikes can be divided in occupational, trade union, and political strikes . Occupational strikes, as the name shows, are those that seek to improve the working conditions of the employees . Trade union strikes refer to those actions that intend to defend or promote the position of an organization and/ or its leaders . Political strikes, fi nally, are those strikes aimed at the political decisions taken by the authorities, whether they relate or not to labour and social policies.

#### 

**Case:**

#### **The status quo doesn’t protect US workers that use political strikes, Without these protections, workers can lose their jobs making them unwilling to strike for moral causes**

#### **NLRB**https://www.nlrb.gov/strikes

#### **The Right to Strike**. Section 7 of the Act states in part, “Employees shall have the right. . . to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.” Strikes are included among the concerted activities protected for employees by this section. Section 13 also concerns the right to strike. It reads as follows:

#### *Nothing in this Act, except as specifically provided for herein, shall be construed so as either to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike, or to affect the limitations or qualifications on that right.*

#### It is clear from a reading of these two provisions that: **the law** not only **guarantees the right** of employees **to strike, but also places limitations** and qualifications **on the exercise of that right.**

#### Lawful and unlawful strikes. **The lawfulness of a strike may depend on the** object, or **purpose**, of the strike, on its timing, or on the conduct of the strikers. The object, or objects, of a strike and whether the objects are lawful are matters that are not always easy to determine. Such issues often have to be decided by the National Labor Relations Board. The consequences can be severe to striking employees and struck employers, involving as they do questions of reinstatement and backpay.

#### Strikes for a lawful object. **Employees who strike for a lawful object fall into two classes: economic strikers and unfair labor practice strikers. Both classes continue as employees,** but unfair labor practice strikers have greater rights of reinstatement to their jobs.

#### Economic strikers defined. If the object of a strike is to obtain from the employer some economic concession such as higher wages, shorter hours, or better working conditions, the striking employees are called economic strikers. They retain their status as employees and cannot be discharged, but they can be replaced by their employer. If the employer has hired bona fide permanent replacements who are filling the jobs of the economic strikers when the strikers apply unconditionally to go back to work, the strikers are not entitled to reinstatement at that time. However, if the strikers do not obtain regular and substantially equivalent employment, they are entitled to be recalled to jobs for which they are qualified when openings in such jobs occur if they, or their bargaining representative, have made an unconditional request for their reinstatement.

#### Unfair labor practice strikers defined. Employees who strike to protest an unfair labor practice committed by their employer are called unfair labor practice strikers. Such strikers can be neither discharged nor permanently replaced. When the strike ends, unfair labor practice strikers, absent serious misconduct on their part, are entitled to have their jobs back even if employees hired to do their work have to be discharged.led to reinstatement.

**EU Nations have similar restrictions**

#### **Warneck 07**Strike rules in the EU27 and beyond A comparative overview Wiebke Warneck European Trade Union Institute for Research, Education and Health and Safety (ETUI-REHS) Brussels, 2007 https://www.asi.is/media/7581/Strike\_rules\_in\_the\_EU27.pdf

#### The regulation of this field of labour law by the social partners themselves, by means of collective agreements, is a feature highly specific to Denmark, Finland, Sweden and Ireland. In some countries – including Belgium, Italy and France – the right to collective action is an individual right, while in others – Germany, Greece, Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia and Sweden – it has to be exercised by trade unions . **The EU**27 **offers a** very **diverse picture with regard to** the different types of **collective action** used. Nor is the same term always used to describe the same sort of collective action. What is more, **some types of collective action are legal under some legal systems but prohibited under others.** Purely **political strikes are, in most countries**, at least in theory, **prohibited**, exceptions being Denmark (if short and for “reasonable cause”), Finland, Ireland, Italy and Norway.

#### 

#### **Big tech has the political power to create climate change action, inaction is due to lack of will**

#### **Terstein 21 [Terstein, Zoya, 1-28-2021, "Big Tech says it wants to solve climate change. Its lobbying dollars say otherwise.,"** [**https://grist.org/politics/big-tech-says-it-wants-to-solve-climate-change-its-lobbying-dollars-say-otherwise/**](https://grist.org/politics/big-tech-says-it-wants-to-solve-climate-change-its-lobbying-dollars-say-otherwise/)**] //DDPT**

#### It’s hard to quantify **political power**, but it’s safe to say that **big tech companies wield** [**a lot**](https://www.newyorker.com/tech/annals-of-technology/what-can-america-learn-from-europe-about-regulating-big-tech) **of it**. A decade ago, companies like Amazon and Google employed [just a smattering of lobbyists](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2020/01/22/amazon-facebook-google-lobbying-2019/) who worked to influence D.C. policymakers on their behalf. Now, the **Big** Five **tech** companies — Apple, Microsoft, Facebook, Google, and Amazon — **spend tens of millions of dollars each year lobbying Congress.** In 2020, they collectively spent [$61 million domestically lobbying](https://www.cnbc.com/2021/01/22/facebook-spent-more-on-lobbying-than-any-other-big-tech-company-in-2020.html) on issues that included international tax policies, copyright reform, and content policy. Only **a tiny fraction of Big Tech’s legislative lobbying** might **is going toward** advocating for **climate policy**, according to a [new report](https://influencemap.org/report/Big-Tech-and-Climate-Policy-afb476c56f217ea0ab351d79096df04a) from the think tank InfluenceMap. Between 2019 and 2020, just 4 percent of Apple, Alphabet (Google’s parent company), Amazon, Facebook, and Microsoft’s self-reported lobbying activities targeted climate-related policy at the federal level. **In Europe, these companies do even less lobbying on climate** — InfluenceMap says **they have been “largely silent on the EU’s ambitious climate policy agenda.” This halfhearted effort to promote climate-friendly policies stands in sharp contrast to Big Tech’s much-publicized promises to lead the rest of the business sector**, and indeed the entire world, toward a greener future. Apple, for instance, revealed a plan last summer to make its supply chain and products carbon neutral by 2030, something CEO Tim Cook said will be good for the planet and its products. “With our commitment to carbon neutrality, we hope to be a ripple in the pond that creates a much larger change,” [Cook said](https://www.apple.com/newsroom/2020/07/apple-commits-to-be-100-percent-carbon-neutral-for-its-supply-chain-and-products-by-2030/). In 2019, Amazon unveiled a climate plan that aims to get the company to meet the decarbonization requirements of the Paris Agreement 10 years early. “If we can do this, anyone can do this,” Amazon founder Jeff Bezos [said](https://www.cnbc.com/2019/09/19/jeff-bezos-speaks-about-amazon-sustainability-in-washington-dc.html) at the time. “Climate change is a crisis we will only be able to address if we all work together on a global scale,” Facebook founder Mark Zuckerberg [said](https://sustainability.fb.com/). Facebook aims to make its global operations [net-zero](https://sustainability.fb.com/), starting with making its value chain net-zero by 2030. “We will support new public policy initiatives to accelerate carbon reduction and removal opportunities,” Microsoft president Brad Smith [wrote](https://blogs.microsoft.com/blog/2020/01/16/microsoft-will-be-carbon-negative-by-2030/) in January last year, outlining seven principles the company will adhere to in its quest to remove more emissions than it produces by 2030 and eliminate all of its emissions since 1975 by mid-century. “We know that no company, no matter how ambitious, can solve a challenge like climate change alone,” Google said in its [sustainability report](https://www.gstatic.com/gumdrop/sustainability/carbon-free-by-2030.pdf) last September. It’s clear that these companies like to talk about climate action being a collective effort. But despite the many detailed climate plans and pledges, Big Tech has done strikingly little government-level work to bring about the global-scale climate action it says it wants to see. The little lobbying the Big Five do has been largely focused on technical rules that are directly tied to these companies’ abilities to stick to their climate commitments, like procuring enough renewable energy. Meanwhile, **the world is** [**nowhere near**](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/dec/12/world-is-in-danger-of-missing-paris-climate-target-summit-is-warned) **where it needs to be to meet the climate targets outlined in the Paris Agreement.** “Relative to their scale, **they invest very little in saving the planet**,” **Nic Bryant**, a spokesperson for the climate activist group Extinction Rebellion, **told Grist, referring to tech companies.** **“These companies could and should be leading the way.”**

#### **Terstein continues:**

#### **Further complicating Big Tech’s stance** on climate **are its** membership in **industry associations**. InfluenceMap scored each of the Big Five tech companies on the climate-friendliness of the industry groups they belong to. **These are organizations like the Chamber of Commerce**, the [**most powerful trade organization in the world**](https://www.wri.org/blog/2020/08/how-chamber-commerces-scorecard-elevates-climate-deniers), **which has** [**lobbied extensively against climate policy**](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1vopnWHRekDcqc8yEqAQi8TnoXubs-abK/view), as well as groups with progressive agendas like the Renewable Energy Buyers Alliance. By looking at **Big Tech’s membership in industry associations** across the board, InfluenceMap **found** **“misalignment between the companies’ own climate lobbying positions and those of their industry associations.”**“**Big Tech has no problem shelling out tens of millions** of dollars jockeying **for their own interests** **in Washington**, so we know **their failure** to lobby **for climate solutions is not due to a lack of means**, **but a lack of will**,” David Arkush, director of the climate program at the nonprofit consumer advocacy organization Public Citizen, told Grist. “If they’re serious about climate, they need to push for government climate action at the scale and speed we need.”

#### 

#### **Tech worker strikes in the squo shift corporate policy, proves solvency, worker strikes influence climate change action**

#### **Baca and Greene ’19 [Amazon, Google, other tech employees protest in support of climate action, Marie Baca and Jay Greene,** [**https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2019/09/20/amazon-google-other-tech-employees-protest-support-climate-action/**](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2019/09/20/amazon-google-other-tech-employees-protest-support-climate-action/)**, September 20 2019, Education: Stanford University, BA in Human Biology; Stanford University, MA in Communications, Graduate Program in Journalism Marie C. Baca was a breaking news technology and business reporter in San Francisco. She left The Post in December 2019, Education: Macalester College, BA in English; Columbia University, MS in Journalism Jay Greene is a reporter for The Washington Post who is focused on technology coverage in the Pacific Northwest.] [SS]**

#### **Thousands of workers at** the nation’s largest **tech companies** were expected to **walk off their jobs** Friday **to urge** industry and world **leaders to address climate change** more aggressively, part of a larger wave of demonstrations expected to draw millions of people across the globe. The group Amazon Employees for Climate Justice said **more than 1,800 Amazon employees in 25 cities pledged to walk out. Google** Workers for Action on Climate tweeted that they **expected** about **700 workers** **to strike** as of Thursday. Similar groups that said they were representing employees **at Microsoft, Facebook, Twitter, Square and other major tech companies** tweeted that they also **expected significant numbers of employees to walk out**. Hundreds gathered Friday outside Amazon’s headquarters in downtown Seattle as part of the demonstrations**. Participants chanted**, “Hey hey, ho ho, **fossil fuels have got to go**” and held signs with messages such as “Amazon, Let’s lead. Zero Emissions By 2030.” Rebecca Sheppard, 28, works in Amazon’s air, science and tech group to make the online retail giant’s planes more efficient. She said she thought about quitting last year over her concerns about Amazon’s massive carbon footprint, but colleagues discouraged her, saying she could effect change by sticking around. “We’ve just got to double down,” she said about employee efforts to produce change. (Amazon founder and chief executive Jeff Bezos owns The Washington Post.) ‘I hope the politicians hear us’: Millions of youth around the world strike for action **The strike is being held in advance of a Monday climate summit at the U**nited **N**ations. U.N. Secretary-General António Guterres has insisted that instead of bringing “fancy speeches” with them to the meeting, the countries must offer concrete commitments such as reaching net zero emissions by 2050 or eliminating the construction of coal-fired power plants. Strike organizers expected more than 1,000 events to take place in the United States alone. **The tech workers joined millions of youths from more than 150 countries** around the world who skipped school Friday in solidarity with the movement. Among them was 16-year-old Swedish climate activist Greta Thunberg, who has given a speech before the United Nations, met with political and business leaders, and has been nominated for a Nobel Peace Prize for her work. **Facebook released a statement** Friday **expressing its support for employees who chose to walk out** and said that **the company is “building sustainability into our operations** **as well as engaging the global community** on this important issue with our products.” Microsoft declined to comment. Google, Twitter and Square were not immediately available to comment. At Amazon, the walkout came a day after **Bezos announced a “Climate Pledge” that would require signatories to meet the goals of the Paris climate agreement a decade early. The pledge also requires regular measuring and reporting of emissions, as well as obtaining net zero carbon across businesses by 2040,** among other stipulations. U.S. takes a low profile as nations gather in New York to debate steps to combat climate change Bezos said **Amazon would be the first company to sign the pledge**. Critics, who have long claimed Amazon does little to offset the emissions it produces, say the pact lacks transparency and standardized rules for what is measured and reported. Amazon declined to comment on the walkout. In Seattle, workers who walked out held signs that opposed deals with gas and oil companies. The crowd booed when a speaker noted that Amazon funds climate-denying lobbyists. There was also a speaker from Google. **Sarah Read, a** user experience **researcher** with Prime Video, said Thursday’s announcement shows employees are having an impact. She said she **believes the Climate Pact is related to an employee-sponsored shareholder resolution that would have required the company create a plan to address climate change,** a resolution that failed in spring. Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos announces new ‘Climate Pledge’ ahead of employee protests “**It’s a direct response to Amazon employees standing up, speaking out** and saying this is important to them,” Read said.

#### **This isn’t enough, in squo companies overall lobby against action; turning political influence uniquely creates climate change action**

#### 

#### **Winston 19** [Winston, Andrew, Harvard Business Review, 10-15-2019, "Corporate Action on Climate Change Has to Include Lobbying,"<https://hbr.org/2019/10/corporate-action-on-climate-change-has-to-include-lobbying>] //DDPT

#### The business world has recently started acting on climate change in earnest. Hundreds of the world’s largest companies have agreed to use [100% renewable energy](http://there100.org/companies) and set [targets](https://sciencebasedtargets.org/companies-taking-action/) that commit them to reduce emissions at the pace that science demands. Companies are [buying many gigawatts of renewable energy](https://www.forbes.com/sites/mikescott/2019/09/09/companies-continue-to-drive-demand-for-clean-energy/amp/?__twitter_impression=true), slashing their own energy use, and innovating to create products that help customers reduce their emissions. But it’s not nearly enough. **The climate crisis is upon us**, and **there’s no time to wait for voluntary corporate action** to tackle the challenge. **We need the collective will that government provides**. Many in business will rebel against this idea, but **we are long past the point where free markets** alone **could solve the challenge in time** (if such a possibility ever even existed). **Business needs to**, [in the words of Environmental Defense Fund president Fred Krupp](https://www.wri.org/news/2019/10/release-major-environmental-groups-call-businesses-lead-climate-policy), “**unleash the most powerful tool they have to fight climate change: their political influence.”** This is the logic and imperative behind [an announcement today](https://medium.com/@timetolead/its-time-to-lead-on-climate-policy-6f849eb114ba) from 11 environmental and sustainability organizations that have significant influence on the world’s largest companies and on policymakers. Using a full-page ad in The New York Times, the group is calling for business to advocate for policies, at all levels of government, that are consistent with what climate science is telling us we need to do — what they’re calling a “science-based climate policy agenda.” The statement also calls for companies to adjust their trade associations’ advocacy to align with climate science. (The signatories are the heads of BSR, C2ES, CDP, Ceres, Conservation International, Environmental Defense Fund, The Climate Group, The Nature Conservancy, the Union of Concerned Scientists, World Resources Institute, and WWF U.S.) In support of this public plea, the Sustainable Food Policy Alliance — which includes food and consumer products giants Nestle, Unilever, Mars, and Danone — is running the same letter in Roll Call with the message “we agree.” The new statement is also building on a [similar call to action last month](https://www.ceres.org/sites/default/files/Final%20Generic%20SIGN-ON%20PACKET%20Investor%20Expectations%20on%20Climate%20Lobbying%20sign-on%20packet%20September%202019.pdf) from 200 investors with more than $6 trillion in assets. It’s about time. Companies have long allowed a chasm to open up between their own statements and actions on climate and what their government relations and lobbying teams are doing in the halls of power. Most of these companies have also conveniently ignored that their own industry and trade associations have generally been fighting climate policy every step of the way. It’s an important discussion to have right now and this initiative could have an impact. I want to offer some thoughts on the context and where the policy discussion could, or should, go. This isn’t the first attempt. In 2006, some of these same NGOs formed the [U.S. Climate Action Partnership](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/U.S._Climate_Action_Partnership) with notable business partners such as Alcoa, BP, Caterpillar, Dupont, and GE. While the call to action was vague, it was an important message from some heavy industry players that they wanted pro-climate policies. But when the Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade climate bill [failed in the U.S. Senate in 2009](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060039422), and climate policy entered the wilderness for years, the partnership petered away. Over the last decade, the nonprofit Ceres, a signer on this latest statement, has convened the Business for Innovative Climate and Energy Policy, or [BICEP](https://www.ceres.org/networks/ceres-policy-network), to bring company leaders in to talk to legislators. And more recently, a group of scientists and former high-ranking government officials (mostly Republican), launched the [Climate Leadership Council](https://www.clcouncil.org/), which is pushing for [a package of policies](https://www.clcouncil.org/our-plan/) that includes a carbon fee and “dividend” that returns most of the revenue to citizens. But none of these have really gotten the kind of traction we need. This time could be different. A few shifts in the world may make this push more effective. First, **climate change is real and affecting businesses today**. **We’re not just discussing a model of future weather and costs; we’re seeing very real and massively expensive disruptions to operations, supply chains, and communities.** Second, with increasing transparency, it’s much harder to hide the disconnect between what companies are saying they’re doing and what they’re actually advocating for behind the scenes. A [just-released **analysis of corporate lobbying**](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/oct/10/exclusive-carmakers-opponents-climate-action-us-europe-emissions) **shows** that **major auto companies,** while talking up their efforts on electric vehicles, **have lobbied aggressively to fight any real climate policy.** Third, **stakeholders** — **customers, employees, and communities** — **are demanding more action and are less tolerant of inconsistencies** on this issue. Recently [**Microsoft employees staged a walkout**](https://www.theverge.com/2019/9/19/20874081/microsoft-employees-climate-change-letter-protest) **for climate**, and almost **8,700 Amazon employees have** [**signed an open letter**](https://medium.com/@amazonemployeesclimatejustice/public-letter-to-jeff-bezos-and-the-amazon-board-of-directors-82a8405f5e38) **calling on their CEO to lead on the issue. (Amazon then announced it would go climate-neutral by 2040** and [buy 100,000 electric vans](https://www.freightwaves.com/news/amazon-announces-purchase-of-100000-ev-delivery-vehicles-from-rivian-the-largest-order-ever)). There’s clearly pressure on business to take a broader role in society, which is why about 200 big-company CEOs signed a [statement from the Business Roundtable](https://hbr.org/2019/08/is-the-business-roundtable-statement-just-empty-rhetoric) pledging that they would focus on stakeholder needs, not just shareholder value.

#### 

#### **US climate action specifically spurs global climate action.**

#### 

#### **Geman 6/7/21 [National Journal Energy and Environment Correspondent, reporter for Axios, Ben, “The global stakes of Biden's infrastructure negotiations.” https://www.axios.com/biden-infrastructure-bill-climate-change-87b70d16-fdec-4c84-84a6-e7532c592f15.html]**

#### The infrastructure drama enveloping Capitol Hill could spill onto the global climate stage. Why it matters: **Major new U.S. investments and policies could help spur other nations to take more aggressive and tangible steps to cut emissions**. But failure to steer major new initiatives through Congress could hinder the White House diplomatic posture as the U.N. conference looms. State of play: The White House is negotiating with Republicans amid all kinds of uncertainty over whether Democrats can pass legislation without GOP backing. President Biden has proposed major investments in electric vehicles, grid tech, mass transit, clean energy tax incentives and many other initiatives. The negotiations with Republicans — who object to the plan's steep price tag and expansive definition of infrastructure — come ahead of November's critical United Nations climate summit. What they're saying: "**Because of the importance of American leadership on climate, the rest of the world is definitely watching** what happens on Capitol Hill," said the Environmental Defense Fund's Nathaniel **Keohane**. Keohane, who leads EDF's climate program, said **major U.S. investments** will bolster the country's economy and competitiveness. But they'**re** also **consequential internationally**, he said. "**The more the U.S. can demonstrate leadership — not only in the ambition of its targets but in the ambition** of its implementation **and** the **seriousness of its implementation — the more likely we are to see the rest of the world stepping into its ambition and accelerating its own climate action**," he said. Catch up fast: In April **the White House set a voluntary target under** the **Paris** Agreement **of cutting U.S. emissions by 50% below 2005 levels by 2030**.But **that's much harder to achieve absent Capitol Hill approval of new investments and incentives**. The Atlantic Council's Margaret Jackson said Biden's climate initiatives thus far have borne some fruit, pointing to several nations strengthening their Paris targets. But Jackson, who has written about the importance of congressional action, also tells Axios: "**U.S. allies and partners are still somewhat skeptical in terms of how much this administration can really accomplish, and will it be lasting**."

**Without global action to stop climate change, extinction occurs**

**Specktor 19**

[Brandon 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] 6-4-2019, "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims," livescience, <https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html> Justin

#### 

#### 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](https://www.livescience.com/65524-antarctica-ice-unstable.html), 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), **result[s] 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.

#### 

#### **Framework**

#### Because the resolution uses the word ought, creating a moral obligation, the value is morality

The value criterion is protecting life, prefer because life is a prereq to all other structures

### **1] Morality is based on response to problems in the world, which justifies focus on resolving material conditions of violence.**

Gregory Fernando **Pappas 16** [Texas A&M University] “The Pragmatists’ Approach to Injustice”, The Pluralist Volume 11, Number 1, Spring 2016,

In Experience and Nature, Dewey names the empirical way of doing philosophy the “denotative method” (LW 1:371).18 What Dewey means by “denotation” is simply the phase of an empirical inquiry where we are con- cerned with designating, as free from theoretical presuppositions as possible, the concrete problem (subject matter) for which we can provide different and even competing descriptions and theories. Thus an empirical **inquiry about an injustice must begin with a rough and tentative designation of where the injustices from within the broader context of our everyday life and activities are.** Once we designate the subject matter, we then engage in the inquiry itself, including diagnosis, possibly even constructing theories and developing concepts. Of course, that is not the end of the inquiry. We must then take the results of that inquiry “as a path pointing and leading back to something in primary experience” (LW 1:17). This looping back is essential, and it neverends as long as there are new experiences of injustice that may require a revi- sion of our theories.¶ **Injustices are events suffered by concrete people** at a particular time and in a situation. We need to **start by pointing out and describing** these **problematic experiences instead of** starting with a **theoretical account** or diagnosis of them. Dewey is concerned with the consequences of not following the methodological advice to distinguish designation from diagnosis. Definitions, theoretical criteria, and diagnosis can be useful; they have their proper place and function once inquiry is on its way, but if stressed too much at the start of inquiry, they can blind us to aspects of concrete problems that escape our theoretical lenses. We must attempt to pretheoretically designate the subject matter, that is, to “point” in a certain direction, even with a vague or crude description of the problem. But, for philosophers, this task is not easy because, for instance, we are often too prone to interpret the particular problem in a way that verifies our most cherished theories of injustice. One must be careful to designate the subject matter in such a way as not to slant the question in favor of one’s theory or theoretical preconceptions. A philosopher must make an honest effort to designate the injustices based on what is experienced as such because **a concrete social problem** (e.g., injustice) **is independent and neutral with respect to** the different possible **competing diagnoses** or theories about its causes. Otherwise, there is no way to test or adjudicate between competing accounts.¶ That designation precedes diagnosis is true of any inquiry that claims to be empirical. To start with the diagnosis is to not start with the problem. The problem is pretheoretical or preinquiry, not in any mysterious sense but in that it is first suffered by someone in a particular context. Otherwise, the diagnosis about the causes of the problem has nothing to be about, and the inquiry cannot even be initiated. In his Logic, Dewey lays out the pattern of all empirical inquiries (LW 12). All inquiries start with what he calls an “indeterminate situation,” prior even to a “problematic situation.” Here is a sketch of the process:¶ Indeterminate situation → problematic situation → diagnosis: What is the problem? What is the solution? (operations of analysis, ideas, observations, clarification, formulating and testing hypothesis, reasoning, etc.) → final judgment (resolution: determinate situation)¶ To make more clear or vivid the difference of the starting point between Anderson and Dewey, we can use the example (or analogy) of medical prac- tice, one that they both use to make their points.19 The doctor’s startingpoint is the experience of a particular illness of a particular patient, that is, the concrete and unique embodied patient experiencing a disruption or prob- lematic change in his life. “The patient having something the matter with him is antecedent; but being ill (having the experience of illness) is not the same as being an object of knowledge.”20 The problem becomes an object of knowledge once the doctor engages in a certain interaction with the patient, analysis, and testing that leads to a diagnosis. For Dewey, “diagnosis” occurs when the doctor is already engaged in operations of experimental observation in which he is already narrowing the field of relevant evidence, concerned with the correlation between the nature of the problem and possible solu- tions. Dewey explains the process: “A physician . . . is called by a patient. His original material of experience is thereby provided. This experienced object sets the problem of inquiry. . . . He calls upon his store of knowledge to sug- gest ideas that may aid him in reaching a judgment as to the nature of the trouble and its proper treatment.”21¶ Just as with the doctor, empirical inquirers about injustice must return to the concrete problem for testing, and should never forget that their con- ceptual abstractions and general knowledge are just means to ameliorate what is particular, context-bound, and unique. In reaching a diagnosis, the doc- tor, of course, relies on all of his background knowledge about diseases and evidence, but a good doctor never forgets the individuality of the particular problem (patient and illness).¶ The physician in diagnosing a case of disease deals with something in- dividualized. He draws upon a store of general principles of physiology, etc., already at his command. Without this store of conceptual material he is helpless. But he does not attempt to reduce the case to an exact specimen of certain laws of physiology and pathology, or do away with its unique individuality. Rather he uses general statements as aids to direct his observation of the particular case, so as to discover what it is like. They function as intellectual tools or instrumentalities. (LW 4:166)¶ Dewey uses the example of the doctor to emphasize the radical contex- tualism and particularism of his view. The good doctor never forgets that this patient and “this ill is just the specific ill that it is. It never is an exact duplicate of anything else.”22 Similarly, the empirical philosopher in her in- quiry about an injustice brings forth general knowledge or expertise to an inquiry into the causes of an injustice. She relies on sociology and history as well as knowledge of different forms of injustice, but it is all in the service of inquiry about the singularity of each injustice suffered in a situation.¶ The correction or refinement that I am making to Anderson’s character- ization of the pragmatists’ approach is not a minor terminological or scholarly point; it has methodological and practical consequences in how we approach an injustice. The distinction between the diagnosis and the problem (the ill- ness, the injustice) is an important functional distinction that must be kept in inquiry because it keeps us alert to the provisional and hypothetical aspect of any diagnosis. **To rectify or improve any diagnosis, we must return to the concrete problem;** as with the patient, this may require attending as much as possible to the uniqueness of the problem. This is in the same spirit as Anderson’s preference for an empirical inquiry that tries to “capture all of the expressive harms” in situations of injustice. But this requires that we begin with and return to concrete experiences of injustice and not by starting with a diagnosis of the causes of injustice provided by studies in the social sciences, as in (5) above. For instance, a diagnosis of causes that are due to systematic, structural features of society or the world disregards aspects of the concrete experiences of injustice that are not systematic and structural.¶ **Making problematic situations** of injustice **our** explicit **methodological** commitment as a **starting point** rather than a diagnosis of the problem **is** an **important** and useful imperative for nonideal theories**. It functions as a directive to inquirers toward the problem, to locate it, and designate it before venturing into descriptions, diagnosis, analysis, clarifications, hypotheses, and reasoning about the problem**. These operations are instrumental to its ame- lioration and must ultimately return (be tested) by the problem that sparked the inquiry. The directive can make inquirers more attentive to the complex ways in which such differences as race, culture, class, or gender intersect in a problem of injustice. Sensitivity to complexity and difference in matters of injustice is not easy; it is a very demanding methodological prescription because it means that no matter how confident we may feel about applying solutions designed to ameliorate systematic evil, our **cures should** try to **address** as much as possible **the unique** **circumstances** of each injustice. The analogy with medical inquiry and practice is useful in making this point, since the hope is that someday we will improve our tools of inquiry to prac- tice a much more personalized medicine than we do today, that is, provide a diagnosis and a solution specific to each patient.

### **2] Our Framework comes lexically prior to any other: Threats to bodily security and life preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively utilize other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis that inhibit the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose – my fw comes first and my offense outweighs theirs under their framework.**

### 

### **3] We win precision- Governments have a unique responsibility for consequences.**

**Enoch 07** – David. “Intending, Foreseeing, and the State” The Hebrew University in Jerusalem, 9-13-2007. Published by: Legal Theory.

The general difficulty of the intending-foreseeing distinction here stemmed, you will recall, from the feeling that attempting to pick and choose among the foreseen consequences of one’s actions those one is more and those one is less responsible for looks more like the preparation of a defense than like a genuine attempt to determine what is to be done. **Hiding behind the intending-foreseeing distinction seems like an attempt to evade responsibility, and so thinking about the distinction in terms of responsibility serves to reduce even further the plausibility of attributing to it intrinsic moral significance.**

This consideration—however weighty in general—seems to me very weighty when applied to state action and to the decisions of state officials. For perhaps it may be argued that individuals are not required to undertake a global perspective, one that equally takes into account all foreseen consequences of their actions. Perhaps, in other words, **individuals are entitled to (roughly) settle for having a good will, and beyond that let chips fall where they may**. But this is precisely what stateswomen and statesmen—and certainly states—are not entitled to settle for.44 **In making policy decisions, it is precisely the global (or at least statewide, or nationwide, or something of this sort) perspective that must be undertaken. Perhaps, for instance, an individual doctor is entitled to give her patient a scarce drug without thinking about tomorrow’s patients** (I say “perhaps” because I am genuinely not sure about this), **but surely when a state committee tries to formulate rules for the allocation of scarce medical drugs and treatments, it cannot hide behind the intending-foreseeing distinction, arguing that if it allows45 the doctor to give the drug to today’s patient, the death of tomorrow’s patient is merely foreseen and not intended.** When making a policy-decision, this is clearly unacceptable.

Or think about it this way (I follow Daryl Levinson here):46 perhaps restrictions on the responsibility of individuals are justified because individuals are autonomous, because much of the value in their lives comes from personal pursuits and relationships that are possible only if their responsibility for what goes on in the (more impersonal) world is restricted. But none of this is true of **states and governments.** They **have no special relationships and pursuits, no personal interests, no autonomous lives to lead in anything like the sense in which these ideas are plausible when applied to individuals persons. So there is no reason to restrict the responsibility of states in anything like the way the responsibility of individuals is arguably restricted.**47

States and state officials have much more comprehensive responsibilities than individuals do. Hiding behind the intending-foreseeing distinction thus more clearly constitutes an evasion of responsibility in the case of the former. So the evading-responsibility worry has much more force against the intending-foreseeing distinction when applied to state action than elsewhere.

**4) Death permanently disallows axiology, extinction is the worst outcome by any standard.**

#### **Bostrom 12** [Nick Bostrom. Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford. “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy (2012)]

#### These reflections on **moral uncertainty suggest[s]** an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate.¶ **Our present understanding of axiology might** well **be confused. We may not** nowknow — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet **be able to imagine the best ends** of our journey. **If we are** indeedprofoundly **uncertain** about our ultimate aims,then we should recognize that **there is a great** option **value in preserving** — and ideally improving — **our ability to recognize value and** to **steer the future accordingly. Ensuring** that **there will be a future** version of **humanity** with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely **is** plausibly **the best way** available to us **to increase the probability that the future will contain** a lot of **value.** To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

## **Theory**

**A)**

#### 

**B)**

#### 

#### 

**Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all previously read positions before the debate on their NDCA wiki page. The tournament rules require this:**

**Appropriate disclosure is required within five minutes of the check in time.** Appropriate disclosure includes disclosure of the advantages and plan text if the affirmative has been read before. If not, the team should let the negative know that it is a new affirmative. **Negative teams should disclose previous 2NRs.**

**B. Violation: You didn’t - I have screenshots, even asks for my Aff**

**C. Standards:**

**1. Evidence Quality – Disclosure generates an information database that encourages debaters to find the best evidence on the topic. Key to education since we have better debates with better arguments.**

**Nails 13** [(Jacob, NDT Policy Debater at Georgia State University), “A Defense of Disclosure (Including Third Party Disclosure)”,NSDUpdate,10/10/2013EM]

I fall squarely on the side of disclosure. I find that the largest advantage of widespread disclosure is the educational value it provides. First, **disclosure streamlines research.** Rather than every team and every lone wolf researching completely in the dark, **the wiki provides a public body of knowledge that everyone can** contribute to and **build off of. Students can look through** the **different studies** on the topic **and choose the best ones** on an informed basis without the prohibitively large burden of personally surveying all of the literature. The best arguments are identified and replicated, which is a natural result of an open marketplace of ideas. **Quality of evidence increases across the board.**

**2. Quality engagement --- disclosure allows in-depth preparation before the round which checks back against unpredictable positions and allows debaters to effectively write case negs and blocks. Not just in the context of this round, but for rounds in general. Quality engagement is an independent voter because the constitutive reason we debate is to engage and clash our arguments otherwise we would just be doing oratory. It’s also key to fairness since I need to have prep to win. This means vote on inclusion since debaters of lower skill level can have a chance to engage with better debaters which makes debate less centered towards those with larger coaching staffs.**

**Framing: You can’t coopt any of the reasons why procedurals are bad in the context of the affirmative since I don’t constrain your ability to read it– the contention is that this aff should’ve been read, just disclosed. Also, your prep outs argument is nonsense a) prep outs are a 2 way street b) they’re good as per the shell c) being a good debater solves back.**

**Fairness is a votes because making arguments assumes it will be evaluated fairly.**

**Education is voter because only portable impact.**

**Drop the debater to deter them from doing this in future rounds.**