

1

Interpretation— The Affirmative must defend the whole resolution by defending all just governments and all workers.

Violation: They specify India

1] Indefinite articles like “a” or “an” are used to represent generalities. This is from the UWash English Dept.

<https://depts.washington.edu/engl/askbetty/articles.php>

5. Generic reference **Sometimes when writing you are not referring to just one member of the class or to specific entity; instead you want to refer to the whole class or every member of that class. In other words, you want to generalize what you are saying.** There are two main ways to do so, 5.1

Use the plural form of noun By pluralizing a noun, you can make it generic. This makes sense because the plural form indicates that there is more than one instance, and that what you say applies to all of these instances, as in: 5.1.1 I like to eat apples and oranges. 5.1.2 Parents will always love their children. In both of these examples, the nouns are in their plural forms ("apples", "oranges", "parents" and "children"), and so have generic meanings. That is, the speaker in 5.1.1 likes all apples and all oranges, while the speaker in 5.1.2 is making assumption that all parents—without exception—love their children. If you choose this

option, do not forget to use the plural form of verb as well to agree with the plural subject noun. 5.2 **Use the singular form with the definite article**

"the" This option gives you the same generic reference as the plural option above. However, you have to be careful because this option is not as widely applicable as the first option. Some nouns cannot be used with the article "the" to signal generic reference. Nouns that can be used with this option are usually those that refer to occupations (e.g., the student, the doctor, the patient, the soldier, the farmer, etc.), names of animals (e.g., the lion, the turtle, etc.), body parts (e.g., the lungs, the heart, etc.), and human inventions (e.g., the telephone, the computer, etc.). Choosing this option, you need to have a singular form of verb. 5.3 **Use the singular**

form with the indefinite article "a" or "an" This is the least used option because its use is very restricted. It is usually used when you explain the components of something, as in: 5.3.1 An essay has three main parts: the introduction, the body, and the conclusion. 5.3.2 A bicycle has two wheels. In both examples, the speaker is talking about the components of an essay and a bicycle in general; she or he means that every essay and every bicycle will have those components. Note that the generic reference above will be lost if you say, for example, 5.3.3 I received a letter in the mail. 5.3.4 A bicycle was stolen from the store. In these two sentences, the indefinite article just introduces a new information that the hearer or the reader has not heard before, and it does not refer to letters and bicycles in general. The following sentence also sounds odd because of misuse of the indefinite article to signal generic reference: 5.3.5 A lion is an endangered animal. For this sentence, you need to say "Lions are an endangered animal" or "The lion is an endangered animal". This is because "an endangered animal" includes the whole species, but by saying "a lion," you're just referring to a member of the whole species.

“A” before “just government” is an indefinite article and “workers” is a bare plural which means that they express a generalization.

2] We win UQ- Indefinite articles can ONLY be used when the identity of the noun is unknown. That means they don’t get to spec govts or workers since in the context of semantics, we don’t know which govts or which workers.

Butte College English Department, Another Academic institution telling us about English/Grammar Rules
<http://www.butte.edu/departments/cas/tipsheets/grammar/articles.html>

Following are **the three specific rules** which **explain the use of** definite and **indefinite articles. Rule #1 - Specific identity not known: Use the indefinite article a or an only**

with a singular count noun whose specific identity is not known to the reader. Use a before nouns that begin with a consonant sound, and use an before nouns that begin with a vowel sound. **Use the article a or an to indicate any non-specified member of a group or category.** *I think an animal is in the garage. That man is a scoundrel. We are looking for an apartment.*

Additionally Prefer—

1] Prep-skew- Negs can only prep for the resolution as it is given to us. Specking affs makes them completely unpredictable and puts an infinite research burden on the neg. I can spend a million hours preparing and still never be prepared for the affs interpretation of the resolution.

2] Accessibility- Small schools and disadvantaged people may not have the resources to find the right evidence or have people to make numerous plans for debaters to overrun the neg with. It means that advantaged debaters will continue to have a greater advantage over disadvantaged debaters, and the losing debaters will stop debating. Diversity is important to keep debate educational.

5] Limits— Even if your aff is predictable, your interp is severely under limited. Supercharged on this topic because there are 200+ governments the aff can defend, the aff can spec to defend an unconditional RTS for any category or specific group. There are thousands of specific affs that are permissible if we don't accept my interp, generating an infinite caselist.. Limits are key to fairness since we can't prep for a thousand affs.

6] Semantics First- — any other interp justifies the aff jettisoning words from the resolution at will; it's ridiculous to expect us to prepare for things outside of the topic.

Nebel 15 - (Jake [Marshall Scholar of Philosophy, Princeton University] "The Priority of Resolutional Semantics"

<http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/>) GHS//GB

One reason why LDers may be suspicious of my view is because they see topicality as just another theory argument. But unlike other theory arguments, **topicality involves two "interpretations."** **The first is an interpretation**, in the ordinary sense of the word, of the resolution or of some part of it.

The second is a rule—namely, that the affirmative must defend the resolution.² If we don't distinguish between these two interpretations, then the negative's view is merely that the affirmative must defend whatever proposition they think should be debated, not because it is the proposition expressed by the resolution, but rather because it would be good to debate. This failure to see what is distinctive about topicality leads quickly to the pragmatic approach, by ignoring what the interpretation is supposed to be an interpretation of. By contrast, **the topicality rule—i.e., that the affirmative must defend the resolution—justifies the semantic approach.** This rule is justified by appeals to fairness and education: **it would be unfair to expect the negative to prep** **are** **against anything other than the res** **olution**, because

that is the only mutually acceptable basis for preparation; **the educational benefits** **that are unique to debate stem from** **clash focused on a proposition determined beforehand.** **The inference to the priority of semantic considerations is simple.** Consider the following argument: **We ought to debate the resolution. The resolution means X. Therefore, We ought to debate X.** **The first premise is just the topicality rule. The second**

premise is that X is the semantically correct interpretation. Pragmatic considerations for or against X do not, in themselves, support or deny this second premise. They might show that it would be better or worse if the resolution meant X, but sentences do not in general mean what it would be best for them to mean. At best, pragmatic considerations may show that we should debate some proposition other than the resolution. They are (if anything) reasons to change the topic, contrary to the topicality rule. Pragmatic considerations must, therefore, be weighed against the justifications for the topicality rule, not against the semantic considerations: they are objections to the first premise, not the second premise, in the argument above.

Voters

Fairness & Education

TVA – you could have just [...]

Solves abuse

- a. You can read country specific evidence, you just need to apply it to all countries or argue why it would apply.**
- b. You could've even read the same plan just under a whole res advocacy, just make it a contention or advantage so my arguments can still link.**

Paradigm Issues:

- 1] No RVI- RVI Chills Theory, the point of initiating theory is to point out abuse that has already happened and correct it to make the debate space better. If someone is proven not guilty in court it doesn't mean that they should prosecute the judge. If neg can easily win off their abuse by manipulating theory, then they will continue to be abusive.**
- 2] Use competing interps – it's key to norm setting – judges endorse the best interpretation instead of allowing abuse, checking a race to the bottom**
- 3] DTD- Abuse has already happened, I can't respond to the arguments that my opponents have made because instead I need to get into theory. DTD checks future abuse by teaching the opponent this isn't acceptable.**

2

India's economy is up now, despite covid struggles

Brende 11/10 World Economic Forum Nov 10, 2021

<https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2021/11/india-s-future-and-role-in-the-post-covid-19-world/>

Indeed, rays of recovery are beginning to emerge in our economies. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) projects that the global economy will grow by 6% in 2021, and forecasts 9.5% growth in the Indian economy. At the same time, the world is seeing exponential growth in digital services and infrastructure, from the adoption of large-scale work-from-home arrangements to the use of cloud services and videoconferencing.

Many tech leaders have noted that the advancements in digital transformation that were achieved within a couple of months would have normally taken two to three years. These are hopeful signs, but there is still much work to be done. India's future on the world stage

Despite the economic devastation caused by the virus, India's agile response has been commendable, especially as the country rallied to manage a deadly second wave of the virus early in 2021. India was the first country to feel the impact of the virulent Delta variant but quickly swung into action to ensure that as many people as possible were vaccinated. One billion doses of the vaccine have already been administered.

In addition to protecting its own population, India has also acted in the world's best interest by providing medical supplies and equipment to more than 150 countries across the globe and placing a critical supply of the COVID-19 vaccine on the world market. Indeed, the pandemic is an inflection point for India to introspect on its potential as a global leader, especially coming at a time when the country is celebrating 75 years of independence.

For years, India has supplied crucial drugs and medications to the global market, more recently investing in the supply of the COVID-19 vaccine to ensure equitable access around the world.

At the start of the COVID crisis, India's South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation (SAARC) initiative held the first multilateral summit, inspiring the G20 and others to follow suit. With the country taking over the G20 presidency in December 2022, it will certainly play a leading role in the post-COVID global recovery process.

Away from the pandemic, India is meeting other global commitments including living up to its climate mitigation promises. It is also well ahead of target to achieve other ambitious commitments such as making renewables 40% of its energy mix by 2030 and managing the sequestration of 2.5 billion tonnes of carbon.

At the ongoing United Nations Climate Change Conference of the Parties (COP26) taking place in Glasgow, Scotland, Prime Minister Narendra Modi committed India to an ambitious Panchamrit pledge that will see the country address five key sectors of its economy to reduce its

greenhouse gas emissions. The five sectors - energy, mobility, industry, infrastructure and cities, and agriculture - are critical to achieving the global 1.5-degree Celsius warming target.

A recent report from the World Economic Forum - *Mission 2070: A Green New Deal for a Net-Zero India* - outlines how India's path to net zero will have an estimated economic impact of over \$1 trillion by 2030 and around \$15 trillion by 2070. In addition, India has prioritized cooperation, technology, and digitalization as part of its efforts to support the achievement of the United Nation's *Sustainable Development Goals* (SDGs).

The Global Economy is stabilizing and set for increases in 2021 but is still vulnerable to shocks

World Bank 6-8 6-8-2021 "The Global Economy: on Track for Strong but Uneven Growth as COVID-19 Still Weighs"

<https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2021/06/08/the-global-economy-on-track-for-strong-but-uneven-growth-as-covid-19-still-weighs>

A year and a half since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the global economy is poised to stage its most robust post-recession recovery in 80 years in 2021. But the rebound is expected to be uneven across countries, as major economies look set to register strong growth even as many developing economies lag. Global growth is expected to accelerate to 5.6% this year, largely on the strength in major economies such as the United States and China. And while growth for almost every region of the world has been revised upward for 2021, many continue to grapple with COVID-19 and what is likely to be its long shadow. Despite this year's pickup, the level of global GDP in 2021 is expected to be 3.2% below pre-pandemic projections, and per capita GDP among many emerging market and developing economies is anticipated to remain below pre-COVID-19 peaks for an extended period. As the pandemic continues to flare, it will shape the path of global economic activity.

Strikes hurt the Economy – two warrants:

1] They hurt critical core industries that is necessary for economic growth

McElroy 19 John McElroy 10-25-2019 "Strikes Hurt Everybody"

<https://www.wardsauto.com/ideaxchange/strikes-hurt-everybody> (MPA at McCombs school of Business)

This creates a poisonous relationship between the company and its workforce. Many GM hourly workers don't identify as GM employees. They identify as UAW members. And they see the union as the source of their jobs, not the company. It's an unhealthy dynamic that puts GM at a disadvantage to non-union automakers in the U.S. like Honda and Toyota, where workers take pride in the company they work for and the products they make. Attacking the company in the media also drives away customers. Who wants to buy a shiny new car from a company that's accused of underpaying its workers and treating them unfairly? Data from the Center for Automotive Research (CAR) in Ann Arbor, MI, show that GM loses market share during strikes and never gets it back. GM lost two percentage points during the 1998 strike, which in today's market would represent a loss of 340,000 sales. Because GM reports sales on a quarterly basis we'll only find out at the end of

December if it lost market share from this strike. UAW members say one of their greatest concerns is job security. But causing a company to lose market share is a sure-fire path to more plant closings and layoffs.

Even so, unions are incredibly important for boosting wages and benefits for working-class people. GM's UAW-represented workers earn considerably more than their non-union counterparts, about \$26,000 more per worker, per year, in total compensation. Without a union they never would have achieved that. Strikes are a powerful weapon for unions. They usually are the only way they can get management to accede to their demands. If not for the power of collective bargaining and the threat of a strike, management would largely ignore union demands. If you took away that threat, management would pay its workers peanuts. Just ask the Mexican line workers who are paid \$1.50 an hour to make \$50,000 BMWs. But strikes don't just hurt the people walking the picket lines or the company they're striking against. They hurt suppliers, car dealers and the communities located near the plants.

The Anderson Economic Group estimates that 75,000 workers at supplier companies were temporarily laid off because of the GM strike. Unlike UAW picketers, those supplier workers won't get any strike pay or an \$11,000 contract signing bonus. No, most of them lost close to a month's worth of wages, which must be financially devastating for them. GM's suppliers also lost a lot of money. So now they're cutting budgets and delaying capital investments to make up for the lost revenue, which is a further drag on the economy. According to CAR, the communities and states where GM's plants are located collectively lost a couple of hundred million dollars in payroll and tax revenue. Some economists warn that if the strike were prolonged it could knock the state of Michigan – home to GM and the UAW – into a recession.

That prompted the governor of Michigan, Gretchen Whitmer, to call GM CEO Mary Barra and UAW leaders and urge them to settle as fast as possible. So, while the UAW managed to get a nice raise for its members, the strike left a path of destruction in its wake. That's not fair to the innocent bystanders who will never regain what they lost. John McElroy I'm not sure how this will ever be resolved. I understand the need for collective bargaining and the threat of a strike. But there's got to be a better way to get workers a raise without torching the countryside.

2] Strikes create a stigmatization effect over labor and consumption that devastates the Economy

Tenza 20, Mlungisi. "The effects of violent strikes on the economy of a developing country: a case of South Africa." *Obiter* 41.3 (2020): 519-537. (Senior Lecturer, University of KwaZulu-Natal)

When South Africa obtained democracy in 1994, there was a dream of a better country with a new vision for industrial relations.⁵ However, the number of violent strikes that have bedevilled this country in recent years seems to have

shattered-down the aspirations of a better South Africa. South Africa recorded 114 strikes in 2013 and 88 strikes in 2014, which cost the country about R6.1 billion according to the Department of Labour.⁶ The impact of these strikes has been hugely felt by the mining sector, particularly the platinum industry. The biggest strike took place in the platinum sector where about 70 000 mineworkers' downed tools for better wages. Three major platinum producers (Impala, Anglo American and Lonmin Platinum Mines) were affected. The strike started on 23 January 2014 and ended on 25 June 2014. Business Day reported that "the five-month-long strike in the platinum sector pushed the economy to the brink of recession".⁷ This strike was closely followed by a four-week strike in the metal and engineering sector. All these strikes (and those not mentioned here) were characterised with violence accompanied by damage to property, intimidation, assault and sometimes the killing of people. Statistics from the metal and engineering sector showed that about 246 cases of intimidation were reported, 50 violent incidents occurred, and 85 cases of vandalism were recorded.⁸ Large-scale unemployment, soaring poverty levels and the dramatic income inequality that characterise the South African labour market provide a broad explanation for strike violence.⁹ While participating in a strike, workers' stress levels leave them feeling frustrated at their seeming powerlessness, which in turn provokes further violent behaviour.¹⁰ These strikes are not only violent but take long to resolve. Generally, a lengthy strike has a negative effect on employment, reduces business confidence and increases the risk of economic stagnation. In addition, such strikes have a major setback on the growth of the economy and investment opportunities. It is common knowledge that consumer spending is directly linked to economic growth. At the same time, if the economy is not

showing signs of growth, employment opportunities are shed, and poverty becomes the end result. The economy of South Africa is in need of rapid growth to enable it to deal with the high levels of unemployment and resultant poverty. One of the measures that may boost the country's economic growth is by attracting potential investors to invest in the country. However, this might be difficult as investors would want to invest in a country where there is a likelihood of getting returns for their investments. The wish of getting returns for investment may not materialise if the labour environment is not fertile for such investments as a result of, for example, unstable labour relations. Therefore, investors may be reluctant to invest where there is an unstable or fragile labour relations environment.

3 THE COMMISSION OF VIOLENCE DURING A STRIKE AND CONSEQUENCES The Constitution guarantees every worker the right to join a trade union, participate in the activities and programmes of a trade union, and to strike. 11 The Constitution grants these rights to a "worker" as an individual. 12 However, the right to strike and any other conduct in contemplation or furtherance of a strike such as a picket 13 can only be exercised by workers acting collectively. 14 The right to strike and participation in the activities of a trade union were given more effect through the enactment of the Labour Relations Act 66 of 1995¹⁵ (LRA). The main purpose of the LRA is to "advance economic development, social justice, labour peace and the democratisation of the workplace". 16 The advancement of social justice means that the exercise of the right to strike must advance the interests of workers and at the same time workers must refrain from any conduct that can affect those who are not on strike as well members of society. Even though the right to strike and the right to participate in the activities of a trade union that often flow from a strike¹⁷ are guaranteed in the Constitution and specifically regulated by the LRA, it sometimes happens that the right to strike is exercised for purposes not intended by the Constitution and the LRA, generally. 18 For example, it was not the intention of the Constitutional Assembly and the legislature that violence should be used during strikes or pickets. As the Constitution provides, pickets are meant to be peaceful. 19 Contrary to section 17 of the Constitution, the conduct of workers participating in a strike or picket has changed in recent years with workers trying to emphasise their grievances by causing disharmony and chaos in public. A media report by the South African Institute of Race Relations pointed out that between the years 1999 and 2012 there were 181 strike-related deaths, 313 injuries and 3,058 people were arrested for public violence associated with strikes.²⁰ The question is whether employers succumb easily to workers' demands if a strike is accompanied by violence? In response to this question, one worker remarked as follows: "[T]here is no sweet strike, there is no Christian strike ... A strike is a strike. [Y]ou want to get back what belongs to you ... you won't win a strike with a Bible. You do not wear high heels and carry an umbrella and say '1992 was under apartheid, 2007 is under ANC'. You won't win a strike like that." 21 The use of violence during industrial action affects not only the strikers or picketers, the employer and his or her business but it also affects innocent members of the public, non-striking employees, the environment and the economy at large. In addition, striking workers visit non-striking workers' homes, often at night, threaten them and in some cases, assault or even murder workers who are acting as replacement labour. 22 This points to the fact that for many workers and their families' living conditions remain unsafe and vulnerable to damage due to violence. In *Security Services Employers Organisation v SA Transport & Allied Workers Union (SATAWU)*,²³ it was reported that about 20 people were thrown out of moving trains in the Gauteng province; most of them were security guards who were not on strike and who were believed to be targeted by their striking colleagues. Two of them died, while others were admitted to hospitals with serious injuries.²⁴ In *SA Chemical Catering & Allied Workers Union v Check One (Pty) Ltd*,²⁵ striking employees were carrying various weapons ranging from sticks, pipes, planks and bottles. One of the strikers Mr Ngoko was alleged to have threatened to cut the throats of those employees who had been brought from other branches of the employer's business to help in the branch where employees were on strike. Such conduct was held not to be in line with good conduct of striking.²⁶ These examples from case law show that South Africa is facing a problem that is affecting not only the industrial relations' sector but also the economy at large. For example, in 2012, during a strike by workers employed by Lonmin in Marikana, the then-new union Association of Mine & Construction Workers Union (AMCU) wanted to exert its presence after it appeared that many workers were not happy with the way the majority union, National Union of Mine Workers (NUM), handled negotiations with the employer (Lonmin Mine). AMCU went on an unprotected strike which was violent and resulted in the loss of lives, damage to property and negative economic consequences including a weakened currency, reduced global investment, declining productivity, and increase unemployment in the affected sectors.²⁷ Further, the unreasonably long time it takes for strikes to get resolved in the Republic has a negative effect on the business of the employer, the economy and employment. 3 1 Effects of violent and long strikes on the economy Generally, South Africa's economy is on a downward scale. First, it fails to create employment opportunities for its people. The recent statistics on unemployment levels indicate that unemployment has increased from 26.5% to 27.2%. 28 The most prominent strike which nearly brought the platinum industries to its knees was the strike convened by AMCU in 2014. The strike started on 23 January 2014 and ended on 24 June 2014. It affected the three big platinum producers in the Republic, which are the Anglo American Platinum, Lonmin Plc and Impala Platinum. It was the longest strike since the dawn of democracy in 1994. As a result of this strike, the platinum industries lost billions of rands.²⁹ According to the report by Economic Research Southern Africa, the platinum group metals industry is South Africa's second-largest export earner behind gold and contributes just over 2% of the country's Gross Domestic Product (GDP).³⁰ The overall metal ores in the mining industry which include platinum sells about 70% of its output to the export market while sales to local manufacturers of basic metals, fabricated metal products and various other metal equipment and machinery make up to 20%. 31 The research indicates that the overall impact of the strike in 2014 was driven by a reduction in productive capital in the mining sector, accompanied by a decrease in labour available to the economy. This resulted in a sharp increase in the price of the output by 5.8% with a GDP declined by 0.72 and 0.78%.³²

Economic Collapse goes Nuclear.

Tønnesson 15, Stein. "Deterrence, interdependence and Sino-US peace." International Area Studies Review 18.3 (2015): 297-311. (the Department of Peace and Conflict, Uppsala University, Sweden, and Peace research Institute Oslo (PRIO), Norway)

Several recent works on China and Sino-US relations have made substantial contributions to the current understanding of how and under what circumstances a combination of nuclear deterrence and economic interdependence may reduce the risk of war between major powers.

At least four conclusions can be drawn from the review above: first, those who say that interdependence may both inhibit and drive conflict are right. Interdependence raises the cost of conflict for all sides but asymmetrical or unbalanced dependencies and negative trade expectations may generate tensions leading to trade wars among inter-dependent states that in turn increase the risk of military conflict (Copeland, 2015: 1, 14, 437; Roach, 2014). The risk may increase if one of the interdependent countries is governed by an inward-looking socio-economic coalition (Solingen, 2015); second, the risk of war between China and the US should not just be analysed bilaterally but include their allies and partners. Third party countries could drag China or the US into confrontation; third, in this context it is of some comfort that the three main economic powers in Northeast Asia (China, Japan and South Korea) are all deeply integrated economically through production networks within a global system of trade and finance (Ravenhill, 2014; Yoshimatsu, 2014: 576); and fourth, decisions for war and peace are taken by very few people, who act on the basis of their future expectations. International relations theory must be supplemented by foreign policy analysis in order to assess the value attributed by national decision-makers to economic development and their assessments of risks and opportunities. If leaders on either side of the Atlantic begin to seriously fear or anticipate their own nation's decline then they may blame this on external dependence, appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, contemplate the use of force to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately refuse to be deterred by either nuclear arms or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. Such a dangerous shift could happen abruptly, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party. Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. The greatest risk is not that a territorial dispute leads to war under present circumstances but that changes in the world economy alter those circumstances in ways that render inter-state peace more precarious. If China and the US fail to rebalance their financial and trading relations (Roach, 2014) then a trade war could result, interrupting transnational production networks, provoking social distress, and exacerbating nationalist emotions. This could have unforeseen consequences in the field of security, with nuclear deterrence remaining the only factor to protect the world from Armageddon, and unreliably so. Deterrence could lose its credibility: one of the two great powers might gamble that the other yield in a cyber-war or conventional limited war, or third party countries might engage in conflict with each other, with a view to obliging Washington or Beijing to intervene.

Case

Global Democracy is impossible.

Dixon 10 [Dr. Patrick Dixon, PhD Foreign Policy, "The Truth About the War With Iraq",
<http://www.globalchange.com/iraqwar.htm>]

And so we find an interesting fact: those who live in democratic nations, who uphold democracy as the only honourable form of government, are not really true democrats after all. They have little or no interest in global democracy, in a nation of nations, in seeking the common good of the whole of humanity. And it is this single fact, more than any other, this inequality of wealth and privilege in our shrinking global village, that will make it more likely that our future is dominated by terror groups, freedom fighters, justice-seekers, hell-raisers, protestors and violent agitators.

No tipping point from biodiversity—overwhelming experimental ev. No impact

Jeremy **Hance 18**, wildlife blogger for the Guardian and a journalist with Mongabay focusing on forests, indigenous people, climate change and more. He is also the author of Life is Good: Conservation in an Age of Mass Extinction., 1-16-2018, "Could biodiversity destruction lead to a global tipping point?," Guardian,

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/radical-conservation/2018/jan/16/biodiversity-extinction-tipping-point-planetary-boundary>

"It makes no sense that there exists a tipping point of biodiversity loss beyond which the Earth will collapse," said co-author and ecologist, José Montoya, with Paul Sabatier Univeristy in France. "There is no rationale for this." Montoya wrote the paper along with Ian Donohue, an ecologist at Trinity College in Ireland and Stuart Pimm, one of the world's leading experts on extinctions, with Duke University in the US. Montoya, Donohue and Pimm argue that there isn't evidence of a point at which loss of species leads to ecosystem collapse, globally or even locally. If the planet didn't collapse after the Permian-Triassic extinction event, it won't collapse now – though our descendants may well curse us for the damage we've done. Instead, according to the researchers, every loss of species counts. But the damage is gradual and incremental, not a sudden plunge. Ecosystems, according to them, slowly degrade but never fail outright. "Of more than 600 experiments of biodiversity effects on various functions, none showed a collapse," Montoya said. "In general, the loss of species has a detrimental effect on ecosystem functions...We progressively lose pollination services, water quality, plant biomass, and many other important functions as we lose species. But we never observe a critical level of biodiversity over which functions collapse."

Even if they win an internal link, it doesn't cause extinction

Hance 13 (Jeremy Hance, Senior correspondent for Mongabay as well as being a blogger for the Guardian and a freelance journalist, 3-5-2013, "Warnings of global ecological tipping points may be overstated", Mongabay Environmental News, <https://news.mongabay.com/2013/03/warnings-of-global-ecological-tipping-points-may-be-overstated/#r2IbUBDMyux2eU7i.99>, accessed 7-22-2019)

There's little evidence that the Earth is nearing a global ecological tipping point, according to a new Trends in Ecology and Evolution paper that is bound to be controversial. The authors argue that despite numerous warnings that the Earth is headed toward an ecological tipping point due to environmental stressors, such as habitat loss or climate change, it's unlikely this will occur anytime soon—at least not on land. The paper comes with a

number of caveats, including that a global tipping point could occur in marine ecosystems due to ocean acidification from burning fossil fuels. In addition, regional tipping points, such as the Arctic ice melt or the Amazon rainforest drying out, are still of great concern.

“When others have said that a planetary critical transition is possible/likely, they’ve done so without any underlying model (or past/present examples, apart from catastrophic drivers like asteroid strikes),” lead author Barry Brook and Director of Climate Science at the University of Adelaide told mongabay.com. “It’s just speculation and we’ve argued [...] that this conjecture is not logically grounded. No one has found the opposite of what we suggested—they’ve just proposed it.”

According to Brook and his team, a truly global tipping point must include an impact large enough to spread across the entire world, hitting various continents, in addition to causing some uniform response.

“These criteria, however, are very unlikely to be met in the real world,” says Brook.

The idea of such a tipping point comes from ecological research, which has shown that some ecosystems will flip to a new state after becoming heavily degraded. But Brook and his team say that tipping points in individual ecosystems should not be conflated with impacts across the Earth as a whole.

Even climate change, which some scientists might consider the ultimate tipping point, does not fit the bill, according to the paper. Impacts from climate change, while global, will not be uniform and hence not a “tipping point” as such.

“Local and regional ecosystems vary considerably in their responses to climate change, and their regime shifts are therefore likely to vary considerably across the terrestrial biosphere,” the authors write.

Barry adds that, “from a planetary perspective, this diversity in ecosystem responses creates an essentially gradual pattern of change, without any identifiable tipping points.”

The paper further argues that biodiversity loss on land may not have the large-scale impacts that some ecologists argue, since invasive species could potentially take the role of vanishing ones.

“So we can lose the unique evolutionary history (bad, from an intrinsic viewpoint) but not necessarily the role they impart in terms of ecosystem stability or provision of services,” explains Brook. The controversial argument goes against many scientists’ view that decreased biodiversity will ultimately lessen ecological services, such as pollination, water purification, and carbon sequestration.

Unions are essentially labor cartels, which have a worse effect on the economy AND the worker.

Sherk 2009 [James (Research Fellow, Labor Economics at the Heritage Foundation), 21 May 2009, “What Unions Do: How Labor Unions Affect Jobs and the Economy”, The Heritage Foundation,

<https://www.heritage.org/jobs-and-labor/report/what-unions-do-how-labor-unions-affect-jobs-and-the-economy>] //DebateDrills LC

Unions function as labor cartels. A labor cartel restricts the number of workers in a company or industry to drive up the remaining workers’

wages, just as the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) attempts to cut the supply of oil to raise its price.

Companies pass on those higher wages to consumers through higher prices, and often they also earn lower profits. Economic research finds that

unions benefit their members but hurt consumers generally, and especially workers who are denied job opportunities.

The average union member earns more than the average non-union worker. However, that does not mean that expanding union membership will raise wages: Few workers who join a union today get a pay raise. What explains these apparently contradictory findings? The economy has become more competitive over the past generation. Companies have less power to pass price increases on to consumers without going out of business. Consequently, **unions do not negotiate higher wages for many newly organized workers**

. These days, unions win higher wages for employees only at companies with competitive advantages that allow them to pay higher wages, such as successful research and development (R&D) projects or capital investments.

Unions effectively tax these investments by negotiating higher wages for their members, thus lowering profits. Unionized companies respond to this union tax by reducing investment. Less investment makes unionized companies less competitive.

This, along with the fact that unions function as labor cartels that seek to reduce job opportunities, causes unionized companies to lose jobs. Economists consistently find that unions decrease the number of jobs available in the economy. **The vast majority of manufacturing jobs lost over the past three decades have been among union members**--non-union manufacturing employment has risen. Research also shows that **widespread unionization delays recovery from economic downturns.**

Some unions win higher wages for their members, though many do not. But with these higher wages, **unions bring less investment, fewer jobs, higher prices, and smaller 401(k) plans for everyone else.** On balance, labor cartels harm the economy, and enacting policies designed to force workers into unions will only prolong the recession.

Striking leads to worse conditions.

Condon 18 [Jacki, 1 October 2018, "Strikes and their Economic Consequences", Engineering News, <https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/article/strikes-and-their-economic-consequences-2018-10-01>] //DebateDrills LC

While several activities can be taken in an effort to prevent strikes from occurring or escalating, in the South African context, **the tendency towards violent outbursts seems to outweigh reasonable action.**

Strikes and labour unrest have marked negative impacts on the employees themselves, the employers and their stakeholders, the government, consumers, and the economy." advises Jacki Condon, Managing Director of Apache Security Services.

"The negative effects on international trade include the hinderance of economic development, creating great economic uncertainty – especially as the global media continues to share details, images and videos of violence, damage to property and ferocious clashes between strikers and security."

Strike action results in less productivity, which in turn means less profits. Labour Law expert, Ivan Israelstam confirms that; "The employer is likely to lose money due to delayed service to clients or to lost production time. **The employees will lose their pay due to the no work, no pay principle. If the strikers are dismissed they will lose their livelihoods altogether**."

This year alone, Eskom, Prasa, various manufacturing plants, Sasol and the Post Office have faced crippling strikes – to name but a few. **Condon argues that there are more immediate consequences to consider than loss of income.**

"As the socio-economic issues continue to affect South Africans across the board, tensions are constantly rising," states Condon. "Businesses must protect themselves, their assets, business property, and their non-striking employees from violence and intimidation."

Strikes already work

Labor unions effective – no need for more strikes

Graham 16' Graham, James. "A Reconsideration of the Right to Strike." *The Catholic Lawyer* 9.2 (2016): 4.

Employers in certain industries almost always bow to union demands because, having banded together in collective bargaining associations with their competitors, they are in a position to make the public pay the price of increased wages or shorter hours. This is an oversimplification, of course, but

it would not be naive not to suppose, for example, that at least one effect of the inflated wage scales in the building trades is to make it more difficult for the lowerincome groups to increase their earnings and someday to buy a **home**.

Conclusion In any 'event, it would appear that government neutrality in labor disputes is fast becoming a thing of the past. The Kennedy administration has to date shown no reluctance to invoke the Taft-Hartley injunction procedures in labor disputes affecting the national welfare. **A proposal by former Secretary of Labor Goldberg that government representatives participate as "observers" in major negotiations was greeted with a cry of indignation from George Meaney and a chilly "no thanks" from management spokesmen,** but Goldberg's proposal does reflect an increasing concern for the public interest in labor-management disputes. It seems that government mediators often will intervene in disputes that only remotely affect

national defense interests. Perhaps this tendency has been influenced by the widely-held view among labor practitioners that public tolerance for strikes is much lower today than during the years when unions were organizing in the mass production industries.^{3 6} In conclusion, it is safe to say that additional legislation to curb illegal strikes and to compel arbitration in certain industries may not only be inevitable but necessary as well. We also can expect government regulation over other areas of collective bargaining unless the powerful unions pay heed to the principle enunciated by Pope Pius XI in Quadragesimo Anno that the right to strike should be exercised only as a last resort and in situations where it needs no justification.