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## 1ac

### Fw

#### Agents must be practical reasoners –

#### Practical reason constrains everything:

#### 1] Postulation – reason is a prior question to evaluation of ethics since anything else collapses on itself as we can infinitely question our foundations otherwise but raising the question of reason proves itself valuable as it necessitates reason.

#### 2] Epistemology – rational deliberation of educational concepts is necessary to interpret other arguments since it's a prerequisite to interpreting epistemological concepts and it's the terminal impact of debate as education is the only portable impact.

#### 3] Procedure – reason is a side constraint on debate since otherwise we can't refute – responding to this concedes the authority of reason since you're reasoning via logical deliberation.

#### We have a unified perspective – If I say that 2+2=4, I understand not only that I know that 2+2=4, but that everyone around can arrive at the same conclusion too because they create practical syllogisms to justify their conclusion. But, willing a maxim that violates the freedom of others is a contradiction – that’s bad.

Engstrom, Stephen (Professor of Ethics at UPitt). “Universal Legislation As the Form of Practical Knowledge.” <http://www.philosophie.uni-hd.de/md/philsem/engstrom_vortrag.pdf> rct st

Given the preceding considerations, it’s a straightforward matter to see how **a maxim of action that assaults the freedom of others with a view to furthering one’s own ends results in a contradiction when we attempt to will it as a universal law** in accordance with the foregoing account of the formula of universal law. **Such a maxim would lie in a practical judgment that deems it good on the whole to act to limit others’ outer freedom, and hence their self-sufficiency, their capacity to realize their ends, where doing so augments, or extends, one’s own outer freedom and so also one’s own self-sufficiency.** In this passage, Kant mentions assaults on property as well as on freedom. But since property is a specific, socially instituted form of freedom, I have omitted mention of it to focus on the primitive case. Now on the interpretation we’ve been entertaining, **applying the formula of universal law involves considering whether it’s possible for every person—every subject capable of practical judgment—to share[s] the practical judgment asserting the goodness of every person’s acting according to the maxim in question.** Thus in the present case the application of **the formula involves considering whether it’s possible for every person to deem good every person’s acting to limit others’ freedom, where practicable, with a view to augmenting their own freedom**. Since here **all persons are on the one hand deeming good both the limitation of others’ freedom and the extension of their own freedom,** while on the other hand, insofar as they agree with the similar judgments of others, **also deeming good the limitation of their own freedom and the extension of others’ freedom, they are all deeming good both the extension and the limitation of both their own and others’ freedom.**

#### Only a collective will that can have power over individuals can guarantee the enforcement of good maxims. Thus, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative.

#### To clarify, the framework does not value the ability to set any end, but rather the ability to decide which ends to pursue.

Ripstein **1**, (Arthur Ripstein, Arthur Ripstein is Professor of Law and Philosophy and University Professor. He was appointed to the Department of Philosophy in 1987, promoted to Full Professor in 1996, appointed to the Faculty of Law in 1999, and appointed to the rank of University Professor in 2016. He received a doctorate in philosophy from the University of Pittsburgh, a master’s degree in law from Yale, and an undergraduate degree from the University of Manitoba. He was Chair of the Philosophy Department 2011-14 and Acting Chair 2019-20., 2009, accessed on 8-18-2020, Harvard University Press, "Force and Freedom",) NP 8/4/16. rct st

**Independence is the basic principle of right. It guarantees equal free- dom, and so requires that no person be subject to the choice of another.** The idea of independence is similar to one that has been the target of many objections. The basic form of almost all of these focuses on the fact that **any set of rules prohibits some acts that people would otherwise do**, so that, for example, **laws prohibiting personal injury** and property dam- age **put limits on the ability of people to do as they wish.** Because differ- ent **people have incompatible wants, to let one person do what [they] want[] will typically require preventing others from doing what they want.** Thus, it has been contended, **freedom cannot even be articulated as a political value, because freedoms always come into conflict,** and **the only way to mediate those conflicts is by appealing to goods other than freedom.** As I will explain in more detail in Chapter 2, such an objection has some force against freedom understood as the ability to do whatever you wish, but fails to engage Kant’s conception of independence. **Limits on indepen- dence generate a set of restrictions that are by their nature equally appli- cable to all.** Their **generality depends on the** fact that they **abstract from** what Kant calls **the “matter” of choice—the particular purposes being pursued—and focus instead on the capacity to set purposes without hav- ing them set by others.** **What you can accomplish depends on what oth- ers are doing—someone else can frustrate your plans by getting the last quart of milk in the store. If they do so, they don’t interfere with your in- dependence, because they impose no limits on your ability to use your powers to set and pursue your own purposes. They** just change the world in ways that **make your means useless for the particular purpose you would have set. Their entitlement to change the world in those ways just is their right to independence.** In the same way, your ability to enter into cooperative activities with others depends upon their willingness to co- operate with you, and their entitlement to accept or decline your invita- tions is simply their right to independence

#### Impact calc –

#### [1] Only the categorical imperative can motivate action – it’s external to wills of agents so it can obligate them all to follow certain rules – unilateral wills fail since they would involve one person coercing other people under their will and there would be no obligation to follow a person.

#### [2] Consequences fail – A) Induction Fails – You only know induction works because past experiences have told you it has, but that is in itself a form of induction, so you use induction to prove induction – that’s circular B) Butterfly Effect – Every action has an infinite number of consequences that stem from it – me picking up a pen could cause nuclear war a hundred years down – you can’t quantify the infinite amount of pain and pleasure to come C) Aggregation fails – everyone has different feelings of pain and pleasure, so you can’t universalize that and say it’s good – it’s impossible to measure something that’s completely subjective D) Culpability – any consequence can lead to another consequence so it’s impossible to assign obligations since you can’t pinpoint a specific actor that caused a consequence.

## Offense

#### I defend “Resolved: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.”

#### I’m willing clarify or specify whatever you want me to in CX if it doesn’t force me to abandon my maxim. Check all interps in CX – I could’ve met them before the NC and abuse would’ve been solved. PICs don’t negate: a] General principles don’t defend an absolute action, so they tolerate exceptions b] Fails under my framework because they create arbitrary exceptions, which means it’s not universalizable.

#### Not recognizing the right to strike is not universalizable – affirm:

#### [1] Respecting agents – the right to strike gives workers more power over their freedom and forces companies to respect their dignity.

Gourevitch, 16 (Alex Gourevitch, Norman E. Bowie is professor emeritus at the University of Minnesota. Until his retirement in 2009 he was Elmer L Andersen Chair of Corporate Responsibility and served in the departments of strategic management and of philosophy., June 2016, accessed on 10-4-2021, American Political Science Association, "Quitting Work but Not the Job: Liberty and the Right to Strike", doi:10.1017/S1537592716000049)//st \*brackets for grammar\*

On top of which, as Smith noted, “masters are always and every where in a sort of tacit, but constant anduniform combination.” In a world in which economic necessity couples with employer collusion, workers have little choice: “Such combinations [by employers], however, are frequently resisted by a contrary defensive combination of the workmen; who sometimes too, without any provocation of this kind, combine of their own accord to raise the price of their labour.” 51 For this reason Smith thought it was wrong to treat trade unions as criminal conspiracies.52 The view of unions and strikes as defensive, aimed at lessening employers’ ability to take advantage of workers’ need, persisted throughout the industrial age. By the time L.T. Hobhouse wrote Liberalism, it was possible for a liberal to argue that **strikes might even be connected to human freedom:** The emancipation of **trade unions,** however, extending over the period from 1824 to 1906, and perhaps not yet complete, **was in the main a liberating movement, because combination was [are] necessary to place the workman on something approaching terms of equality with the employer, and because tacit combinations of employers could never, in fact, be prevented by law.**53 We must note, however, that nearly all of these arguments remain within a form of social theory that attempts to make capitalist practice more like its theoretical self-image. These thinkers tended to defend unions and their right to strike as a way of achieving “real freedom of contract” in the face of economic necessity. Hobhouse was updating Smith and Mill when arguing that “in **the matter of contract true freedom postulates substantial equality between the parties. In proportion as one party is in a position of vantage, he is able to dictate his terms. In proportion as the other party is in a weak position, he [and] must accept unfavourable terms.”** 54 On this account, the right to strike is defensible only insofar as it helps maintain a position of relative equality among independent bargaining parties. It thereby secures contracts that are not just voluntary but truly free—Mill’s “necessary instrumentality of that free market.” This basic idea reappears in any number of twentieth-century acts of labor legislation and jurisprudence, perhaps most notably in the 1935 law granting American workers the right to strike.55

#### [2] Coercion – coercion in the workplace treats agents as a means to an ends by overriding suitable working conditions.

Chima, 1(Sylvester C Chima, 1Programme of Bio & Research Ethics and Medical Law, Nelson R Mandela School of Medicine & School of Nursing and Public Health, College of Health Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa, 12-19-2013, accessed on 10-4-2021, PubMed Central (PMC), "Global medicine: Is it ethical or morally justifiable for doctors and other healthcare workers to go on strike?", https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B64)

One can also argue that denial of such striking rights may also be considered unfair discrimination and therefore morally unjustifiable.Some philosophers have described moral obligations or duties, which ought to guide ethical behavior, such as the duty of fidelity or the obligation to keep promises, and beneficence - the obligation to do 'good' [[10](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B10)]. However, it has been suggested that some other equally compelling moral duties or ethical obligations may conflict with the above duties, such as the right to justice. Justice is the right to fair treatment in light of what is owed a person [[63](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B63)]. For example, it may be argued that *everybody is equally entitled to a just wage for just work*. The philosopher Immanuel Kant based his moral theory on a categorical imperative which encourages moral agents to act, based on a principle, which they would deem to become a universal law [[64](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B64)]. One can argue that the decision by any HCW to go on strike may not be universalisable. However, looking at this decision from the principle of respect for autonomy, or freedom of choice, **one can conclude that individual autonomy is a sentiment which is desirable for all human beings. Accordingly, every worker should be free to choose whether to work or not, based on a whether any specific set of conditions of their own choosing have been met. Kant argues further that moral agents or individuals should be treated, "whether in your own person or in that of any other, never solely as a means, but always as an end"** [[64](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B64)]. This idea that individuals should be treated as ends in themselves has influenced political philosophy for centuries, and stresses the libertarian ideology that **people should not have their individual freedoms curtailed either for others or for the good of society in general** [[10](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B10),[64](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B64)]. From this axiomatic considerations, **one can conclude that it would be unethical for people to be used as slaves or be forced to work for inadequate wages or under slave-like conditions** [[4](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B4),[10](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B10),[12](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B12),[51](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B51)]. The issue of HCW strikes can also be analyzed from utilitarian principles as formulated by one of its major disciples JS Mills as follows [[65](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B65)]: *The creed which accepts as the foundation of morals, utility, or the greatest happiness principle, holds that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness*. One can argue based on utilitarian principles that the short term suffering induced by doctor and HCW strikes can be mitigated by the long-term benefits such as improvement of healthcare services for the greatest number of people over time [[2](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B2)]. Even if the immediate gains are improved wages and conditions of employment for HCWs alone, in the long-term these will translate into better healthcare service delivery to the local community and society-at-large. Similarly a rights based approach to the issue of strikes, would suggest that even though the goal of bringing about the better healthcare for individual patients or the public at large is a major ethical duty. There is an equally compelling moral duty to protect and enhance individual rights. Protection of individual rights in employment helps to ensure that no group of citizens, are unfairly discriminated against in the quest for equal rights for all in a democratic society.

#### Strikes allow workers to protest against unfair working conditions.

Chima, 2(Sylvester C Chima, 1Programme of Bio & Research Ethics and Medical Law, Nelson R Mandela School of Medicine & School of Nursing and Public Health, College of Health Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa, 12-19-2013, accessed on 10-4-2021, PubMed Central (PMC), "Global medicine: Is it ethical or morally justifiable for doctors and other healthcare workers to go on strike?", <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B64>)

It has been suggested that doctor and HCW strikes can create a tension between the obligation on doctors and other HCWs to provide adequate care to current patients versus the need to advocate for improved healthcare services for future patients and for society in general [[2](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B2),[31](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B31)]. There is also a potential conflict between doctors' role in advocating for improved healthcare service for others versus the need to advocate for justifiable wages for self and the fulfilment of basic biological needs like all humans [[4](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B4),[32](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B32)]. **It has been suggested that since strikes are considered a fundamental right or entitlement during collective bargaining and labour negotiations [**[**33**](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B33)**]. Therefore to deny any employee the right to strike would be an argument for enslavement of such an employee, because this would simply mean that whatever the circumstances-such an individual must work!** A situation deemed to be both ethically and morally indefensible [[4](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B4)]. It is pertinent to observe that there is an on-going paradigm shift in the organization of healthcare services and doctors' employment options with a change in the role of doctors from self-employment, and medical practice based on benevolent paternalism, to consumer rights and managed healthcare [[2](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B2)]. Historically, doctors had the sole responsibility within the doctor-patient relationship, to determine the costs of medical care to their patients, however, current trends show that doctors are increasingly becoming employees of managed healthcare organizations (HCOs) or employees of public health services [[2](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B2),[34](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B34)-[36](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3878318/#B36)].

#### [3] Bargaining Rights – because employees are dependent upon their employer, employees are subject to a severe power imbalance that constitutes coercion.

Bowie 98: [Norman E., professor emeritus at the University of Minnesota "A Kantian Theory of Meaningful Work."  Springer, 01 July 1998.] LADI rct st

**The overwhelming number of people need to work to survive,** at least for a large portion of their lives. **There is a sense in which people are forced to work. When an assailant says, “Your wallet or your life,” you technically have a choice.** However, for many **this situation is the paradigm of coercion.** How close is the analogy between the assailant and **the requirements of the employer?** Admittedly, in good times the balance of power shifts somewhat, but in hard times **the balance of power is with the employer.** Most people have to take the terms of employment a they get them (Manning 2003). Someone wanting employment does not negotiate about whether or not to be tested for drugs, for example. If drug testing is the company policy, you either submit to the test or forfeit the job. **If you want a job, you agree to employment at will and to layoffs if management believes that they are necessary. Survival** for yourself and any dependents **requires it. As with the assailant, you technically have a choice, but** most **employees** argue they **have little choice about multiple important terms of employment. A Kantian,** in common with the pluralist school of industrial relations, **maintains that the imbalance between employer and employee ought to be addressed. Otherwise, industrial relations rests on an unethical foundation.**

#### The right to strike via unions corrects this power imbalance by ensuring an opportunity for organization and collective bargaining.

Bowie 99**:** [Norman E., professor emeritus at the University of Minnesota “Business Ethics: A Kantian Perspective” Wiley Blackwell.<http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-063121173X.html>] LADI rct st

Although I emphasize meaningful work as a means to gain respect and grow as a human being by exercising one’s talents, Ciulla reminds me that there is much in the work environment that undermines negative freedom (freedom from coercion), and that the decision to work itself requires a giving up of freedom in some respects. This latter point does not overly concern me because all choice forecloses other choices. Moreover, **having a job provides income, and income expands choices because it opens up possibilities. This is especially true when one has an adequate wage**, and that is why I have emphasized the role that **an adequate wage plays in meaningful work.** Of course, Ciulla is well aware of all this and in her analysis she points out that **for the unskilled their range of options is extremely limited, that the demise of unions has given much more power to manage- ment**, and that **there is a correlation between higher-paying jobs and the amount of freedom one has.** All these points are well taken. I especially agree with Ciulla that **unions provide a means for enhancing employee freedom.** In this case I practiced what I now preach. I am a former president of the AAUP union at the University of Delaware. I also point out that the United States is the most anti-union country in the G-20. **Unionization is considered a human right by the United Nations.** Obviously **unions provide an opportunity for participation,** and I think Ciulla and I agree that **participation schemes are one way to limit coercion.** In response to trends over the past twenty years, in this edition of Business Ethics: A Kantian Perspective I pay more attention to adequate pay for the middle class, issues of inequality, and economic mobility. However, none of this requires a revision in my original account of meaningful work.

## Underview

#### 1] 1ar theory

#### a) aff gets it – or else the neg can be infinitely abuse

#### b) it’s drop the debater, competing interps, and no rvis – the aff has a time crunched 4 minute speech, which means I will always be behind

#### 2] The role of the ballot is to the vote for the debater who best proves the truth or falsity of the resolution.

#### a] affirm and negate are defined as to prove true and to deny the truth of by multiple dictionaries. It’s a jurisdictional feature of the ballot because the ballot says “affirmative” or “negative” meaning truth testing is a rule of debate. Outweighs fairness and education because constitutive features of debate must be followed.

#### b] inclusion - other ROBs open the door for personal lives of debaters to factor into decisions and compare who is more oppressed which causes violence in a space where some people go to escape.

## more contention!

#### Farmworkers have been historically prevented from unionizing – recent developments are short in scope but lack further protections key for unions

**Wozniacka, 19**, 5/7/2019, “Less than 1 Percent of US Farmworkers Belong to a Union. Here’s Why.”, CivilEats, Gosia Wozniacka is a senior reporter at Civil Eats. A multilingual journalist with more than fifteen years of experience, Gosia is currently based in Oregon. Wozniacka worked for five years as a staff reporter for The Associated Press in Fresno, California, and then in Portland, Oregon. She wrote extensively about agriculture, water, and other environmental issues, farmworkers and immigration policy, URL: https://civileats.com/2019/05/07/less-than-1-percent-of-us-farmworkers-belong-to-a-union-heres-why/ , KR

Historically Excluded and Unprotected

**Federal and state laws have long excluded farmworker from labor protections.** The National Labor Relations Act of 1935, which forbids employers from firing a worker for joining, organizing, or supporting a labor union, specifically excluded farmworkers and domestic workers. Many of those workers were, at the time, African American.

Farmworkers were also excluded from The Fair Labor Standards Act, enacted in 1938, which guarantees other workers a minimum wage, overtime pay, and other protections. In 1966, the act was amended to partially include agricultural workers in the minimum wage provisions. But 60 years later, farmworkers are still not eligible for overtime pay. The law also offers fewer protections to child agricultural workers than to children in other industries. And those who work on smaller farms are not eligible for the federal minimum wage, which currently stands at $7.25 per hour.

Some do earn a lot more than that per hour. Workers who are paid piece rate—based on how many buckets or bags they pick—can, if they are fast pickers, earn much more than the minimum wage. And some workers get paid an hourly rate that’s higher than the minimum wage. But since farm jobs are seasonal and most farmworkers don’t work year-round, their annual earnings are meager.

In addition, **most farmworkers lack other basic labor protections such as workers’ compensation**, health insurance, and disability insurance. Some states like New York, following the federal government’s lead, have exclude farmworkers from its labor laws. **Only a handful of states have enacted legislation that protects the organizing and collective bargaining efforts** of agricultural workers. A few states, such as California, have also extended overtime pay and other protections to them.

The bottom line: **although federal and state laws don’t explicitly forbid farmworkers from unionizing, they withhold labor protections that make unionizing easier**. In a state where bargaining isn’t specifically protected, **farmworkers may decide to form a union, but an employer does not have to negotiate with them and can retaliate against the workers.**

Because of all this, **convincing farmworkers to unionize has never been more difficult.** “This isn’t steady year-round employment where workers can get together and have a consistent campaign. When farmworkers organize, **it’s often on an isolated farm**. And due to a lack of documentation, **employers have huge leeway to exploit workers and create an atmosphere of fear**,” said Justin Flores, vice president of the Farm Labor Organizing Committee in North Carolina. “Because of all that, traditional labor has deemed agricultural workers un-organizable and has not dedicated campaigns to them. So only a few crazy people historically have been dedicated enough to run a farmworker union,” added Flores.

#### Unions are key for sustainable agriculture – only collective bargaining rights and unionization checks – international union of agriculture proves

**Hurst et. al, 07**, “Agricultural Workers and Their Contribution to Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development”, ILO, Peter Hurst is the IUF's Occupational Health and Safety Specialist, Paola Termine is the FAO's Rural Institutions and Rural Workers Officer, Marilee Karl is a consultant with the FAO's Rural Institutions and Participation Service.URL: <https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_dialogue/---actrav/documents/publication/wcms_113732.pdf>, KR

To address the problem of unilateral codes, **the IUF**, working with affiliates and several NGOs in a body called the International Flower Co-ordination **drew up a** model International **Code of Conduct** for the Production of Cut Flowers.120 This Code is **based firmly on International Labour Organization standards**. Importers, especially in Germany and the foundation that sets the environmental standards for the Netherlands-based flower auction, were targeted to convince them to accept the International Code of Conduct. Workshops were held for East African trade **unions** on the International Code of Conduct and **how to use it to organize workers and to improve their working condition**s. A Training Manual for shop stewards on how to use the Code has been developed.121

Further **negotiations with the flower producers** have led to the introduction of a Fair Trade in Flowers and Plants scheme coordinated by an industry body, Union Fleurs.

The work around promotion of the International Code of Conduct for the Production of Cut Flowers has highlighted the many problems that IUF affiliates have with codes of conduct, even those drawn up multilaterally and based on ILO standards. The evidence so far is that it is very hard for trade unions in producer countries to use codes of conduct to improve working conditions. To date, there are no examples of a code, even with freedom of association as its cornerstone, leading to the formation of a new union. Some unions have been able to use the code to establish new branches but this is still fairly exceptional and there are some examples of improvements in living and working conditions, especially when a union has been able to append the code to its collective bargaining agreement. The ETI aims to enhance the private sector's contribution to sustainable develop- ment by encouraging business practices that embrace social, environmental and financial responsibility. Ethical supply chain management is a critical aspect of responsible business in developing countries.123 The IUF is participating in the ETI at board level and has also been involved in pilots in the agricultural sector, e.g. horticultural products and bananas. Fair-trade “Fair-trade is a trading partnership, based on dialogue, transparency and respect, which seeks greater equity in international trade. It contributes to sustainable development by offering better trading conditions, such as securing the rights of, marginalised producers and workers - especially in the South”. “Fair-trade” is there- fore a recognized term for agreements between producers in developing countries and commercial buyers who wish to purchase and market products based on stable and "just" or "fair" prices and production criteria which respect labour and envi- ronmental standards.124 Fair trade aims to increase producers' access to markets, improve their incomes, and ensure that their production is based on sustainable development principles.

The Fair-trade Labelling Organizations International (FLO), for example, sets com- mon criteria for fair trade tea, coffee, cocoa, honey, orange juice and bananas. FLO works mainly to label goods from small farmers, but in the tea and banana sectors there are also plantations, and the IUF's concern has been to understand fair trade's impact on employed workers and how fair trade can help them both in organizing trade unions and in improving living conditions, without undermining collective bargaining. Workers promote Integrated Production and Pest Management Integrated Production and Pest Management (IPPM) is a way of growing crops that maximizes control of pests by their natural enemies - pests, parasites and pathogens (diseases), integrated with other crop husbandry measures. This management tech- nique aims to keep pest populations below economically damaging levels and to restrict pesticide use to amounts that are economically justified and reduce risks to human health and the environment. The four key principles of IPPM125 are: Grow a healthy crop, and conserve a healthy soil; Conserve natural enemies - pests, parasites and pathogens; Observe the crop on a regular basis; Farmers and agricultural workers are the experts in pest control. Agricultural **workers often say**, "We know that chemical pesticides are bad for our health and that of our families and communities. So **what are the alternatives**? How do we stop using these poisons?”

One answer is to **ensure workers are trained to understand** and use IPPM **tech- niques**. Normally, it is only farmers who receive IPPM training, especially through Agricultural Workers and Their Contribution to Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development 65 an educational method called "Farmer Field Schools" (FFS). The FAO has been promoting the use of such techniques through farmer field schools in its country programmes throughout the world. The FAO's integrated pest management pro- gramme (IPM) has been particularly successful in Asia and in 1993, the FAO inter- country programme on IPM rice in Asia organized a global IPM meeting to intro- duce its successful IPM approach to interested policy makers from other regions. Consequently, the FAO, World Bank, United Nations Development Programme and United Nations Environmental Programme established the Global Integrated Pest Management Facility in 1995. This joint programme is housed in the FAO and is the main international agency promoting IPPM worldwide

**The IUF is now working with the Global IPM Facility to train agricultural workers in IPPM techniques**, using the FFS method.

Field Schools mean that **workers, like farmers, go into a field to study how a crop grows, to learn to identify harmful insects, diseases and weeds, and to learn to identify how to protect and encourage beneficial insects.** The workers then draw up their own agro-ecology plan for that particular crop and field, setting out how to grow a healthy crop and how to protect it from pest and disease attack and weed competition by non-chemical means.

Equipped with this new knowledge, **workers can then negotiate clauses requiring use of IPPM programmes in collective bargaining agreements with employers. The aim is to give agricultural workers knowledge and skills on IPPM so that when instructed by an employer or manager to use a toxic pesticide, they can point out that IPPM techniques provide a safer way of controlling the weed, insects or dis- eases.** Safer for themselves and the supervisors, the managers, the community and the environment and for the crop (which may then be sold at a premium price).

Pilot IPPM courses - **the first ever of their kind for waged agricultural workers - were held in 2001 for agricultural trade unions in Tanzania** (TPAWU) and **Uganda** (NUPAW and NUCMAW). **The unions concerned also invited some NGOs and organic farmers' organizations to join the courses**. Training was given by profes- sional IPPM trainers provided by the Facility. The pilot training is ongoing, with a view to expanding it to other unions and countries.

2.4 Workers promote improved health,

safety and environmental standards for pesticides

To improve workplace occupational health, safety and environmental standards, especially targeting fatalities, poisoning, ill-health and pollution resulting from intensive pesticide use, **the IUF started a Global Health, Safety and Environment Project in 1998**. The Project aims to build the capacities of affiliated national unions and the IUF's regional and international networks to tackle occupational hazards within the context **of promoting integrated production and pest manage- ment and sustainable agriculture**. Health, Safety and Environment, A Series of Trade Union Education Manuals for Agricultural Workers have been developed by the IUF and ILO, which are also designed for use by small farmers and non- governmental organizations.126

#### Sustainable agriculture, emphasized by farmers and unions, is key for biodiversity

**FP, 20**, “Biodiversity and Agriculture: Industrial agriculture places consistency and productivity over biodiversity, but preserving the immense variety of life on earth is vital to the health of our planet and helps us safeguard our own food supply.”, Food Print: a non-profit organization dedicated to research and education on food production practices., URL: <https://foodprint.org/issues/biodiversity-and-agriculture/>, 20+ since some citations are from 2020, KR

Given that agriculture’s expanding footprint is responsible for so much habitat loss, **preventing wild lands from being converted into farmland is critical to maintaining biodiversity. By embracing both traditional knowledge and new research, farmers and scientists are producing food in a way that harnesses biodiversity to make the most of what nature provides. This approach is called agroecology, and is a core component of regenerative agriculture**, which builds up natural resources like healthy soil and water rather than using them up.38

While embracing agroecology is **a revolutionary shift away from industrial farming,** it’s nothing new: these practices are often adapted from the practices of indigenous peoples worldwide, who have created complex agroecological systems that exist in balance with nature. Preserving and reviving these indigenous traditions can make agriculture around the world more sustainable and help preserve biodiversity.39 The fact that 80 percent of the world’s biodiversity is preserved on lands that are managed by indigenous people is a testament to agroecology’s potential.40

Agroecology: Harnessing the Benefits of Biodiversity

A critical part of regenerative agriculture **is building a productive agroecosystem that isn’t reliant on chemicals. Harnessing biodiversity is key to this, and breaking up big, monocultured fields with just a few more species can bring great benefits to both crops and wildlife. Creating productive agroecosystems means** — following the example of indigenous peoples’ longstanding traditions — selecting plants that will benefit each other rather than relying on chemical inputs. For example, legumes like beans and lentils add vital nitrogen into the soil, which other plants need to grow. This has benefits that stretch beyond the farm: incorporating legumes into diverse fields not only provides crops with natural fertilizer, it avoids all of the greenhouse gas emissions associated with using synthetic fertilizers, and helps curb global warming.41 Other plants can provide valuable shade or support — like the classic “three sisters” system of Native American agriculture. Mixing plants together like this is called intercropping, and this can help lower the environmental footprint of a farm. Even without chemical inputs, farmers can see enormous benefits when they grow crops in intercropped systems: experiments with corn, beans, wheat, bananas and other crops have all shown that such systems can be more productive than their industrial counterparts while enhancing biodiversity on the farm and making a varied, rich habitat for wildlife.42

#### Biod loss causes extinction – outweighs neg disads and is a threat multiplier

**Torres 16** [Phil Biologist, conservationist, science advocate & educator. 2 years based in Amazon rainforest, now exploring science around the world. “[Biodiversity Loss: An Existential Risk Comparable to Climate Change](http://futureoflife.org/2016/05/20/biodiversity-loss/)” <http://futureoflife.org/2016/05/20/biodiversity-loss/>.]

According to the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, the two greatest existential threats to human civilization stem from climate change and nuclear weapons. Both pose clear and present dangers to the perpetuation of our species, and the increasingly dire climate situation and nuclear arsenal modernizations in the United States and Russia were the most significant reasons why the Bulletin [decided](http://thebulletin.org/press-release/doomsday-clock-hands-remain-unchanged-despite-iran-deal-and-paris-talks9122) to keep the Doomsday Clock set at three minutes before midnight earlier this year.

But there is another existential threat that the Bulletin overlooked in its Doomsday Clock announcement: biodiversity loss. This phenomenon is often identified as one of the many consequences of climate change, and this is of course correct. But **biodiversity loss is also a contributing factor behind climate change**. For example, deforestation in the Amazon rainforest and elsewhere reduces the amount of carbon dioxide removed from the atmosphere by plants, a natural process that mitigates the effects of climate change. So **the causal relation between climate change and biodiversity loss is bidirectional.**

Furthermore, there are myriad phenomena that are driving biodiversity loss in addition to climate change. Other causes include ecosystem fragmentation, invasive species, pollution, oxygen depletion caused by fertilizers running off into ponds and streams, overfishing, human overpopulation, and overconsumption. All of these phenomena have a direct impact on the health of the biosphere, and all would conceivably persist even if the problem of climate change were somehow immediately solved.

Such considerations warrant decoupling biodiversity loss from climate change, because the former has been consistently subsumed by the latter as a mere effect. Biodiversity loss is a distinct environmental crisis with its own unique syndrome of causes, consequences, and solutions—such as restoring habitats, creating protected areas (“biodiversity parks”), and practicing sustainable agriculture.

Deforestation of the Amazon rainforest decreases natural mitigation of CO2 and destroys the habitats of many endangered species.

The sixth extinction.

The repercussions of biodiversity loss are potentially as severe as those anticipated from climate change, or even a nuclear conflict. For example, according to a 2015 [study](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26601195) published in Science Advances, **the best available evidence reveals “an exceptionally rapid loss of biodiversity over the last few centuries, indicating that a sixth mass extinction is already under way.”** This conclusion holds, even on the most optimistic assumptions about the background rate of species losses and the current rate of vertebrate extinctions. The group classified as “vertebrates” includes mammals, birds, reptiles, fish, and all other creatures with a backbone.

The article argues that, using its conservative figures, the average loss of vertebrate species was 100 times higher in the past century relative to the background rate of extinction. (Other scientists have suggested that the current extinction rate could be as much as 10,000 times higher than normal.) As the authors write, “The evidence is incontrovertible that recent extinction rates are unprecedented in human history and highly unusual in Earth’s history.” Perhaps the term “Big Six” should enter the popular lexicon—to add the current extinction to the previous “Big Five,” the last of which wiped out the dinosaurs 66 million years ago.

But the concept of biodiversity encompasses more than just the total number of species on the planet. It also refers to the size of different populations of species. With respect to this phenomenon, multiple studies have confirmed that wild populations around the world are dwindling and disappearing at an alarming rate. For example, the 2010 [Global Biodiversity Outlook](https://www.cbd.int/gbo3) report found that the population of wild vertebrates living in the tropics dropped by 59 percent between 1970 and 2006.

The report also found that the population of farmland birds in Europe has dropped by 50 percent since 1980; bird populations in the grasslands of North America declined by almost 40 percent between 1968 and 2003; and the population of birds in North American arid lands has fallen by almost 30 percent since the 1960s. Similarly, 42 percent of all amphibian species (a type of vertebrate that is sometimes called an “ecological indicator”) are undergoing population declines, and 23 percent of all plant species “are estimated to be threatened with extinction.” [Other studies](http://commondreams.org/views/2016/02/10/biodiversity-loss-and-doomsday-clock-invisible-disaster-almost-no-one-talking-about) have found that some 20 percent of all reptile species, 48 percent of the world’s primates, and 50 percent of freshwater turtles are threatened. Underwater, about 10 percent of all coral reefs are now dead, and another 60 percent are in danger of dying.

Consistent with these data, the 2014 [Living Planet Report](http://bit.ly/1ssxx5m) shows that the global population of wild vertebrates dropped by 52 percent in only four decades—from 1970 to 2010. While biologists often avoid projecting historical trends into the future because of the complexity of ecological systems, it’s tempting to extrapolate this figure to, say, the year 2050, which is four decades from 2010. As it happens, a 2006[study](http://science.sciencemag.org/content/314/5800/787) published in Science does precisely this: It projects past trends of marine biodiversity loss into the 21st century, concluding that, unless significant changes are made to patterns of human activity, there will be virtually no more wild-caught seafood by 2048.

48% of the world’s primates are threatened with extinction.

Catastrophic consequences for civilization.

**The consequences of this rapid pruning of the evolutionary tree of life extend beyond the obvious. There could be surprising effects of biodiversity loss that scientists are unable to fully anticipate in advance. For example, prior research has shown that localized ecosystems can undergo abrupt and irreversible shifts when they reach a tipping point.** According to a 2012 [paper](http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html) published in Nature, there are reasons for thinking that we may be approaching a tipping point of this sort in the global ecosystem, beyond which the consequences could be catastrophic for civilization.

As the authors write, **a planetary-scale transition could precipitate** “substantial losses of ecosystem services required to sustain the human population.” An ecosystem service is any ecological process that benefits humanity, such as food production and crop pollination**. If the global ecosystem were to cross a tipping point and substantial ecosystem services were lost, the results could be “widespread social unrest, economic instability, and loss of human life.” According to Missouri Botanical Garden ecologist Adam Smith, one of the paper’s co-authors, this could occur in a matter of decades—far more quickly than most of the expected consequences of climate change, yet equally destructive.**

**Biodiversity loss is a “threat multiplier” that, by pushing societies to the brink of collapse, will exacerbate existing conflicts and introduce entirely new struggles between state and non-state actors.** Indeed, it could even fuel the rise of terrorism. (After all, climate change has been [linked](http://thebulletin.org/climate-change-and-syrian-uprising) to the emergence of ISIS in Syria, and multiple high-ranking US officials, such as former US Defense Secretary [Chuck Hagel](http://www.defense.gov/News-Article-View/Article/603441)and CIA director [John Brennan](http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/cnsnewscom-staff/cia-director-cites-impact-climate-change-deeper-cause-global), have affirmed that climate change and terrorism are connected.)

The reality is that we are entering the sixth mass extinction in the 3.8-billion-year history of life on Earth, and the impact of this event could be felt by civilization “in as little as three human lifetimes,” as the aforementioned 2012 Nature paper notes. Furthermore, the widespread decline of biological populations could plausibly initiate a dramatic transformation of the global ecosystem on an even faster timescale: perhaps a single human lifetime.

The unavoidable conclusion is that **biodiversity loss constitutes an existential threat** in its own right. As such, it ought to be considered alongside climate change and nuclear weapons as one of the most significant contemporary risks to human prosperity and survival.