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## 1

#### A just government ought to

* Allocate necessary funding to develop high nutrient and water-use efficiency crops without yield penalty, including but not limited to mandating an increase in wages for agricultural laborers per the recommendations of the 1ac Reily evidence
* Increase research and funding for research related to energy production, pollution, remediation, and oceanic biodiversity
* Not convert/destroy tropical forests and wild lands into farm lands beyond a biodiversity threshold per the recommendations of the 1ac Tian and FP evidence
* Train agricultural laborers with IPPM techniques (using the FFS method) and require abiding by IPPM in all agricultural production

#### That solves without strikes – it increases yield which is their internal link to bioD

**1ac Tian et al 21**-- Tian, Zhixi [principal investigator, Institute of Genetics and Developmental Biology and former research geneticist at Purdue], et al. "Designing future crops: challenges and strategies for sustainable agriculture." The Plant Journal 105.5 (2021): 1165-1178. (AG DebateDrills)

**Increasing agricultural resource use efficiency. It was reported that ~17% of arable land has lost productivity since 1945 due to inappropriate agriculture management** (Oldeman, 1994). In fact, nutrient-use efficiencies of today’s crops only reach 30–50% for nitrogen fertilizer (Cassman et al., 2002) and ~45% for phosphorus fertilizer (Smil, 2000). Moreover, fresh water has become a limiting factor for agriculture in many areas in the world. It is estimated that about 2800 km3 of fresh water per year is used for agricultural irrigation, and that crop production decreases by ~20% without irrigation (Siebert and Doll, 2010). **Therefore, to reduce agricultural inputs and environmental burdens, we should aim to develop high nutrient and water-use efficiency crops without yield penalty.**

#### 2nd plank Doubles the current global yield

NAS 8 National Academy of Sciences 12-3-2008 “The Role of the Life Sciences in Transforming America's Future Summary of a Workshop” //Re-cut by Elmer

Fostering Industries to Counter Global Problems The life sciences have applications in areas that range far beyond human health. Life-science based approaches could **contribute to advances in** many industries, from energy production and pollution remediation, to clean manufacturing and the production of new biologically inspired materials. In fact, biological systems could provide the basis for new products, services and industries that we cannot yet imagine. Microbes are already producing biofuels and could, through further research, provide a major component of future energy supplies. Marine and terrestrial organisms extract carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, which suggests that biological systems could be used to help manage climate change. Study of the complex systems encountered in biology is decade, it is really just the beginning.” Advances in the underlying science of plant and animal breeding have been just as dramatic as the advances in genetic can put down a band of fertilizer, come back six months later, and plant seeds exactly on that row, reducing the need for fertilizer, pesticides, and other agricultural inputs. Fraley said that the global agricultural system needs to adopt the goal of doubling the current yield of **crops while reducing key inputs like pesticides, fertilizers, and water** by one third. “It is more important than putting a man on the moon,” he said. Doubling agricultural yields would “change the world.” Another billion people will join the middle class over the next decade just in India and China as economies continue to grow. And all people need and deserve secure access to food supplies. Continued progress will require both basic and applied research, The evolution of life “put earth under new management,” Collins said. Understanding the future state of the planet will require understanding the biological systems that have shaped the planet. Many of these biological systems are found in the oceans, which cover 70 percent of the earth’s surface and have a crucial impact on weather, climate, and the composition of the atmosphere. In the past decade, new tools have become available to explore the microbial processes that drive the **chemistry of the oceans**, observed David Kingsbury, Chief Program Officer for Science at the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation. These technologies have revealed that a large proportion of the planet’s genetic diversity resides in the oceans. In addition, many organisms in the oceans readily exchange genes, creating evolutionary forces that can have global effects. The oceans are currently under great stress, Kingsbury pointed out. Nutrient runoff from agriculture is helping to create huge and expanding “dead zones” where oxygen levels are too low to sustain life. Toxic algal blooms are occurring with higher frequency in areas where they have not been seen in the past. Exploitation of ocean resources is disrupting ecological balances that have formed over many millions of years. Human-induced changes in the chemistry of the atmosphere are changing the chemistry of the oceans, with potentially catastrophic consequences. “If we are not careful, we are not going to have a sustainable planet to live on,” said Kingsbury. Only by understanding the basic biological processes at work in the oceans can humans live sustainably on earth.

#### preventing forest clearing also solves their only internal link to biodiversity loss

**1ac Tian et al 21**-- Tian, Zhixi [principal investigator, Institute of Genetics and Developmental Biology and former research geneticist at Purdue], et al. "Designing future crops: challenges and strategies for sustainable agriculture." The Plant Journal 105.5 (2021): 1165-1178. (AG DebateDrills)

**Clearing of forests will result in prohibitive ecological costs, such as loss of biodiversity and greenhouse gas emissions. It was reported that, due to agriculture expansion, ~30% of all plant species will become extinct** (Taiz, 2013). The destruction of tropical forests releases about 1.1 9 1012 tons of carbon per year, which accounts for 12% of total anthropogenic CO2 emissions (Friedlingstein et al., 2010).

#### Their adv 2 internal link says ag workers can use collective bargaining to enforce IPPM – but strikes aren’t key – the CP’s IPPM mandate would solve

**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

**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.**

#### 1AC FP ev says preventing wild land conversion maintains 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.**

## 2

#### **Their legalistic discourse—valorizing legal rights and procedures, derived from technical rationality and utilitarian efficiency—creates an idealized fantasy of order and consensus. It legitimizes domination, ignores hierarchies of workplace domination and subordination, and represses alternative visions of social life, both as it is and might be.**

Gordon 87 - Robert W. Gordon, Professor of Law at Stanford University, 1987 [“Unfreezing Legal Reality: Critical Approaches To Law,” Florida State University Law Review (15 Fla. St. U.L. Rev. 195), Summer, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Lexis-Nexis] LADI//KK

Now a central tenet of CLS work has been that the ordinary discourses of law—debates over legislation, legal arguments, administrative and court decisions, lawyers' discussions with clients, legal commentary and scholarship, etc.—all contribute to cementing this feeling, at once despairing and complacent, that things must be the way they are and that major changes could only make them worse. Legal discourse accomplishes this in many ways. First by endlessly repeating the claim that law and the other policy sciences have perfected a set of rational techniques and institutions that have come about as close as we are ever likely to get to solving the problem of domination in civil society. Put another way, legal dis-course paints an idealized fantasy of order according to which legal rules and procedures have so structured relations among people that such relations may primarily be understood as instituted by their consent, their free and rational choices. Such coercion as ap-parently remains may be explained as the result of neces-sity—either natural necessities (such as scarcity or the limited human capacity for altruism) or social necessities. For example, in a number of the prevailing discourses, the ordinary hierarchies of workplace domination and subordination are explained: (1) by ref-erence to the contractual agreement of the parties and to their rel-ative preferences for responsibility versus leisure, or risk taking versus security; (2) by the natural distribution of differential tal-ents and skills (Larry Bird earns more as a basketball player be-cause he is better); and (3) by the demands of efficiency in produc-tion, which are said to require extensive hierarchy for the purposes of supervision and monitoring, centralization of investment deci-sions, and so forth. There are always some residues of clearly un-happy conditions—undeserved deprivation, exploitation, suffer-ing—that cannot be explained in any of these ways. The discourses of law are perhaps most resourceful in dealing with these residues, treating them as, on the whole, readily reformable within the pre-vailing political options for adjusting the structures of ordinary practices—one need merely fine tune the scheme of regulation, or deregulation, to correct them. But the prevailing discourse has its cynical and worldly side, and its tragic moments, to offset the gen-eral mood of complacency. In this mood it resignedly acknowledges that beyond the necessary minimum and the reformable residues of coercion and misery there is an irreducible, intractable remain-der—due to inherent limits on our capacity for achieving social knowledge, or for changing society through deliberate intervention, or for taking collective action against evil without suffering the greater evil of despotic power.

These discourses of legal and technical rationality, of rights, con-sent, necessity, efficiency, and tragic limitation, are of course dis-courses of power—not only for the obvious reasons that law's com-mands are backed by force and its operations can inflict enormous pain, but because to have access to these discourses, to be able to use them or pay others to use them on your behalf, is a large part of what it means to possess power. Further, they are discourses that—although often partially constructed, or extracted as conces-sions, through the pressure of relatively less powerful groups strug-gling from below—in habitual practice tend to express the inter-ests and the perspectives of the powerful people who use them. The discourses have some of the power they do because some of their claims sound very plausible, though many do not. The claim, for example, that workers in health-destroying factories voluntarily "choose," in any practical sense of the term, the risks of the work-place in return for a wage premium, is probably not believed by anyone save those few expensively trained out of the capacity to recognize what is going on around them. In addition, both the plausible and implausible claims are backed up in the cases of law and of economics and the policy sciences by a quite formidable-seeming technocratic apparatus of rational justifica-tion—suggesting that the miscellany of social practices we happen to have been born into in this historical moment is much more than a contingent miscellany. It has an order, even if sometimes an invisible one; it makes sense. The array of legal norms, institu-tions, procedures, and doctrines in force, can be rationally derived from the principles of regard for individual autonomy, utilitarian efficiency or wealth creation, the functional needs of social order or economic prosperity, or the moral consensus and historical tradi-tions of the community. There are several general points CLS people have wanted to as-sert against these discourses of power. First, the discourses have helped to structure our ordinary perceptions of reality so as to sys-tematically exclude or repress alternative visions of social life, both as it is and as it might be. One of the aims of CLS methods is to try to dredge up and give content to these suppressed alternative visions. Second, the discourses fail even on their own terms to sus-tain the case for their relentlessly apologetic conclusions. Carefully understood, they could all just as well be invoked to support a politics of social transformation instead.' Generally speaking, the CLS claims under this heading are that the rationalizing criteria appealed to (of autonomy, functional utility, efficiency, history, etc.) are far too indeterminate to justify any conclusions about the inevitability or desirability of particular current practices; such claims, when unpacked, again and again turn out to rest on some illegitimate rhetorical move or dubious intermediate premise or empirical assumption. Further, the categories, abstractions, con-ventional rhetorics, reasoning modes and empirical statements of our ordinary discourses in any case so often misdescribe social ex-perience as not to present any defensible pictures of the practices that they attempt to justify. Not to say of course that there could be such a thing as a single correct way of truthfully rendering so-cial life as people live it, or that CLS writers could claim to have discovered it. But the commonplace legal discourses often produce such seriously distorted representations of social life that their cat-egories regularly filter out complexity, variety, irrationality, unpre-dictability, disorder, cruelty, coercion, violence, suffering, solidarity and self-sacrifice.

#### The aff’s portrayal of civil rights as the light at the end of the tunnel for progressive movements obscures the reality of these movements simply being co-opted into legal frameworks that regress progress. \*reunderline

Horwitz et al 17 [Morton J. Horwitz is Charles Warren Professor at Harvard Law School, where he teaches Torts and American Legal History. Abram Chayes, William Fisher, Morton Horwitz, Frank Michelman, Martha Minow, Charles Nesson, Todd Rakoff Critical Perspectives on Rights. The Bridge. 7/2/17 <https://cyber.harvard.edu/bridge/CriticalTheory/rights.htm>] LADI 7/29/17

Losing a case based on a claim of rights may in some cases lead the public to think that the claims have no merit and need not be given weight in policy debates.

Robert Gordon similarly argues that even noted legal victories for blacks, for labor, for the poor, and for women did not succeed in fundamentally altering the social power structure. "The labor movement secured the vitally important legal right to organize and strike, at the cost of fitting into a framework of legal regulation that certified the legitimacy of managements making most of the important decisions about the conditions of work." Robert Gordon, "Some Critical Theories of law and Their Critics," in The Politics of Law 647 (David Kairys ed., third edition, Basic Books: New York, 1998). Moreover, rights are double-edged, as demonstrated in the content of civil rights. "Floor entitlements can be turned into ceilings (you’ve got your rights, but that’s all you’ll get). Formal rights without practical enforceable content are easily substituted for real benefits. Anyway, the powerful can always assert counter-rights (to vested property, to differential treatment according to "merit," to association with one’s own kind) to the rights of the disadvantaged. "Rights" conflict and the conflict cannot be resolved by appeal to rights." Id., at 657-68.

The content of contemporary American rights in particular must be understood as failing to advance progressive causes. Current constitutional doctrine, for example, heavily favors so-called negative liberties (entitlements to be free of government interference) over positive liberties (entitlements to government protection or aid) and thus reinforces the pernicious "public/private" distinction. That distinction implies that neither government nor society as a whole are responsible for providing persons with the resources they need to exercise their liberties, and indeed, any governmental action risks violating private liberties. Current freedom of speech doctrine accords protection to commercial speech and pornography, limits governmental regulation of private contributions to political campaigns, and forbids sanctions for hate speech. Such rules operate in the often-stirring language of individual freedom, but their effect is more likely to be regressive than progressive.

#### This legitimizes structures of injustice, racism, and dehumanization and turns case.

West 11 [West, Robin L, Georgetown University Law Center "Tragic Rights: The Rights Critique in the Age of Obama." Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 53 (2011): 713.]

Rights harm us, according to the Bill of Particulars put forward by the rights critics of the 1980s, in three distinct ways. First, even apparently liberating rights thatseemingly expand the sphere of individual liberty also subordinate,at least according to the first and perhaps the most important of the rights critics' charges. Rightsto privacy protect not only private decision making against the prying and moralistic eye of the state but also, even if inadvertently or indirectly, private subordination of vulnerable family members.' Rights to liberty of contract protect private choices of individuals but also the economic subordination of laborers by employers," and rights to speech protect ideas but also, arguably, pornography and private verbal, racial, or sexual harassment.' Whatever else rights do, Horwitz, Tushnet, MacKinnon, and other critics argued, rights that protect spheres of privacy, liberty, or autonomy against state intervention also, and by virtue of that protection, facilitate the subordination of the weak by the strong**,** within whatever spheres of insularity, entitlement, and nonintervention from the government the particular right in question creates. Thus, the first charge: rights subordinate. Second, by protecting against particularized but well-defined sorts of unfair relations in the private realm, even those rights that do operate to specify limits on a generalized liberty in the interest of equality—such as limits on our liberty to intentionally discrimi-nate—also run the risk of legitimizing the larger unjust social world within which those particularized moments of injustice are framed. The censure of the intentional discriminator, and our right to be free of him, for example, legitimates not only structural or unintentional racism but also an unjust classism. Our condemnation of the errors in an error-ridden meritocracy legitimates the unjust stinginess of the ways we construct merit and blame, and even a purified and idealized meritocracy legitimates our nonresponsiveness to human need.' Miranda rights, critics argued, and more largely procedural protections in the criminal justice system, legitimate not only on-going interrogation abuses that they only partially address but an overly punitive and blatantly racist system of excessive incarcera-tion as well." The targeting of gender-based "stereotypes" so as to free the nonconforming woman legitimate the belittling and cramped opportunities that attach to voluntarily assumed tradi-tional gender roles." Attempts to secure rights to a "minimum wage" render all the more difficult attempts to ensure a livable family wage—and so on.' Rights harm, then, not only because of the subordination they protect and valorize but also because they distract our critical gaze, thereby legitimating larger injustices. In brief, rights legitimate.' Lastly, critics argued, rights alienate, even those rights that seemingly empower the weakest of us in a hostile world. They alien-ate us from the dreaded other from whom they claim to protect us," from our communities,' and from a recognition of even the possibil-ity of unmediated human connection.' Rights do have a function: they facilitate essential trade between withdrawn selves, as elu-cidated by Peter Gabel's artful description of us as deeply and paranoically fearful of others, the state, and human community." But by so doing, rights intensify the very withdrawal from human life to which they then offer their poison pill as a necessary reme-diation. In short: rights alienate.

#### The alternative is a non-essential legal pluralism. Only a rejection of the aff’s fixed notions can liberate law from its self-referential ordering, allowing us to better analyze, describe, and utilize law’s sociology to line up with empirical realities.

Walby ‘7 (Kevin Walby, Associate Professor and Chancellor’s Research Chair in the Department of Criminal Justice at University of Winnipeg, “Contributions to a Post-Sovereigntist Understanding of Law: Foucault, Law as Governance, and Legal Pluralism,” SOIAL & LEGAL STUDIES SAGE Publications, Vol. 16(4), 551–571, 12/1/7, <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0964663907082735?legid=spsls%3B16%2F4%2F551&patientinform-links=yes>) LADI//DS

A number of conclusions useful for informing a post-sovereigntist understanding of law can be drawn from the foregoing analysis. Law must always be seen as a process, or else analyses of law become self-referential. Typologies should retain the speciﬁcity of legal and normative ordering yet acknowledge interpenetrating tendencies. The ﬁction of law as a uniﬁed phenomenon subsidiary to the liberal democratic state does not correspond with empirical reality. Knowledge in legal and normative ordering and the spilling of legal ordering into normative ordering must be a primary variable in future analyses. Social scientists ought to look for a plurality of legal and normative ordering strategies across social practices and not simply in, as Tamanaha (2000: 315) puts it, ‘self-regulated semi-autonomous social ﬁelds’. Focus on technologies and techniques of governance provides a methodological sensitizing device useful for social scientiﬁc inquiry. Finally, while continuing to recognize that actors are active participants in all forms of ordering, examining the ‘plurality of resistances’ that are the counter-stroke of plural legal and normative ordering strategies should take priority in our academic practice. If, as Tamanaha hints, NELP is the only viable version of legal pluralism, the foregoing analysis has implications for the future of legal pluralism as an approach capable of standing on its own. Twining (2003) and Cotterrell (1995) suggest we drop the language of legal pluralism. Little is gained, however, by announcing the death of legal pluralism, and the results of my critique are not that devastating. As I have argued, NELP offers some insight if placed within the broader set of questions Foucault raised about power and government. The typology of law resulting from the reading of the LAG approach with NELP does not lose sight of the speciﬁcity of legal and normative modes of social ordering while acknowledging their interrelatedness. Concentrating on what the law is doing, as process, as verb, instead of as a ﬁxed set of rules, as constitutionalism, as noun, is the progressive backdrop for a new paradigm of sociologically-informed thought about the carrying out of law in the everyday.

## 3

#### Tech can solve infrastructure concerns but needs to be integrated – operators are key.

Jacobs 5/31 [Lionel; Senior Security Architect in the Palo Alto Networks ICS and SCADA solutions team. Coming from the asset-owner side , Lionel has spent more than 20 years working in the IT/OT environment, with a focus on ICS systems design, controls, and implementation. He was a pioneer in bridging the IT-OT security gap and implementing next-generation security into performance and safety critical process control areas. During his tenure, he successfully deployed a large scale ICS/SCADA security architecture composed of over 100 next-generation firewalls, hundreds of advanced endpoint protection clients and SIEM, distributed over dozens of remote plants and a centralized core, all based on a "Zero Trust" philosophy. Lionel graduated from Houston Baptist University with a double degree in Physics and Mathematics and has held certifications as a MCSE, CCA, CCNP, CCIP, CCNA, CSSA, and GICSP; “Critical Infrastructure Protection: Physical and Cyber Security Both Matter,” eSecurity Planet; 5/31/21; https://www.esecurityplanet.com/networks/critical-infrastructure-protection-physical-cybersecurity/]//SJWen

Segmentation based on business criteria

Segmentation is not just breaking apart the network based on the IP-Address space. True segmentation requires identifying and grouping devices into Zones or Enclaves based on meaningful business criteria to protect better vulnerable devices found within the address space. Access to devices in the zone needs to be restricted by users, groups, protocols, networks, and devices. In some instances, you may even consider restricting access by time of day.

IoT/IIoT is beginning to take hold in the energy industry, which means there are going to be more devices attached to these networks gathering information and possibly running on a vendor’s proprietary software and hardware, which more than likely will not be managed or patchable by the operator of the system. So O&G needs to have a definite plan on how they will address this growing trend, and a zero trust-based strategy offers the best means of doing this integration in a safe, secure, and, most important, reversible manner.

Camera and sensor security

Segmentation will also include the zoning of radio frequency (RF) technologies like Wi-Fi, Microwave, satellite, and cellular. ICS and SCADA systems operators must remain mindful of the possibility of an upstream attack by threat actors who have managed to compromise their RF facilities. Remote facilities and devices often have cameras and sensors to alert when a door has been opened. Still, because they are remote, attackers have time to enter the facilities and plant a device that can go completely unnoticed.

Another option physical access affords them is the opportunity to compromise the runtime operating systems and/or OS of the devices they find. The only way you will find these would be to do a physical search of the facility or cabinet and run an audit of the OS to ensure nothing has been tainted.

Zoning limits damage

So the reason why the zone trust segmentation (zoning) is so important is if you don’t have the time to perform these acts to confirm that the site is not compromised. With proper zoning enforcement, you can limit and isolate the damage to a region or just that location.

Zones in a Zero Trust network also serve as an inspection point for traffic entering and exiting the enclave. The enabling of IPS, IDS, and virtual sandboxing technology can be applied on a per-zone basis, allowing for customized protection for the vulnerable devices contained within. Implementing these security measures is a best practice even on zones where devices can receive updates and have some form of endpoint protection.

With proper design and device consideration, zoning with the different inspection technologies enabled can also be a remediating factor for those devices in your network that cannot be patched, updated, and even those that are end-of-life. In short, zoning with inspection technology enabled helps to ensure IT and OT network systems’ safe operations. In even the most secure environments, it is never safe to assume that data traffic transversing the network is free of a potential threat.

#### Increased strikes send a clear signal to terrorists that critical US infrastructure is vulnerable by weakening organizations.

Davies 6 [Ross; George Mason University - Antonin Scalia Law School, Faculty, The Green Bag; “Strike Season: Protecting Labor-Management Conflict in the Age of Terror,” SSRN; 4/12/06; https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=896185]//SJWen

Strikes (and, to a lesser extent, lockouts) are painful but necessary parts of private-sector American labor-management relations. Even if they weren't - even if sound public policy called for their eradication - we couldn't stop them. They are an inevitable byproduct of the conflicting interests and limited resources of organized workers and their employers. History shows that this is true even in times of warfare overseas or crisis at home: labor-management strife lessens at the beginning of a conflict and then bounces back. Now, however, we are confronted with warfare at home, a phenomenon that the United States has not had to deal with since the Civil War - before the rise of today's unprecedentedly large, complex, and interdependent economy and government.

And history is repeating itself again. After a lull at the beginning of the war with terrorists, work stoppages have returned to their pre-war levels. The overall rate of strike activity is substantially lower than it was during previous wars (it has been slowly declining, along with overall union membership in the private sector, for decades). Today's war, however, is being fought in part on American soil, and against enemies who operate worldwide, but whose attacks tend to be small and local, seeking advantage from the unpredictability and brutality of the damage they inflict rather than from its scale. Thus, even small, localized, and occasional work stoppages - not just the large-scale strikes that arguably affected the military-industrial complex and thus the war efforts in the past - have the potential to increase risks to critical infrastructure and public safety during the war on terror. In other words, persistent strike activity at current levels poses risks of public harm, albeit risks that are difficult to anticipate with specificity in the absence of much experience or available data. This justifies taking some reasonable precautions, including the proposal made in this Article.

By its very nature, a labor strike increases the vulnerability of that employer's operations to a terrorist attack. A strike is an act specifically designed to disrupt and weaken an employer's operations, for the (usually) perfectly lawful purpose of pressing for resolution of a dispute with management. A weakened organization or other entity is, of course, less capable of resisting and surviving exogenous shocks, whether they be commercial competition or terrorist attacks. In the United States, with its fully extended and endlessly interconnected critical infrastructure that touches everything from food processing to energy distribution to water quality, a strike in the wrong place at the wrong time that disrupts and weakens some part of that infrastructure could be decisive in the success or failure of a terrorist attack of the small, local sort described above, on such a weakened link in some infrastructural chain. Of course, none of this is to suggest that any union or its members (or any employer or its managers) would knowingly expose their fellow citizens or their property to a terrorist attack. To the contrary, experience to date suggests that union members are at least as patriotic and conscientious as Americans in general. In fact, the effectiveness of the proposal made in this Article is predicated in part on the assumption that neither workers nor their employers will knowingly contribute to the incidence or effectiveness of terrorist attacks. The concern addressed here is, rather, that innocent instigators or perpetuators of a work stoppage might unwittingly facilitate a successful terrorist attack or aggravate its effects.

#### Attacks on critical infrastructure collapses the economy through multiple avenues.

FAS 6 [DCSINT Handbook No. 1.02; Info directly from US army and Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence; “Critical Infrastructure Threats and Terrorism,” DCSINT/FAS; 8/10/6; https://fas.org/irp/threat/terrorism/sup2.pdf]//SJWen

Agriculture

In 1984, a cult group poisoned salad bars at several Oregon restaurants with Salmonella bacteria as the first recorded event of bioterrorism in the United States. This resulted in 750 people becoming sick.24 A review of the agriculture infrastructure results in vulnerable areas such as the high concentration of the livestock industry and the centralized nature of the food processing industry. The farm-to table chain contains various points into which an attack could be launched. The threat of attack would seriously damage consumer confidence and undermine export markets. Understanding the goal of the threat points to the area most likely attacked. If the intent was economic disruption the target would be livestock and crops, but if the intent was mass casualties the point of attack would be contamination of finished food products. Damage to livestock could be very swift, the USDA calculated that foot-and mouth disease could spread to 25 states in 5 days.25 CDC is presently tracking and developing scenarios for the arrival of Avian Flu.

Banking

Prior to the destruction of the Twin Towers, physical attacks against the banking industry, such as the destruction of facilities, were rare. Unfortunately, evidence indicates that may change, in March 2005 three British al-Qa’ida operatives were indicted by a U.S. federal court on charges of conducting detailed reconnaissance of financial targets in lower Manhattan, Newark, New Jersey, and Washington, D.C. In addition to video taping the Citigroup Center and the New York Stock Exchange in New York City, the Prudential Financial building in Newark, and the headquarters of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank in Washington D.C., the men amassed more than 500 photographs of the sites.26 The Banking infrastructures primary weakness is along its cyber axis of attack. Through phishing and banking Trojan targeting specific financial institutions, attackers reduce confidence among consumers. Recently American Express posted an alert online, including a screenshot of a pop-up that appeared when users log in to its secure site.27

The attack not only attempts to obtain personal information that can be used for various operations, but also launches a virus into the user’s computer. CitiBank, and Chase Manhattan Bank have both been victim during 2005 and 2006 to phishing schemes misrepresenting their services to their clients.

Energy

Recently the oil industry occupied the headlines, and the criticality of this infrastructure is not lost on terrorists. In mid-December 2004, Arab television aired an alleged audiotape message by Usama bin Laden in which he called upon his followers to wreak havoc on the U.S. and world economy by disrupting oil supplies from the Persian Gulf to the United States.28 The U.S. uses over 20.7 million barrels a day of crude oil and products and imports 58.4% of that requirement.29 On 19 January 2006 al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden announced in a video release that, “The war against America and its allies will not be confined to Iraq…..”, and since June of 2003 there have been 298 recorded attacks against Iraqi oil facilities.30 Terrorists conduct research as to the easiest point to damage the flow of oil or to the point where the most damage can be done. Scenarios involving the oil fields themselves, a jetliner crashing into the Ras Tanura facility in Saudi Arabia could remove 10 percent of the world’s energy imports in one act.31 Maritime attacks are also option for terrorists; on October 6, 2002 a French tanker carrying 397,000 barrels of crude oil from Iran to Malaysia was rammed by an explosive laden boat off of the port of Ash Shihr, 353 miles east of Aden. The double-hulled tanker was breached, and maritime insurers tripled the rates.32 Energy most travel often long distances from the site where it is obtained to the point where it is converted into energy for use, a catastrophic event at any of the sites or along its route can adversely impact the energy infrastructure and cause ripples in other infrastructures. The security of the pipeline in Alaska increases in importance as efforts are made to make America more independent on energy use.

Economy

The U.S. economy is the end-state target of several terrorist groups as identified in the introduction quote. The means by which terrorists and other threats attempt to impact the economic infrastructure is through it’s linkage to the other infrastructures. Attacks are launched at other infrastructures, such as energy or the Defense Industrial Base in an effort to achieve a “cascading” result that impacts the economy. Cyber attacks on Banking and Finance are another effort to indirectly impact the economy. The short term impacts of the 9/11 attacks on Lower Manhattan resulted in the loss of 30% of office space and a number of businesses simply ceased to exist. Close to 200,000 jobs were destroyed or relocated out of New York City. The destruction of physical assets was estimated in the national accounts to amount to $14 billion for private businesses, $1.5 billion for state and local government enterprises and $0.7 billion for federal enterprises. Rescue, cleanup and related costs are estimated to at least $11 billion for a total direct cost of $27.2 billion.33 The medium and long term effects cannot be accurately estimated but demonstrate the idea of cascading effects. The five main areas affected over a longer period were Insurance, Airlines, Tourism and other Service Industries, Shipping and Security and military spending. At various times terrorist rhetoric has mentioned attacks against Wall Street proper, but the more realistic damage to the economy will come through the indirect approach of cascading effects.

Transportation

The attack on commuter trains in Madrid in March of 2004 and the London bombings in July of 2005, which together killed 243 people, clearly indicated the threat to the transportation infrastructure. Statistics provided by the Brookings Institute in Washington DC show that between 1991 and 2001 42% of worldwide terrorist attacks were directed against mass transit. Transportation is viewed by terrorists as a “soft target” and one that will impact the people of a country. Mass Service Transportation (MST) is the likely target of a terrorist attack.

MST caters to large volumes of people, crammed into narrow confined spaces

MST is designed to move large numbers of people quickly and efficiently, which is often counter to protective measure

MST assets are enclosed, serving to amplify explosions

MST attacks can result in “cascading effects” because communications and power conduits are usually collocated in proximity to their routes

The Department of Homeland Security sent a “public sector notice” in May of 2006 based on two incidents of “suspicious videotaping” of European mass-transit systems.34 The individual had several tapes besides the one in his camera, none of which showed any tourist sites. The tapes focused on the insides of subway cars, the inside and outside of several stations and exit routes from the stations. In June of 2003 the FBI arrested Iyman Faris, a 34 year old naturalized American citizen who had been in contact with Al Qaeda conducting research and reconnaissance in an effort to destroy the Brooklyn Bridge.35 Mr. Faris had traveled to Afghanistan and Pakistan in 2000, meeting with Osama bin Laden, he returned to the U.S. and began gathering information concerning the Brooklyn Bridge and communicating via coded messages with Al Qaeda leaders. An attack on the bridge would have not only damaged the transportation infrastructure, but also a known American landmark. On 24 May 2006, a Pakistani immigrant was convicted on charges of plotting to blow up one of Manhattan’s busiest subway stations in retaliation for the U.S. actions at the Abu Ghraib prison.36

Terrorist threats to the transportation infrastructure extend beyond land to the sea. Vice Admiral Jonathan Greenert, commander of the U.S. Seventh Fleet, said “one of my nightmares would be a maritime terrorism attack in the Strait of Malacca”.37 “There is a strain of al-Qaida in Southeast Asia, called Jemaah Islamiya. They are actively pursuing a maritime terrorism capability that includes diving and mining training.”38 As how this might impact on the economy, $220 billion in trade comes through the Seventh Fleet area of responsibility and 98% of the commerce is moved by sea. Just as ports can be viewed a SPOF within the maritime transport system, there are certain waterway chokepoints or heavily trafficked areas that can be viewed as a high payoff target to a terrorist or result in catastrophic damage from a natural disaster.

#### Extinction.

Liu '18 [Qian; 11/13/18; Managing Director of Greater China for The Economist Group, previously director of the global economics unit and director of Access China for the Economist Intelligence Unit, PhD in economics from Uppsala University; "The next economic crisis could cause a global conflict. Here's why," <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/the-next-economic-crisis-could-cause-a-global-conflict-heres-why/>] // Re-Cut SJWen

The next economic crisis is closer than you think. But what you should really worry about is what comes after: in the current social, political, and technological landscape, a prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising income inequality, could well escalate into a major global military conflict. The 2008-09 global financial crisis almost bankrupted governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the global economy back from the brink, using massive monetary stimulus, including quantitative easing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates. But monetary stimulus is like an adrenaline shot to jump-start an arrested heart; it can revive the patient, but it does nothing to cure the disease. Treating a sick economy requires structural reforms, which can cover everything from financial and labor markets to tax systems, fertility patterns, and education policies. Policymakers have utterly failed to pursue such reforms, despite promising to do so. Instead, they have remained preoccupied with politics. From Italy to Germany, forming and sustaining governments now seems to take more time than actual governing. And Greece, for example, has relied on money from international creditors to keep its head (barely) above water, rather than genuinely reforming its pension system or improving its business environment. The lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented excess liquidity that central banks injected into their economies was not allocated to its most efficient uses. Instead, it raised global asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008. In the United States, housing prices are now 8% higher than they were at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, according to the property website Zillow. The price-to-earnings (CAPE) ratio, which measures whether stock-market prices are within a reasonable range, is now higher than it was both in 2008 and at the start of the Great Depression in 1929. As monetary tightening reveals the vulnerabilities in the real economy, the collapse of asset-price bubbles will trigger another economic crisis – one that could be even more severe than the last, because we have built up a tolerance to our strongest macroeconomic medications. A decade of regular adrenaline shots, in the form of ultra-low interest rates and unconventional monetary policies, has severely depleted their power to stabilize and stimulate the economy. If history is any guide, the consequences of this mistake could extend far beyond the economy. According to Harvard’s Benjamin Friedman, prolonged periods of economic distress have been characterized also by public antipathy toward minority groups or foreign countries – attitudes that can help to fuel unrest, terrorism, or even war. For example, during the Great Depression, US President Herbert Hoover signed the 1930 Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, intended to protect American workers and farmers from foreign competition. In the subsequent five years, global trade shrank by two-thirds. Within a decade, World War II had begun. To be sure, WWII, like World War I, was caused by a multitude of factors; there is no standard path to war. But there is reason to believe that high levels of inequality can play a significant role in stoking conflict. According to research by the economist Thomas Piketty, a spike in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Income inequality then declines for a while, before rising again, until a new peak – and a new disaster. Though causality has yet to be proven, given the limited number of data points, this correlation should not be taken lightly, especially with wealth and income inequality at historically high levels. This is all the more worrying in view of the numerous other factors stoking social unrest and diplomatic tension, including technological disruption, a record-breaking migration crisis, anxiety over globalization, political polarization, and rising nationalism. All are symptoms of failed policies that could turn out to be trigger points for a future crisis. Voters have good reason to be frustrated, but the emotionally appealing populists to whom they are increasingly giving their support are offering ill-advised solutions that will only make matters worse. For example, despite the world’s unprecedented interconnectedness, multilateralism is increasingly being eschewed, as countries – most notably, Donald Trump’s US – pursue unilateral, isolationist policies. Meanwhile, proxy wars are raging in Syria and Yemen. Against this background, we must take seriously the possibility that the next economic crisis could lead to a large-scale military confrontation. By the logic of the political scientist Samuel Huntington , considering such a scenario could help us avoid it, because it would force us to take action. In this case, the key will be for policymakers to pursue the structural reforms that they have long promised, while replacing finger-pointing and antagonism with a sensible and respectful global dialogue. The alternative may well be global conflagration.

## 4

#### Counterplan text: States ought to increase transparency measures between workers and employers to increase the opportunities of agreements before striking. If strikes were to occur, parties would be required to take appropriate precautions to decrease the risk of terrorist attacks.

Davies 6 [Ross; George Mason University - Antonin Scalia Law School, Faculty, The Green Bag; “Strike Season: Protecting Labor-Management Conflict in the Age of Terror,” SSRN; 4/12/06; https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=896185]//SJWen

Part I of this Article lays out the unique threat posed by strikes (and, to a lesser extent, by lockouts) in the age of terror. Using American experience during the world wars, Part II shows that there is no way to prevent strikes from happening, foreclosing any argument for a fruitless ban on strikes or for some sort of nostalgic and fictional Greatest-Generation-inspired, return to a patriotic war footing regulation of labor-management relations. Part III reviews the generally applicable labor laws currently in force and shows that both experience and precedent limit their prospects for effective regulation of labor-management conflict in the age of terror, with the notable exception of the 1974 health care amendments to the NLRA. Part IV describes a proposed extension of the 1974 amendments to cover critical infrastructure more generally and explains how and why it would serve labor, management, and the American people in the age of terror. It would do so not by directly reducing strikes, lockouts, or the use of replacements (the three forms of risky work-stoppage-related behavior at which the proposed notice rule is directed), but rather by increasing transparency in the use of those weapons of labor-management conflict and thus increasing the opportunities for the parties, the government, and the public to share information and take appropriate precautions to avoid increased risks of effective terrorist attacks. The adoption of the rule proposed here would alter slightly the armaments of both labor and management, but in all likelihood it would do so without affecting the overall balance of power between them in any meaningful way.

## Case

### T/L

1. Does the plan include people who are h2b and h2v visas? (temporary workers)

Massive portion of the workers are on temp visas or undocumented

Solv advocates says there’s exclusions on ag labor in the plan text

Some are excluded from the statute

NRLA

#### No impact to ag collapse – no shortages or war

Allouche 11, research Fellow – water supply and sanitation @ Institute for Development Studies, frmr professor – MIT, ‘11

(Jeremy, “The sustainability and resilience of global water and food systems: Political analysis of the interplay between security, resource scarcity, political systems and global trade,” Food Policy, Vol. 36 Supplement 1, p. S3-S8, January)

The question of resource scarcity has led to many debates on whether scarcity (whether of food or water) will lead to conflict and war. The underlining reasoning behind most of these discourses over food and water wars comes from the Malthusian belief that there is an imbalance between the economic availability of natural resources and population growth since while food production grows linearly, population increases exponentially. Following this reasoning, neo-Malthusians claim that finite natural resources place a strict limit on the growth of human population and aggregate consumption; if these limits are exceeded, social breakdown, conflict and wars result. Nonetheless, it seems that most empirical studies do not support any of these neo-Malthusian arguments. Technological change and greater inputs of capital have dramatically increased labour productivity in agriculture. More generally, the neo-Malthusian view has suffered because during the last two centuries humankind has breached many resource barriers that seemed unchallengeable. Lessons from history: alarmist scenarios, resource wars and international relations In a so-called age of uncertainty, a number of alarmist scenarios have linked the increasing use of water resources and food insecurity with wars. The idea of water wars (perhaps more than food wars) is a dominant discourse in the media (see for example Smith, 2009), NGOs (International Alert, 2007) and within international organizations (UNEP, 2007). In 2007, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon declared that ‘water scarcity threatens economic and social gains and is a potent fuel for wars and conflict’ (Lewis, 2007). Of course, this type of discourse has an instrumental purpose; security and conflict are here used for raising water/food as key policy priorities at the international level. In the Middle East, presidents, prime ministers and foreign ministers have also used this bellicose rhetoric. Boutrous Boutros-Gali said; ‘the next war in the Middle East will be over water, not politics’ (Boutros Boutros-Gali in Butts, 1997, p. 65). The question is not whether the sharing of transboundary water sparks political tension and alarmist declaration, but rather to what extent water has been a principal factor in international conflicts. The evidence seems quite weak. Whether by president Sadat in Egypt or King Hussein in Jordan, none of these declarations have been followed up by military action. The governance of transboundary water has gained increased attention these last decades. This has a direct impact on the global food system as water allocation agreements determine the amount of water that can used for irrigated agriculture. The likelihood of conflicts over water is an important parameter to consider in assessing the stability, sustainability and resilience of global food systems. None of the various and extensive databases on the causes of war show water as a casus belli. Using the International Crisis Behavior (ICB) data set and supplementary data from the University of Alabama on water conflicts, Hewitt, Wolf and Hammer found only seven disputes where water seems to have been at least a partial cause for conflict (Wolf, 1998, p. 251). In fact, about 80% of the incidents relating to water were limited purely to governmental rhetoric intended for the electorate (Otchet, 2001, p. 18). As shown in The Basins At Risk (BAR) water event database, more than two-thirds of over 1800 water-related ‘events’ fall on the ‘cooperative’ scale (Yoffe et al., 2003). Indeed, if one takes into account a much longer period, the following figures clearly demonstrate this argument. According to studies by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), organized political bodies signed between the year 805 and 1984 more than 3600 water-related treaties, and approximately 300 treaties dealing with water management or allocations in international basins have been negotiated since 1945 (FAO, 1978 and FAO, 1984). The fear around water wars have been driven by a Malthusian outlook which equates scarcity with violence, conflict and war. There is however no direct correlation between water scarcity and transboundary conflict. Most specialists now tend to agree that the major issue is not scarcity per se but rather the allocation of water resources between the different riparian states (see for example Allouche, 2005, Allouche, 2007 and [Rouyer, 2000] ). Water rich countries have been involved in a number of disputes with other relatively water rich countries (see for example India/Pakistan or Brazil/Argentina). The perception of each state’s estimated water needs really constitutes the core issue in transboundary water relations. Indeed, whether this scarcity exists or not in reality, perceptions of the amount of available water shapes people’s attitude towards the environment (Ohlsson, 1999). In fact, some water experts have argued that scarcity drives the process of co-operation among riparians (Dinar and Dinar, 2005 and Brochmann and Gleditsch, 2006). In terms of international relations, the threat of water wars due to increasing scarcity does not make much sense in the light of the recent historical record. Overall, the water war rationale expects conflict to occur over water, and appears to suggest that violence is a viable means of securing national water supplies, an argument which is highly contestable. The debates over the likely impacts of climate change have again popularised the idea of water wars. The argument runs that climate change will precipitate worsening ecological conditions contributing to resource scarcities, social breakdown, institutional failure, mass migrations and in turn cause greater political instability and conflict (Brauch, 2002 and Pervis and Busby, 2004). In a report for the US Department of Defense, Schwartz and Randall (2003) speculate about the consequences of a worst-case climate change scenario arguing that water shortages will lead to aggressive wars (Schwartz and Randall, 2003, p. 15). Despite growing concern that climate change will lead to instability and violent conflict, the evidence base to substantiate the connections is thin ( [Barnett and Adger, 2007] and Kevane and Gray, 2008).

#### 1] Strikes allows for domination by exercising coercion.

**Gourevitch 18** [Alex; Brown University; “The Right to Strike: A Radical View,” American Political Science Review; 2018; [https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/s0003055418000321]](https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/s0003055418000321%5d//SJWen) Justin

\*\*Edited for ableist language

Every liberal democracy **recognizes** that workers have a **right** to **strike**. That right is protected in law, sometimes in the constitution itself. Yet strikes pose **serious** **problems** for **liberal** **societies**. They involve **violence** and **coercion**, they often violate some **basic** **liberal** **liberties**, they appear to **involve** group rights having **priority** over **individual** **ones**, and they can **threaten** **public** **order** itself. Strikes are also one of the most common forms of **disruptive** **collective** **protest** in modern history. Even given the dramatic decline in strike activity since its peak in the 1970s, they can play significant roles in our lives. For instance, just over the past few years in the United States, large illegal strikes by teachers ~~paralyzed~~ **froze** major school districts in Chicago and Seattle, as well as **statewide** in **West** **Virginia**, **Oklahoma**, **Arizona**, and **Colorado**; a **strike** by taxi drivers played a **major** role in debates and court decisions regarding **immigration**; and strikes by retail and foodservice workers were instrumental in getting new minimum wage and other legislation passed in states like California, New York, and North Carolina. Yet, despite their significance, there is almost no political philosophy written about strikes.1 This despite the enormous literature on neighboring forms of protest like nonviolence, civil disobedience, conscientious refusal, and social movements.

The right to strike raises **far** more **issues** than a **single** **essay** can handle. In what follows, I address a particularly significant problem regarding the right to strike and its **relation** to **coercive** **strike** **tactics**. I argue that strikes present a **dilemma** for liberal societies because for **most** **workers** to have a reasonable chance of **success** they need to use some **coercive** **strike** **tactics**. But these coercive strike tactics both **violate** the law and **infringe** upon what are widely held to be **basic** **liberal** **rights**. To resolve this dilemma, we have to know **why** workers have the right to strike in the first place. I argue that the best way of **understanding** the right to strike is as a right to **resist** the **oppression** that workers face in the **standard** **liberal** **capitalist** **economy**. This way of **understanding** the right explains why the use of **coercive** **strike** **tactics** is not morally **constrained** by the requirement to respect the **basic** **liberties** nor the related laws that strikers violate when using certain coercive tactics.

#### 2] No offense: Strikes quit working, not the job which still allows for instances of domination.

**Gourevitch 16** [Alex; Brown University; “Quitting Work but Not the Job: Liberty and the Right to Strike,” 2016; [https://sci-hub.se/https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592716000049]](https://sci-hub.se/https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592716000049%5d) Justin

The further point is that, short of quasi-socialist redistribution or of giving everyone universal rights to ownership of capital, workers are **justified** in turning to some other way of resisting their structural domination. The legal fact of being able to quit a job is **cold comfort** because it allows workers to leave a **specific boss**, but not the **labor market itself.** Insofar as workers are forced into contracts with employers, and into work associations with other workers, they can only resist their structural domination from within. Here we have an insight into why the right to strike includes the **perplexing claim that workers refuse to work yet maintain a right to the job**. The typical worker can quit the job, but she cannot quit the work. To avoid being exploited she turns the table: she quits working **without** quitting the job.

#### 3] Free-riding: strikes are a form of free-riding since those who don’t participate still reap the benefits – that allows for instances of domination.

**Dolsak and Prakash 19** [Nives and Aseem; We write on environmental issues, climate politics and NGOs; “Climate Strikes: What They Accomplish And How They Could Have More Impact,” 9/14/19; Forbes; <https://www.forbes.com/sites/prakashdolsak/2019/09/14/climate-strikes-what-they-accomplish-and-how-they-could-have-more-impact/?sh=2244a9bd5eed>] Justin

While strikes and protests build **solidarity** among their supporters, they are susceptible to **collective action problems**. This is **because** **the goals that strikers pursue tend to create non-excludable benefits**. That is, benefits such as climate protection can be **enjoyed** by both **strikers** and **non**-**strikers**. Thus, large participation in climate strikes will reveal that in spite of **free-riding problems**, a large number of people have a strong preference for climate action.

#### Government recognition doesn’t mean that the right to strike will actually be upheld, it just means they government says it exists – this is terminal defense to the aff’s solvency and outweighs on legal precision.

Law Dictionary ‘ND [The Law Dictionary; Featuring Black's Law Dictionary Free Online Legal Dictionary 2nd Ed.; No Date; “What is RECOGNIZE?”; https://thelawdictionary.org/recognize/; Accessed 10-28-2021] AK

To try; to examine in order to determine the truth of a matter. Also to enter into a recognizance.