#### Plan text: The United States ought to recognize an unconditional right to strike for agricultural laborers by amending the National Labor Relations Act to get rid of the exception for agricultural laborers. Ask in CX for clarification

### Inherency

#### For agricultural laborers, the NLRA and its interpretation by the courts has not protected their right to strike

Reilly n.d.-- Jaclyn Reilly; JD from Penn State University; Agricultural Laborers: Their Inability to Unionize Under the National Labor Relations Act; Penn State Law Review; <https://pennstatelaw.psu.edu/_file/aglaw/Publications_Library/Agricultural_Laborers.pdf>. (AG DebateDrills)

The broad definition of “agriculture” under the FLSA would seem to exclude from the NLRA any worker who is employed by any agricultural entity. This is not the case, however, because the Supreme Court has adopted a two-part test to determine if an employee is in fact an agricultural laborer excluded from the NLRA.23 An agricultural employee will be excluded from the right to organize if he or she is engaged in either primary or secondary farming. The Supreme Court has taken the FLSA definition of agriculture and essentially limited its application based on a strict application of the statutory language. Primary farming are those tasks specifically referred to in the statutory definition of “agriculture” such as “cultivation and tillage of the soil [and] dairying.”24 The rest of the definition is considered secondary farming, and therefore a worker is an agricultural laborer if the work performed is of the type that would be performed “by a farmer or on a farm as an incident to or in conjunction with such farming operations.” In one of the more recent cases to address the question of who is considered an agricultural employee, the Supreme Court in Holly Farms Corp. v. N.L.R.B. upheld the determination made by the NLRB that workers on live-haul chicken crews do not engage in agricultural labor and therefore are not subject to the agricultural exception from the NLRA.26 The responsibility of the live-haul crew is to enter the farms of independent contractors who raise chickens supplied by Holly Farms; the chickens are then caught and caged by nine chicken catchers, moved by a forklift operator onto a truck to be transported by a truck driver to the processing plant.27 These live-haul crews were not engaged in primary farming because primary farming would have been the actual raising of the poultry, which was the responsibility of the independent contractors, not the livehaul crews.28 The court then focused on whether these live-haul crews were engaged in secondary farming. In doing so, the court immediately found that that the work performed by the live-haul crews were not of the kind “performed by a farmer” because Holly Farms gave up its farmer status as soon as the chicks were delivered to independent contractors for raising.29 As a result of this determination, the truck drivers were not considered agricultural laborers and were therefore not part of the agricultural exception to the NLRA and were able to unionize.

### The Advantage is Sustainable Agriculture

#### Population expansion generally requires farmland expansion to meet food demand—we are on the brink of prohibitive climate and biodiversity costs from deforestation

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)

From the perspective of human evolution, each period of rapid population growth, such as during the Neolithic agricultural revolution, which began at about 8000 BC, the hydro agricultural or irrigation revolutions in the Near East, which began about 3000 BC, and the medieval and modern agricultural periods, which began about 1000 AD, benefited from an advance in agriculture (Taiz, 2013; Wallace et al., 2018). The recent rapid population growth during the past 300 years, in contrast, mainly resulted from the Industrial Revolution, which began in Britain about 1760. The Industrial Revolution greatly increased the range of human activities and accelerated farmland expansion. In 1700, it was reported that nearly 95% of Earth’s ice-free land consisted of wildlands and semi-natural anthromes; however, by 2000, ~55% of these regions were used as arable land (Figure 1a, data from https://ourworldindata.org/). The Industrial Revolution also gave birth to new technologies and production systems in agriculture, such as the application of larger irrigation systems, and more fertilizers and pesticides. In the 1960s, semi-dwarf wheat and rice varieties were introduced. These semi-dwarf crops exhibit beneficial characteristics, such as improved response to fertilizer input, lodging resistance and enhanced light utilization (Hedden, 2003; Wallace et al., 2018). Along with the fertilizers, pesticides and irrigation systems made possible by the Industrial Revolution, semi-dwarf crops were quickly adopted and resulted in a significant increase in total grain production globally. This big leap in agriculture was known as the ‘Green Revolution’ (Khush, 2001). Indeed, statistical data have revealed that the average daily food supply per person (in terms of calories) has doubled since the middle of the 19th century (Figure 1b, data from https://ourworld indata.org/). It is estimated that the world population will rise to more than 9 billion by 2050 (Alexandratos, 1999; Cassman, 1999), and at that time we will need at least 60% more food than is consumed by humans today. Moreover, our population will continuously increase, reaching over 11 billion by 2100 (Figure 1a, data from https://ourworldindata.org/). How to feed the increasing population is a challenge facing the whole world (Tilman et al., 2001; Godfray et al., 2010; Foley et al., 2011; Wallace et al., 2018). A simple solution to feed a population of 9 billion is to constantly turn wild habitats into farmland. However, this type of expansion is unrealistic as most of the world’s icefree and non-barren land area has been exhausted, and much of the rest is unlikely to sustain high yields (Cassman, 1999). More importantly, intact forests have been known to play essential roles in protecting the environment, such as storing fresh water, decreasing flooding and regenerating fertile soils. 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).

#### Biodiversity 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.

#### Climate Change causes Extinction

Specktor 19 [Brandon writes about the science of everyday life for Live Science, and previously for Reader's Digest magazine, where he served as an editor for five years] 6-4-2019, "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims," livescience, <https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html> Justin

The current climate crisis, they say, is larger and more complex than any humans have ever dealt with before. General climate models — like the one that the [United Nations' Panel on Climate Change](https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/) (IPCC) used in 2018 to predict that a global temperature increase of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) could put hundreds of millions of people at risk — fail to account for the **sheer complexity of Earth's many interlinked geological processes**; as such, they fail to adequately predict the scale of the potential consequences. The truth, the authors wrote, is probably far worse than any models can fathom. How the world ends What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill many of the trees in the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.livescience.com/57266-amazon-river.html) (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the planet plunges into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions. "Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and **55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of** [**lethal heat conditions**](https://www.livescience.com/55129-how-heat-waves-kill-so-quickly.html), beyond the threshold of human survivability," the authors hypothesized. Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly **one-third of the world's land surface turns to desert**. Entire **ecosystems collapse**, beginning with the **planet's coral reefs**, the **rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets.** The world's tropics are hit hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than 1 billion people into refugees. This mass movement of refugees — coupled with [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to **stress the fabric of the world's largest nations**, including the United States. Armed conflicts over resources, perhaps culminating in **nuclear war, are likely**. The result, according to the new paper, is "outright chaos" and perhaps "the end of human global civilization as we know it."

#### The only yet extremely effective solution is innovation that leads to more crop yield—there’s multiple possibilities for innovation

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)

The first straightforward strategy for designing future crops that meet sustainable agriculture requirements is to improve the following aspects of current well-cultivated crops. Increasing yield. It is estimated that the yields of major crops need to increase at a rate of 2.4% per year to meet the food supply demand by 2050. However, the current growth rates of the four major crops, maize (Zea mays), rice (Oryza sativa), wheat (Triticum aestivum), and soybeans (Glycine max), are only approximately half of this anticipated rate (Ray et al., 2013). The development of new varieties with high yield potential that can fill this gap is the foremost mission of the Future Crops Design project. In fact, in a trial, it was reported that a super-high-yield rice variety could produce one- to threefold more grains under optimal conditions than in normal paddy fields (Liu et al., 2020a). Improving nutritional quality. Although the amount of food supply has been significantly improved in the last half-century, changes in human lifestyle and food consumption have resulted in a phenomenon called hidden hunger (Nair et al., 2016). For instance, in sub-Saharan Africa and America, about 17–30% of children under the age of 5 years have an inadequate daily intake of Vitamin A (Harjes et al., 2008; Haskell, 2012). It has been reported that about two billion people are suffering from a chronic deficiency of micronutrients (WHO, 2008), a new threat to human health. Moreover, the incidence of type-2 diabetes, obesity and colon disease has markedly increased in the past decade (Zhou et al., 2016). Hence, the second mission of the Future Crops Design project is to generate crops with higher/balanced nutritional quality or specialized metabolites using metabolic engineering and synthetic biology approaches (Francis et al., 2017; Martin and Li, 2017; Sweetlove et al., 2017; Vasconcelos et al., 2017). 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.

#### The reason innovation isn’t happening is lack of profit incentive—there needs to be an incentive for risk taking

Mackenzie 20—Conway Mackenzie; Harve Light Managing Director; Innovation in Agriculture: Why is it so slow?; Shale Magazine; February 3 2020; <https://shalemag.com/innovation-in-agriculture-why-is-it-so-slow/>. (AG DebateDrills)

Innovation is not a new concept in the agriculture industry. As an example, self-driving farm equipment has been around for years and well ahead of the auto industry. This has been a major factor in improving yields and reducing input costs as planting accuracy has improved. However, further automation is needed to improve operating efficiency along the supply chain. Both farmers and processors face significant labor cost increases due to minimum wage hikes that will continue for the next several years. These increases have little positive effect as both farmers and processors still struggle to find people willing to do the work. Robotics will play a significant role in addressing this issue. Whether it’s picking crops in the field or automating functions at the processor, business owners are looking for ways to reduce their labor dependence.

Sensor technology via the Internet of Things has also made significant inroads. These sensors improve farmer visibility into what is going on with their land and crops. This allows them to focus their resources to address known issues. Sensors also help processors maintain quality standards throughout their facilities. Sensor technology is also a major component in addressing another industry challenge, traceability. Today, consumers want to easily determine where their food came from. They want to know that it came from companies that believe in and use sustainable practices. In addition, regulators want to be able to pinpoint sources when food safety issues arise. Sensor technology collects the data needed to meet this need. The second part of the issue is harnessing all that data.

There are several efforts in their infancy that work toward a data solution. One of the most advanced is blockchain technology. In simple terms, blockchain is a technology that allows for collection of data from all market participants in a single, secure repository. It will allow for an end to end supply chain trail of a single item. This technology will allow for better traceability by retailer, consumer and regulator which is being requested by the likes of Walmart. Eventually, it will also allow for better collaboration between all members of a particular supply chain. Today, the biggest hurdles to this innovation are the protocols or data formats. Companies in the industry need to know what data to collect and the form it should take. They will need a lot of help in putting these requirements all together.

So, what’s holding innovation back? While there has been improvement, technological innovation remains slow compared to other industries. Two of the major causes are lack of connectivity and insufficient investment returns. Lack of connectivity is an issue based on the nature of the industry. Farming takes place in rural areas where internet access is spotty at best. This lack of connectivity hampers farmers from collecting data in the field. This results in an inability to make decisions in time to make a difference. Innovation is also inhibited by a lack of investment. Entrepreneurs and startups do not want to invest in developing solutions where they can’t see a clear path to a return on their capital. In agriculture, they can’t see an exit strategy which typically includes the sale of the company to a large industry supplier. For many years, the agriculture industry has been dominated by a few large input suppliers. These suppliers have been making good profits years and see no reason to take on innovation investment risk. Without these large players, startups have no incentive to risk their capital on new solutions. This has led to a very slow rate of development and innovation.

### Solvency

#### First is creation of unions

#### Agricultural laborers don’t form unions in the status quo because of they don’t have an explicit right to strike

Reilly n.d.-- Jaclyn Reilly; JD from Penn State University; Agricultural Laborers: Their Inability to Unionize Under the National Labor Relations Act; Penn State Law Review; https://pennstatelaw.psu.edu/\_file/aglaw/Publications\_Library/Agricultural\_Laborers.pdf

Since the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), agricultural laborers have been excluded form its protection to organize workers and form unions for the purpose of collectively bargaining with employers. Employees who engage in collective bargaining are able to band together to bargain with employers for better wages, a safer working environment, fringe benefits and other terms and conditions of employment.1 The NLRA protects this bargaining process and the parties involved. Agricultural laborers are one of only two classes of workers excluded from the protection of the NLRA.2 Although agricultural laborers are not protected under the NLRA because of their exclusion from the definition of “employee,” there is no mention that agricultural laborers are forbidden from forming unions.3 But without the protection offered by the NLRA, farmers do not have to recognize the union nor will they face any consequences in failing to so recognize in contrast with employers in other industries.4 This lack of protection leads to agricultural laborers not forming unions because of the backlash they could face from employers without any recourse to protect themselves from retaliatory practices or the general refusal of employers to bargain.5

#### Unions are important for fighting for environmental issues- their interests often align with the community’s

Rathzel and Uzzell 11-- Räthzel, Nora, and David Uzzell. "Trade unions and climate change: The jobs versus environment dilemma." Global Environmental Change 21.4 (2011): 1215-1223. (AG DebateDrills)

The importance of unions as actors contributing to sustainable development was advocated almost twenty years ago in the Agenda 21 proposals from the 1992 Rio Earth Summit in a document on ‘Strengthening the Role of Workers & their Trade Unions’ (United Nations, 2009). Reading it today, three features in particular are striking. First, environmental issues are often bound up with health and safety issues, an association that we have found in our research as well. Second, there is an emphasis on collaboration within a tripartite system of government, employers’ and workers’ organisations to encourage capacity building within unions in order to involve them in decision-making on the design, implementation, promotion and evaluation of programmes for sustainable development. Finally, it is advocated that unions should be involved in the development of improvements to both the work environment and the production process, as well as working within the local community. Given this early initiative, it is surprising that it was not until 2006 that an international trade union conference on the environment involving more than 150 unions was held in Nairobi (UNEP, 2006). Not only did they discuss the significance of sustainable development for the trade union movement, but also agreed to incorporate environmental rights into their definition of traditional workers’ rights. In 2009, the International Metalworkers Federation (IMF) organised an international conference to formulate their demands for an international agreement on climate change policies, and in 2010 the International Federation of Transport (ITF) workers dedicated one day of their three-day world conference to issues of climate change. And as part of COP 15 and 16 local and international unions organised workshops at the World of Work Pavilion (WOW) attended by more than 1000 participants, arguing it is no longer acceptable for unionists to ignore environmental concerns or ‘‘leave them to the environmentalists’’. Since 2009 the ITUC, along with other national and international unions, has constructed a website dedicated to climate change issues. Whether these activities translate into policies at national and local levels is a question that remains to be investigated. Nevertheless,trade unions have become social actors, whose positions towards climate change need to be taken into account by governments, business, and scholars.

#### Second is increased worker costs meaning more investment in capital

#### Migrant workers make up the bulk of farm workers— right now they face extreme treatment in the status quo because of their vulnerable position

LeRoy 99-- LeRoy, Michael H. [Professor, School of Labor and Employment Relations, at University of Illinois], Should 'Agricultural Laborers' Continue to Be Excluded from the National Labor Relations Act?. Emory Law Journal, Vol. 48, No. 3, 1999, U Illinois Law & Economics Research Paper No. LE07-023, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=992923>

At least part of this labor market competition appears to be coming from 600,000 of farm

workers who currently are illegal [immigrants] aliens.29 By one estimate, 57% of all migrant farm workers in the U.S. are illegal aliens30 A recent report by the Department of Labor’s Inspector General suggests that agricultural producers prefer to hire illegal aliens.31 Thus, many farm workers are in one of two binds: they are legal immigrants who are passed over in favor illegal aliens in an already crowded labor market; or, they are illegal [immigrants] aliens who, because of their unlawful presence in the U.S., are exposed to extraordinary potential for employer over-reaching. Current labor market statistics suggest, therefore, that the slow progress that farm workers experienced over the past two decades is giving way to more exploitation. In recent cases of extreme treatment, migrant farm workers were enslaved by a labor contractor,32 coerced into field work against their will,33 or connected to forced prostitution.34 As these abuses have suggested a growing pattern, the U.S. Attorney General has responded by forming a task force to propose suitable solutions.35 Even if coercion happens only rarely to migrant farm workers, they nevertheless are vulnerable to more mundane forms of employer over-reaching. Their itinerant work, combined with their poverty, often means that they depend on employer-provided housing. Housing for migrants, while improved over a generation ago,36 is still sub-standard.37 Ironically, since migrant housing is regulated by federal38 and state law,39 many producers provide no housing and, as a result, migrant workers set up shanty-camps.40

#### The cause of worker exploitation is lack of collective bargaining so right to strike drastically improves conditions and wages—other industries prove

Perea 11—Juan Perea [Professor of Law at Loyola University Chicago]; The Echoes of Slavery: Recognizing the Racist Origins of the Agricultural and Domestic Worker Exclusion from the National Labor Relations Act; 72 OHIO ST. L.J. l 95 (2011).; https://lawecommons.luc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1150&context=facpubs

There is a direct relationship between this modem slavery and contemporary labor law. Advocates for migrant farm workers express that relationship: "Modem-day slavery cases don't happen in a vacuum. They only occur in degraded labor environments, ones that are fundamentally, systematically exploitive. In industries where the labor force is conti[n]gent, day-haul, with subpoverty wages, no benefits, no right to overtime, no fight to organize-that's where you see slavery taking root. ' 13 Slavery does not exist in labor environments that offer adequate worker protections like collective bargaining and other federally protected rights. A huge disparity exists between the exploitation and vulnerability lived by agricultural and domestic workers and the more reasonable and humane labor conditions existing in most other occupations.

#### Since conditions are so bad and demand is so constrained in agriculture, increase in wages will drastically increase capital investment in areas like R&D

Bhaskar 92-- Venkataraman Bhaskar [Researcher at Delhi School of Economics]; The Effect of Wages on Investment and Employment in a Vintage Model with Uncertain Demand; The Scandinavian Journal of Economics , Mar., 1992, Vol. 94, No. 1 (Mar., 1992), pp. 123-129; <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3440473>. (AG DebateDrills)

This note investigates the effect of an increase in the wage on investment and employment when demand is uncertain, and when incentives to factor substitution arise from the existence of different vintages of capital equipment. It is shown that the effect on investment is nonmonotonic and depends on the relative likelihood of demand and supply constraints. Moreover, a wage increase can have an ambiguous effect on employment, raising it in some states while reducing it in others. The effect on the expectation of employment may be positive. The model of investment presented here relates most closely to the work of Albrecht and Hart (1983), Artus and Muet (1984), Lambert and Mulkay (1987) and Moene (1985), who assume a putty-clay technology, a fixed output price, and stochastic demand. The innovation in this note is that incentives to factor substitution arise from the existence of different vintages of installed capital equipment, rather than ex ante substitutability. Investment is undertaken to economize on labour costs by replacing older equipment and to meet additional demand. Higher wages reduce the return to incremental investment in supply-constrained states, by reducing the absolute profit margin. However, a wage increase raises the return to incremental investment in demand-constrained states. Since additional output cannot be sold, new equipment can only be used for replacing older vintages and economizing on labour costs. This return depends on the difference in labour costs between old and new equipment, which is greater with higher wages. Hence a wage increase reduces the return to incre- mental investment if supply-constrained states are more likely, but raises investment if the probability of being demand constrained is high. For a given distribution of future demand, I show that there is a critical level of the wage above which the probability of being supply-constrained becomes dominant. Investment is increasing in the wage if it is below this critical level, but decreasing thereafter. The possible positive effect of wage increases on employment may seem surprising and contrary to standard comparative statics under certainty, but it follows from the effects on investment and demand uncertainty. If higher wages reduce investment, this increases employment in demand- constrained states since the firm must use older equipment. This could more than offset the reduced employment in supply-constrained states, thereby increasing expected employment

### FW

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing.

#### Prefer it:

#### 1] Actor specificity:

#### A] Aggregation – every policy benefits some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action.

#### B] No intent-foresight distinction – If we foresee a consequence, then it becomes part of our deliberation which makes it intrinsic to our action since we intend it to happen. Governments not doing this is their fault

#### 2] Phenomenal introspection --- it’s the most epistemically reliable --- historical moral disagreement over internal conceptions of morality such as questions of race, gender, class, religion, etc prove the fallibility of non-observational based ethics --- introspection means we value happiness because we can determine that we each value it --- just as I can observe a lemon’s yellowness, we can make those judgements about happiness.

#### Extinction comes first!

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

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

### UV

#### Aff theory first – a) if we win the NC is abusive, you shouldn’t evaluate the arguments in it, b) norming – it sets norms for all of time but their interp only functions on this topic so it o/w on scope, c) the time-crunched 1ar needs it to beat the 6 minute 2nr

2. Paradigm Issues:

a) No rvis- it’s illogical to vote for them because they’re fair, you don’t win by beating a disad that took time to deal with.

b) competing interps- reasonability necessarily requires judge intervention, which is problematic since we can’t know your bs meter but can make weighing arguments under competing interps

c) drop the debater on theory- anything else is self-serving and arbitrary, making being abusive an no loss, attractive option