I affirm the resolution: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike. Given the resolution’s use of “ought,” the **value** is justice. The **criterion** is utilitarianism. I advocate for this criterion for three reasons:

1. **Policy makers must seek greatest good for most people**

**Robert Goodin, a philosophy professor for Australian National University, writes in his 1995 book *“Utilitarianism as a Public Philosophy”*:** [Robert E, Professor of Philosophy at the Research School of the Social Sciences at the Australian National University, Professor of Government at the University of Essex, “Utilitarianism As a Public Philosophy”, Cambridge University Press, pg 63]

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more plausible for them (or, more precisely, makes them adopt a form of utilitarianism that we would find more acceptable) than private individuals. Before proceeding with that larger argument, I must therefore say what it is that is so special about public officials and their situations that makes it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism.  Consider, first the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices-public and private alike- are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course.  But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, [they] are relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know [is] what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices. But that is all. That is enough to allow public policy makers to use the utilitarian calculus – if they want to use it at all – to choose general rules of conduct. Knowing aggregates and averages, they can proceed to calculate the utility payoffs from adopting each alternative possible general rule. But they cannot be sure what the payoff will be to any given individual or on any particular occasion.

1. **Extinction destroys future society & must be avoided at all costs.**

**Nick Bostrom, faculty of philosophy at Oxford, writes for the journal *Global Policy* in 2012** [Nick Bostrom. Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford. “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy (2012)]

. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving — and ideally improving — our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value. To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

1. **Even a low probability of extinction is still the biggest impact.**

**Bostrom [prev cited] writes for the journal *Global Policy* in 2013**: Bostrom, Nick, Philosopher at University of Oxford. “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy. February 2013.

But This implies that the expected value of reducing existential risk by a mere one millionth of one percentage point is at least a hundred times the value of a million human lives. The more technologically comprehensive estimate of human-brain-emulation subjective life-years (or 1052 lives of ordinary length) makes the same point even more starkly. Even if we give this allegedly lower bound on the cumulative output potential of a technologically mature civilization a mere 1 per cent chance of being correct, we find that the expected value of reducing existential risk by a mere **one billionth of one billionth of one percentage point is worth a hundred billion times as much as a billion human lives.** One might consequently argue that even the tiniest reduction of existential risk has an expected value greater than that of the definite provision of any ‘ordinary’ good, such as the direct benefit of saving 1 billion lives. And, further, that the absolute value of the indirect effect of saving 1 billion lives on the total cumulative amount of existential risk—positive or negative—is almost certainly larger than the positive value of the direct benefit of such an action.10 Maxipok These considerations suggest that the loss in expected value resulting from an **existential catastrophe is so enormous that** the objective of **reducing existential risks should be a dominant consideration whenever we act** out of an impersonal concern for humankind as a whole.

**Observation One: Resolutional Burdens**

1. **Right to Strike Means Right to Collectively Cease Work**

**Investopedia defines strike as “a work stoppage by union members that is endorsed by the union and** that **follows** the **legal requirements** for striking**, such as being voted on by a majority of** union **members.”** (2/2/21)

1. **Workers Means Workers, Not All Workers**

**The resolution only says workers must be granted a right to strike, not all workers. If the aff shows workers should receive such a right, the resolution is true and you should vote aff. We do not need to show that ALL workers deserve such a right**.

1. **Bare Plurals Prove Aff Interpretation**

**The lack of “all” means workers is a “bare plural” & aff can show the resolution true even with exceptions. Prof Nebel explains in ’19 “**Authoritarian regimes” is **a bare plural: [is] a plural noun phrase without an explicit determiner (e.g.,** “five,” “some,” “**all**,” “the,” “most**”). Bare plurals are typically** used to **express generic generalizations, as in “Ravens are black.”** Unlike universally quantified statements, **generics tolerate exceptions.** For example, **“Ravens are black” is true even though “All ravens are black” is false**.” (Victory Briefs, 1/2/19)

1. **Neg Ground: Conditions on the Right to Strike**

**The neg may argue for conditions on the right. For reasons of ground & fairness, the neg must meet several burdens. (1) Literature: The neg must have cards showing someone has argued for the condition. Otherwise the neg can make up any ridiculous scenario and force us to refute it. (2) Right to Strike: The right to strike is collective. The neg must show a collective would undertake such a strike. (3) Not US Restricted: The resolution isn’t US specific. The neg must have a condition that is not unique to the US.**

1. **Aff Ground is a Voting Issue. Neg efforts to impose ridiculous burdens such as proving pilots can’t go on strike when landing a plane or the President can’t go on strike are unfair and destroy debate. Reject those efforts and vote aff to present proper division of ground and fairness.**

**Contention One: Environmental Strikes**

1. **Strikers Will Demand Environmental Protection**

Rosario, 2021

Alexa, CYUNY Hunter College, The Years Project, accessed 10/21/21

**In the 1800s, the labor movement used strikes and public protests to win some of the workers’ rights that are widely accepted today, like the 8-hour work day and paid time off**. Protests were also at the heart of the Civil Rights movement. The famous Memphis strike supported by Martin Luther King lasted from February to April in 1968, helping to provide workers better wages and working conditions. That same year, Latinx students were treated unfairly for speaking their native language in Los Angeles school districts. They staged several walkouts that eventually resulted in school reform and an increase of college enrollment among Latinx youth. **The fight continues today**. Greta Thunberg has ignited a global movement in over 150 different countries and led young people and adults to demand change. Children have taken it upon themselves to combat climate change because it is their future that is most at risk. Researchers say that we have approximately 12 years to cut our gas emissions by at least half to avoid the worst consequences of warming. Because children cannot vote, according to Greta Thunberg, striking is “the most effective way our voices will be heard.” **What began as a small act of defiance by a teenager in front of the Swedish Parliament is sending ripples around the world. A planned walkout by more than 1,500 Amazon employees successfully pressured Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos to be more environmentally conscious**.

1. **Strikers Will Demand Action on Climate Change**

**Neves, 2020**

Felipe, political and environmental analyst, Leaders for Climate Action, Nov. 9 ‘20

Climate **strikes are a common practice for people wanting to make their voices heard and change our current path to ecological catastrophe**. A new wave of young climate activists, such as Greta Thunberg and Luisa Neubauer, has strengthened the movement in the last few years. **All around the world people are protesting in concert against policies and practices that are causing the destruction of ecosystems and warming our planet.**

**Contention Two: Climate Change and Pollution Will Result in Extinction**

1. **On Brink of Irreversible Climate Change – Yet Nothing Being Done**

**Neves, 2020**

Felipe, political and environmental analyst, Leaders for Climate Action, Nov. 9 ‘20

This new vitality is justifiable by the urgency of the matter. According to a 2018 IPCC report, our carbon budget of 420 gigatonnes (Gt) of CO2 – the maximum amount of CO2 the earth’s atmosphere can absorb in order to restrain global warming to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels – will expire in approximately nine years. Yet little is being done, at the governmental and production level, to reduce global greenhouse emissions.

1. **Climate Change Will Result In Imminent Extinction**

**Büchs &** **Koch 17**. Milena Büchs Associate in Sustainability, Economics and Low Carbon Transitions U of Leeds, UK. Max Koch Professor of Social Policy Lund U , Sweden. 2017. Postgrowth and Wellbeing. Springer International Publishing. CrossRef, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-59903-8.

The main arguments here are first that much uncertainty remains about the potential and timing of peak oil, future availability of other fossil fuels and development of alternative low energy resources, while the impacts of **climate change** are already immanent and may accelerate within the **very near future**. Second, even if peaks in fossil fuel production occurred in the near future, remaining resources could still be exploited to their maximum. However, this would be **devastating** from a climate change perspective as, according to the latest IPCC scenarios, greenhouse gas emissions **need to turn net-zero** by the second half of this century for there to be a good chance to limit global warming to 2° Celsius (and ideally, below that) (Anderson and Peters 2016). It is telling that some of the more recent debates about ecological limits to growth put much more emphasis on environmental impacts of growth, rather than on peak oil or other resource limitations (Dietz and O’Neill 2013). Differently put, limits of **sinks**, especially to absorb greenhouse gases, and to the regeneration of vital ecosystems are now attracting **greater concern**, compared to limits of resources. Growing economic production generates increasing pressures on the environment due to pollution of air, water and soil, the destruction of natural habitats and landscapes, for instance, through deforestation and the extraction of natural resources. Therefore, growth often also threatens the regeneration of renewable resources such as healthy **soil**, **freshwater** and **forests**, as well as the functioning of vital **ecosystem**s and ecosystems services such as the purification of **air and water**, water **absorption** and **storage** and the related mitigation of **droughts** and **floods**, decomposition and **detox**ification and absorption of **waste**s, **pollination** and **pest control** (Meadows et al. 2004: 83–84). Recent research on planetary boundaries has started to identify **thresholds** of environmental pollution or disturbance of a range of ecosystems services beyond which the functioning of human **life on earth** will be put **at risk**

1. **Pollution Will Result in Imminent Extinction.**

Julian **Cribb 17**, principal of JCA, Fellow of the Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering, former Director, National Awareness, CSIRO, “The Poisoner,” Surviving the 21st Century Chapter 6

Credible ways in which man-made chemicals might **imperil the human future** include: **Undermining the immune systems**, physical and mental health of the population through growing exposure to toxins **Reducing** the **intelligence** of current and future generations through the action of nerve poisons on the developing brains and central nervous systems of children, rendering humanity **less able** to **solve its problems** and adapt to major changes; and by increasing the level of **violent crime** and **conflict** in society, which is closely linked to lower IQ. Bringing down the economy through the massive healthcare costs of having to nurse, treat and maintain a growing proportion of the population disabled by lifelong chronic chemical exposure. By **poisoning** the **ecosystem** services—clean air, water, soil, plants, insects and wildlife—on which humanity **depends for its own survival** and thereby contributing to potential **global ecosystem breakdown** By augmenting the **global arsenal of [WMD]** weapons of mass destruction and hence the **risk of their use** by nations or uncontrollable fanatics.

1. **Climate Change Will Cause Plankton Extinction Which Ends All Life.**

**Holthaus, 15**

(Eric, reporter for the Rollilng Stone, citing data from/quoting Stephanie Dutkiewicz of MIT and Jacquelyn Gill, paleoecologist at the University of Maine, “The Point of No Return: Climate Change Nightmares Are Already Here”, Aug 5 2015 )  
Attendant with this weird wildlife behavior is a **stunning** drop in the number of plankton — **the basis of the ocean's food chain**. In July, that acidifying oceans are likely to have a "quite **traumatic**" impact on plankton diversity, with some species dying out while others flourish. As the oceans absorb carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, it's converted into carbonic acid — and the pH of seawater declines. According to lead author Stephanie Dutkiewicz of MIT, that trend means "the whole food chain is going to be different."¶ The Hansen study may have gotten more attention, but the Dutkiewicz study, and others like it, could have even more dire implications for our future. The rapid changes Dutkiewicz and her colleagues are observing have shocked some of their fellow scientists into thinking that yes, actually, we're heading toward **the worst-case scenario**. Unlike a prediction of massive sea-level rise just decades away, the warming and acidifying oceans represent a problem that seems to have kick-started **a mass extinction** on the same time scale.¶ Jacquelyn Gill is a paleoecologist at the University of Maine. She knows a lot about extinction, and her work is more relevant than ever. Essentially, she's trying to save the species that are alive right now by learning more about what killed off the ones that aren't. The ancient data she studies shows "really compelling evidence that there can be events of abrupt climate change that can happen well within human life spans. **We're talking less than a decade**."

**Contention Two: Environmental Strikes Stop Pollution and Fight Climate Change in Multiple Ways – These are All Independent Solvency Mechanisms**

1. **Environmental Strikes Force Companies to Act on Pollution & Climate**

**Rosario, 2021**

Alexa, CYUNY Hunter College, The Years Project, accessed 10/21/21

**A planned walkout by more than 1,500 Amazon employees successfully pressured** Amazon **CEO** Jeff **Bezos to be** more **environmentally conscious. Amazon’s pledge includes reducing emissions by at least 50 percent, reducing the usage of water by as much as 80 percent, and achieving zero-waste-to landfill. To help meet its goals, Amazon ordered 100,000 electric delivery trucks.**.

1. **Climate Strikes Force Government Action on Pollution and Climate**

**Rosario, 2021**

Alexa, CYUNY Hunter College, The Years Project, accessed 10/21/21

**Climate strikes have been successful internationally,** too**. In Germany, protestors pressured the German government into passing a 54 billion dollar euro package of measures for tackling climate change in September.** In fact, **over 1000 local governments in 19 countries have declared a climate emergency and committed to action to decrease emissions**.

1. **Studies Show Environmental Strikes Encourage Individual Action By Making People Feel Empowered to Fight Climate Change**

**Andrei 2021**

Mihai Andrei, Author, ZME Science, April 15, 2021

**According to one study**, it can. The research, recently published in the Journal of Environmental Psychology, suggests **striking can promote the psychological factors most important for fighting against climate change. “If you’re wondering what you, as an individual, can do to support action against climate change, joining a strike** (and asking your friends, family and colleagues to come with you) **is a very good start,”** the study authors Belinda Xie and Ben Newell from University of New South Wales write in an article explaining their findings. They started from previous research, which suggests that a range of factors affect people’s willingness to act on climate change. The idea was to see what are the most important factors and how they could be addressed, and they investigated this by surveying a large sample of Australians, asking them how willing they would be to act on climate change, support social interventions, or taking advocacy action. “We found that the three most important variables in predicting an individual’s willingness to act were affect, mitigation response inefficacy, and social norms,” the researchers write.. The most important factor, affect, refers to how unpleasant people found climate change directly. The more unpleasant they found it, the more likely they were to be willing to act on climate change. So should we make people feel worse about climate change? The answer isn’t straightforward. It’s good that people are aware that climate change is a real problem, and it helps that we feel some sense of urgency. But given the global nature of the problem, people are increasingly feeling helpless and anxious about it, without any solutions to work on. This is where the second aspect comes in.: mitigation response inefficacy, or “inefficacy” for short. In other words, this is a feeling that no matter what your nation does, it’s not enough to reduce the global effects of climate change — a feeling of powerlessness. **The more powerless people feel, the less likely they are to act, so researchers emphasize promoting collective action, emphasizing the difference we can make together**. For instance, there is a big difference between these two sentences, although they mean the same thing, and recent research suggests that the second is far more motivating: If one person for a week reduced their TV usage by 20 percent, then, in total, they would prevent 0.5kg of CO₂ being released into the environment. If 1,000 people for a week reduced their TV usage by 20 percent, then, in total, they would prevent 500kg of CO₂ being released into the environment. **This is where the strike part comes in**. **By participating in the strike, people are emphasizing collective action over individual action, which is more effective**.

1. **Climate Strikes Encourage Individual Action By Creating a Norm and Social Pressure to Fight Climate Change**

**Andrei 2021**

Mihai Andrei, Author, ZME Science, April 15, 2021

**Social norms capture the extent to which people important to you are acting on climate change (descriptive norms) and the extent to which you think those people expect you to act on climate change (prescriptive norms),” they write. The more people participate in the strike, the more acceptable it becomes to take different action on climate change**..

1. **Climate Strikes Attract Media Attention Which Increases Pressure to Address Pollution and Climate Change**

**Neves, 2020**

Felipe, political and environmental analyst, Leaders for Climate Action, Nov. 9 ‘20

**The uproar caused by the press is also a major contribution brought about by the strikes. The more people participate, the louder the “buzz” and, consequently, the bigger the interest of the media in the cause. The dissemination of the ideals of the movement is important to raise awareness amongst the population, and having allies in the media is extremely important for this.** Major news outlets, such as the Guardian in the UK and the New York Times in the US**, regularly publish articles and op-eds about the** climate **strikes. For instance, during the last climate week of action,** in September of this year, **the Guardian reported extensively** on the protests, **covering in detail what was taking place** around the globe**, the numbers, their demands, and rationale.**.

1. **Individual Action Can Solve Climate Change and Pollution**

**Williamson, 2018**

Williamson, K., Satre-Meloy, A., Velasco, K., & Green, K., 2018. Climate Change Needs Behavior Change: Making the Case For Behavioral Solutions to Reduce Global Warming. Arlington, VA: Rare.

**As individuals, people often report feeling hopeless that they can effect change on a scale that matters for something as big as climate change. But individual behavior change when taken up by billions of people makes a decisive difference. Nearly two-thirds of global emissions are linked to both direct and indirect forms of human consumption;** despite what the headlines suggest, **even conservative estimates for the potential of changing behaviors to reduce natural resource consumption represent an enormous contribution to reducing global emissions**.