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**I negate the resolution, resolved: A just government ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike.**

**Merriam webster defines “unconditional” as**

https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/unconditional

: not conditional or limited : ABSOLUTE, UNQUALIFIED

**That means the burden of the AFFIRMATIVE is to defend the right to strike is good in EVERY instance, one reason strikes are bad is sufficient to negate.**

I’ll concede the util framework.

## OFFENSE

## Contention 1: Police

#### Police Strikes are used to combat racial progress and attempts to limit police power. Making them legal and easier only make progress much harder.

Andrew Grim 2020 What is the ‘blue flu’ and how has it increased police power? https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2020/07/01/what-is-blue-flu-how-has-it-increased-police-power/

But the result of such protests matter deeply as we consider police reform today. Historically, blue flu strikes have helped expand police power, ultimately limiting the ability of city governments to reform, constrain or conduct oversight over the police. They allow the police to leverage public fear of crime to extract concessions from municipalities. This became clear in Detroit more than 50 years ago. In June 1967, tensions arose between Detroit Mayor Jerome Cavanagh and the Detroit Police Officers Association (DPOA), which represented the city’s 3,300 patrol officers. The two were at odds primarily over police demands for a pay increase. Cavanagh showed no signs of caving to the DPOA’s demands and had, in fact, proposed to cut the police department’s budget. On June 15, the DPOA escalated the dispute with a walkout: 323 officers called in sick. The number grew over the next several days as the blue flu spread, reaching a height of 800 absences on June 17. In tandem with the walkout, the DPOA launched a fearmongering media campaign to win over the public. They took out ads in local newspapers warning Detroit residents, “How does it feel to be held up? Stick around and find out!” This campaign took place at a time of rising urban crime rates and uprisings, and only a month before the 1967 Detroit riot, making it especially potent. The DPOA understood this climate and used it to its advantage. With locals already afraid of crime and displeased at Cavanagh’s failure to rein it in, they would be more likely to demand the return of the police than to demand retribution against officers for an illegal strike. The DPOA’s strategy paid off. The walkout left Detroit Police Commissioner Ray Girardin feeling “practically helpless.” “I couldn’t force them to work,” he later told The Washington Post. Rather than risk public ire by allowing the blue flu to continue, Cavanagh relented. Ultimately, the DPOA got the raises it sought, making Detroit officers the highest paid in the nation. This was far from the end of the fight between Cavanagh and the DPOA. In the ensuing months and years, they continued to tussle over wages, pensions, the budget, the integration of squad cars and the hiring of black officers. The threat of another blue flu loomed over all these disputes, helping the union to win many of them. And Detroit was not an outlier. Throughout the 1960s, ’70s and ’80s, the blue flu was a [ubiquitous and highly effective](https://www.akpress.org/our-enemies-in-blue.html) tactic in Baltimore, Memphis, New Orleans, Chicago, Newark, New York and many other cities. In most cases, as author Kristian Williams writes, “When faced with a walkout or slowdown, the authorities usually decided that the pragmatic need to get the cops back to work trumped the city government’s long term interest in diminishing the rank and file’s power.” But each time a city relented to this pressure, they ceded more and more power to police unions, which would turn to the strategy repeatedly to defend officers’ interests — particularly when it came to efforts to address systemic racism in police policies and practices. In 1970, black residents of Pittsburgh’s North Side neighborhood raised an outcry over the “hostile sadistic treatment” they experienced at the hands of white police officers. They lobbied Mayor Peter F. Flaherty to assign more black officers to their neighborhood. The mayor agreed, transferring several white officers out of the North Side and replacing them with black officers. While residents cheered this decision, white officers and the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP), which represented them, were furious. They slammed the transfer as “discrimination” against whites. About 425 of the Pittsburgh Police Department’s 1,600 police officers called out sick in protest. Notably, black police officers broke with their white colleagues and refused to join the walkout. They praised the transfer as a “long overdue action” and viewed the walkout as a betrayal of officers’ oath to protect the public. Nonetheless, the tactic paid off. After several days, Flaherty caved to the “open revolt” of white officers, agreeing to halt the transfers and instead submit the dispute to binding arbitration between the city and the police union. Black officers, though, continued to speak out against their union’s support of racist practices, and many of them later resigned from the union in protest. Similar scenarios played out in Detroit, Chicago and other cities in the 1960s and ’70s, as white officers continually staged walkouts to preserve the segregated status quo in their departments. These blue flu strikes amounted to an authoritarian power grab by police officers bent on avoiding oversight, rejecting reforms and shoring up their own authority. In the aftermath of the 1967 Detroit walkout, a police commissioner’s aide strongly criticized the police union’s strong-arm tactics, saying “it smacks of a police state.” The clash left one newspaper editor wondering, “Who’s the Boss of the Detroit Police?” But in the “law and order” climate of the late 1960s, such criticism did not resonate enough to stir a groundswell of public opinion against the blue flu. And police unions dismissed critics by arguing that officers had “no alternative” but to engage in walkouts to get city officials to make concessions. Crucially, the very effectiveness of the blue flu may be premised on a myth. While police unions use public fear of crime skyrocketing without police on duty, in many cases, the absence of police did not lead to a rise in crime. In New York City in 1971, [for example](https://untappedcities.com/2020/06/12/the-week-without-police-what-we-can-learn-from-the-1971-police-strike/), 20,000 officers called out sick for five days over a pay dispute without any apparent increase in crime. The most striking aspect of the walkout, as one observer noted, “might be just how unimportant it seemed.” Today, municipalities are under immense pressure from activists who have taken to the streets to protest the police killings of black men and women. Some have already responded by enacting new policies and cutting police budgets. As it continues, more blue flus are likely to follow as officers seek to wrest back control of the public debate on policing and reassert their independence.

#### Those strikes cement a police culture which leads to endless amounts of racist violence and the bolstering of the prison industrial complex.

Chaney and Ray 13, Cassandra (Has a PhD and is a professor at LSU. Also has a strong focus in the structure of Black families) , and Ray V. Robertson (Also has a PhD and is a criminal justice professor at LSU). "Racism and police brutality in America." *Journal of African American Studies* 17.4 (2013): 480-505. SM//do I really need a card for this

Racism and Discrimination According to Marger (2012), “racism is an ideology, or belief system, designed to justify and rationalize racial and ethnic inequality” (p. 25) and “discrimination, most basically, is behavior aimed at denying members of particular ethnic groups’ equal access to societal rewards” (p. 57). Defining both of these concepts from the onset is important for they provide the lens through which our focus on the racist and discriminatory practices of law enforcement can occur. Since the time that Africans [African Americans] were forcibly brought to America, they have been the victims of racist and discriminatory practices that have been spurred and/or substantiated by those who create and enforce the law. For example, The Watts Riots of 1965, the widespread assaults against Blacks in Harlem during the 1920s (King 2011), law enforcement violence against Black women (i.e., Malaika Brooks, Jaisha Akins, Frankie Perkins, Dr. Mae Jemison, Linda Billups, Clementine Applewhite) and other ethnic women of color (Ritchie 2006), the beating of Rodney King, and the deaths of Amadou Diallo in the 1990s and Trayvon Martin more recently are just a few public examples of the historical and contemporaneous ways in which Blacks in America have been assaulted by members of the police system (King 2011; Loyd 2012; Murch 2012; Rafail et al. 2012). In Punishing Race (2011), law professor Michael Tonry’s research findings point to the fact that Whites tend to excuse police brutality against Blacks because of the racial animus that they hold against Blacks. Thus, to Whites, Blacks are viewed as deserving of harsh treatment in the criminal justice system (Peffley and Hurwitz 2013). At first glance, such an assertion may seem to be unfathomable, buy that there is an extensive body of literature which suggests that Black males are viewed as the “prototypical criminal,” and this notion is buttressed in the media, by the general public, and via disparate sentencing outcomes (Blair et al. 2004; Eberhardt et al. 2006; Gabiddon 2010; Maddox and Gray 2004; Oliver and Fonash 2002; Staples 2011). For instance, Blair et al. (2004) revealed that Black males with more Afrocentric features (e.g., dark skin, broad noses, full lips) may receive longer sentences than Blacks with less Afrocentric features, i.e., lighter skin and straighter hair (Eberhardt et al. 2006). Shaun Gabiddon in Criminological Theories on Race and Crime (2010) discussed the concept of “Negrophobia” which was more extensively examined by Armour (1997). Negrophobia can be surmised as an irrational of Blacks, which includes a fear of being victimized by Black, that can result in Whites shooting or harming an AfricanAmerican based on criminal/racial stereotypes (Armour 1997). The aforementioned racialized stereotypical assumptions can be deleterious because they can be used by Whites to justify shooting a Black person on the slightest of pretense (Gabiddon 2010). Finally, African-American males represent a group that has been much maligned in the larger society (Tonry 2011). Further, as victims of the burgeoning prison industrial complex, mass incarceration, and enduring racism, the barriers to truly independent Black male agency are ubiquitous and firmly entrenched (Alexander 2010; Chaney 2009; Baker 1996; Blackmon 2008; Dottolo and Stewart 2008; Karenga 2010; Martin et al. 2001; Smith and Hattery 2009). Thus, racism and discrimination heightens the psychological distress experienced by Blacks (Robertson 2011; Pieterse et al. 2012), as well as their decreased mortality in the USA (Muennig and Murphy 2011). Police Brutality Against Black Males According to Walker (2011), police brutality is defined as “the use of excessive physical force or verbal assault and psychological intimidation” (p. 579). Although one recent study suggests that the NYPD has become better behaved due to greater race and gender diversity (Kane and White 2009), Blacks are more likely to be the victims of police brutality. A growing body of scholarly research related to police brutality has revealed that Blacks are more likely than Whites to make complaints regarding police brutality (Smith and Holmes 2003), to be accosted while operating [driving] a motorized vehicle (“Driving While Black”), and to underreport how often they are stopped due to higher social desirability factors (TomaskovicDevey et al. 2006). Interestingly, data obtained from the General Social Survey (GSS), a representative sample conducted biennially by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago for the years 1994 through 2004, provide further proof regarding the acceptance of force against Blacks. In particular, the GSS found Whites to be significantly (29.5 %) more accepting of police use of force when a citizen was attempting to escape custody than Blacks when analyzed using the chi-squared statistical test (p The average Southern policeman is a promoted poor White with a legal sanction to use a weapon. His social heritage has taught him to despise the Negroes, and he has had little education which could have changed him….The result is that probably no group of Whites in America have a lower opinion of the Negro people and are more fixed in their views than Southern policeman. (Myrdal 1944, pp. 540–541) Myrdal (1944) was writing on results from a massive study that he undertook in the late 1930s. He was writing at a time that even the most conservative among us would have to admit was not a colorblind society (if one even believes in such things). But current research does corroborate his observations that less educated police officers tend to be the most aggressive and have the most formal complaints filed against them when compared to their more educated counterparts (Hassell and Archbold 2010; Jefferis et al. 2011). Tonry (2011) delineates some interesting findings from the 2001 Race, Crime, and Public Opinion Survey that can be applied to understanding why the larger society tolerates police misconduct when it comes to Black males. The survey, which involved approximately 978 non-Hispanic Whites and 1,010 Blacks, revealed a divergence in attitudes between Blacks and Whites concerning the criminal justice system (Tonry 2011). For instance, 38 % of Whites and 89 % of Blacks viewed the criminal justice system as biased against Blacks (Tonry 2011). Additionally, 8 % of Blacks and 56 % of Whites saw the criminal justice system as treating Blacks fairly (Tonry 2011). Perhaps most revealing when it comes to facilitating an environment ripe for police brutality against Black males, 68 % of Whites and only 18 % of Whites expressed confidence in law enforcement (Tonry 2011). Is a society wherein the dominant group overwhelming approves of police performance willing to do anything substantive to curtail police brutality against Black males? Police brutality is not a new phenomenon. The Department of Justice (DOJ) office of Civil Rights (OCR) has investigated more than a dozen police departments in major cities across the USA on allegations of either racial discrimination or police brutality (Gabbidon and Greene 2013). To make the aforementioned even more clear, according to Gabbidon and Greene (2013), “In 2010, the OCR was investigating 17 police departments across the country and monitoring five settlements regarding four police agencies” (pp. 119–120). Plant and Peruche (2005) provide some useful information into why police officers view Black males as potential perpetrators and could lead to acts of brutality. In their research, the authors suggest that since Black people in general, and Black males in particular, are caricatured as aggressive and criminal, police are more likely to view Black men as a threat which justifies the disproportionate use of deadly force. Therefore, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that police officers’ decisions to act aggressively may, to some extent, be influenced by race (Jefferis et al. 2011). The media’s portrayals of Black men are often less than sanguine. Bryson’s (1998) work in this area provides empirical evidence that the mass media that has been instrumental in portraying Black men as studs, super detectives, or imitation White men and has a general negative effect on how these men are regarded by others. Such characterizations can be so visceral in nature that “prototypes” of criminal suspects are more likely to be African-American (Oliver et al. 2004). Not surprisingly, the more Afrocentric the African-American’s facial features, the more prone he or she is expected to be deviant (Eberhardt et al. 2006). Interestingly, it is probable that less than flattering depictions of Black males on television and in news stories are activating pre-existing stereotypes possessed by Whites as opposed to facilitating their creation. According to Oliver et al. (2004), “it is important to keep in mind that media consumption is an active process, with viewers’ existing attitudes and beliefs playing a larger role in how images are attended to, interpreted, and remembered” (p. 89). Moreover, it is reductionist to presuppose that individual is powerless in constructing a palatable version of reality and is solely under the control of the media and exercises no agency. Lastly, Peffley and Hurwitz (2013) describe what can be perceived as one of the more deleterious results of negative media caricatures of Black males. More specifically, the authors posit that most Whites believe that Blacks are disproportionately inclined to engage in criminal behavior and are the deserving on harsh treatment by the criminal justice system. On the other hand, such an observation is curious because most urban areas are moderate to highly segregated residentially which would preclude the frequent and significant interaction needed to make such scathing indictments (Bonilla-Silva 2009). Consequently, the aforementioned racial animus has the effect of increased White support for capital punishment if questions regarding its legitimacy around if capital punishment is too frequently applied to Blacks (Peffley and Hurwitz 2013; Tonry 2011). Ultimately, erroneous (negative) portrayals of crime and community, community race and class identities, and concerns over neighborhood change all contribute to place-specific framing of “the crime problem.” These frames, in turn, shape both intergroup dynamics and support for criminal justice policy (Leverentz 2012).

## Contention 2: Innovation

**Global tech innovation high now.**

Mercury News et al 6/4*[Mercury News and East Bay Times Editorial Boards, June 4, 2021, “Editorial: How America can Win the Global Tech War” https://www.mercurynews.com/2021/06/04/editorial-why-silicon-valley-needs-endless-frontier-bill/ //gord0]*

The nation that wins the global tech race will dominate the 21st century. This has been true since the 1800s. Given the rapid pace of innovation and tech’s impact on our economy and defense capabilities in the last decade, there is ample evidence to suggest that the need for investment in tech research and development has never been greater. China has been closing the tech gap in recent years by making bold investments in tech with the intent of overtaking the United States. This is a tech war we cannot afford to lose. It’s imperative that Congress pass the Endless Frontier Act and authorize the biggest R&D tech investment in the United States since the Apollo years. Rep. Ro Khanna, D-Santa Clara, made a massive increase in science and technology investment a major part of his platform while campaigning for a seat in Congress in 2016. Now the co-author of the 600-page legislation is on the cusp of pushing through a bipartisan effort that has been years in the making. Khanna and his co-authors, Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., Sen. Todd Young, R-Ind., and Rep. Mike Gallagher, R-Wisc., are shepherding the bill through the Senate, which is expected to approve it sometime later this month. That would set up a reconciliation debate between the House and Senate that would determine the bill’s final language. The ultimate size of the investment is still very much up in the air. Khanna would like Congress to authorize $100 billion over a five-year period for critical advancements in artificial intelligence, biotechnology, cybersecurity, semiconductors and other cutting-edge technologies. The Senate is talking of knocking that number down to $50 billion or $75 billion. They should be reminded of China Premier Li Keqiang’s March announcement that China would increase its research and development spending by an additional 7% per year between 2021 and 2025. The United States still outspends China in R&D, spending $612 billion on research and development in 2019, compared to China’s $514 billion. But the gap is narrowing. At the turn of the century, China was only spending $33 billion a year on R&D, while the United States was spending nearly 10 times that amount. The bill would authorize 10 technology hubs throughout the nation designed to help build the infrastructure, manufacturing facilities and workforce needed to help meet the nation’s tech goals. Building tech centers throughout the United States should also create more support for the industry across the country. Tech’s image has taken a beating in recent years — the emergence of the term “Big Tech” is hardly a positive development — and the industry will need all the support it can muster in Congress. The United States continues to have a crucial tech edge over its competitors, most notably China. The only way we can hope to win the 21st century is to make significant investments in research and development that will spark the next wave of innovation.

**Strike efforts are increasing – they slow innovation, specifically in the tech sector.**

Hanasoge 16 *[Chaithra; Senior Research Analyst, Market Researcher, Consumer Insights, Strategy Consulting; “The Union Strikes: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly,” Supply Wisdom; April/June 2016 (Doesn’t specifically say but this is the most recent event is cites); https://www.supplywisdom.com/resources/the-union-strikes-the-good-the-bad-and-the-ugly/]//SJWen*

The result: Verizon conceded to several of the workers’ demands including hiring union workers, protection against outsourcing of call-center jobs, and employee benefits such as salary hikes and higher pension contributions, among others and thus bringing an end to the strike in June.

The repercussion: The strike witnessed **several instances** of **social** disorder, violence and clashes, ultimately calling for third party intervention (Secretary of Labor – Thomas Perez) to initiate negotiations between the parties. Also, as a result of the strike, Verizon reported lower than **expected** revenues in the **second quarter of 2016**. Trade unions/ labor unions aren’t just this millennia’s product and has been in vogue since times immemorial. Unions, to **ensure fairness** to the working class, have gone on strike **for better working conditions** and employee benefits since the **industrial revolution** and are as strong today as they were last century. With the **advent of technology and** advancement in a**rtificial** i**ntelligence**, machines are grabbing the jobs which were once the bastion of the humans. So, questions that arise here are, what relevance do unions have in today’s work scenario? And, are the strikes organized by them avoidable? As long as the concept of labor exists and employees feel that they are not receiving their fair share of dues, unions will exist and thrive. Union protests in most cases cause work stoppages, and in certain cases, disruption of law and order. Like in March 2016, public servants at Federal Government **departments across Australia** went on a series of strikes over failed pay negotiations, disrupt**ing** operations of many **government departments** for a few days.  Besides such direct effects, there are many **indirect** effects as well such as strained **employee** relations, slower **work** processes, lesser productivity and **unnecessary legal** hassles. Also, union strikes can **never be taken too lightly** as they have prompted major overturn of decisions, on a few occasions. Besides the Verizon **incident** that was a crucial example of this, nationwide strikes were witnessed in India in March and April this year when the national government introduced reforms related to the withdrawal regulations and interest rate of employee provident fund, terming it as ‘anti-working class’. This compelled the government to withhold the reform for further review. In France, strike against labor law reforms in May turned violent, resulting in riots and significant damage to property. The incident prompted the government to consider modifications to the proposed reforms. However, aside from employee concerns, such incidents are also determined by a number of other factors such as the country’s political scenario, economy, size of the overall workforce and the unions, history of unionization, labor laws, and culture. For example, it is a popular saying that the French are always on strike as per tradition (although recent statistics indicate a decline in frequency). In a communist government like China, strikes have steadily risen in number. In 2015, China Labor Bulletin (CLB), a Hong Kong-based workers’ rights group recorded 2,700 incidents of strikes and protests, compared to 1,300 incidents in 2014. Most of them have stemmed out of failure by the government to respect the basic rights of employees and address labor concerns. Interestingly, unions have not **been able to** gain a **strong** foothold in the IT**-BPO** industry. While many countries do have a separate union to represent workers from the sector, incidents of strikes like Verizon have been **relatively** low.  However, workplace regulations, in addition to other factors mentioned could be a trigger for such incidents, even if on a smaller scale. For example, a recent survey that **interviewed several BPO employees** in India revealed that while **forming a union** in the BPO sector was **difficult**, irksome workplace regulations such as constant surveillance, irregular timings and incentives have prompted employees to express their resentment in smaller ways such as corruption of internal servers and so on.  Such risks are further enhanced in a city like Kolkata, which carries a strong trade union culture.

**The Aff mobilizes unions in the IT sector.**

Vynck et al 21 *[Gerrit De; Carleton University, BA in Journalism and Global Politics, tech reporter for The Washington Post. He writes about Google and the algorithms that increasingly shape society. He previously covered tech for seven years at Bloomberg News; Nitashu Tiku; Columbia University, BA in English, New York University, MA in Journalism, Washington Post's tech culture reporter based in San Francisco; Macalester College, BA in English, Columbia University, MS in Journalism, reporter for The Washington Post who is focused on technology coverage in the Pacific Northwest; “Six things to know about the latest efforts to bring unions to Big Tech,” The Washington Post; https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/01/26/tech-unions-explainer/]//SJWen*

In response to **tech** company crackdowns and lobbying, gig workers have shifted their strategy to emphasize building **worker-led** movements and increasing their ranks, rather than focusing on employment status as the primary goal, says Veena Dubal, a law professor at the University of California Hastings College of the Law in San Francisco. The hope is that with **President Biden in the White House and an even split in the Senate**, legislators will mobilize at the federal level, through the NLRA or bills such asthe PRO Act, to recognize gig worker **collectives as real** unions.

**Technological innovation solves every existential threat – which outweighs.**

Matthews 18 *Dylan. Co-founder of Vox, citing Nick Beckstead @ Rutgers University. 10-26-2018. "How to help people millions of years from now." Vox. https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/26/18023366/far-future-effective-altruism-existential-risk-doing-good*

If you care about improving human lives, you should overwhelmingly care about those quadrillions of lives rather than the comparatively small number of people alive today. The 7.6 billion people now living, after all, amount to less than 0.003 percent of the population that will live in the **future**. It’s reasonable to suggest that those **quadrillions** of future people have, accordingly, hundreds of thousands of times more moral weight than those of us living here **today** do. That’s the basic argument behind Nick Beckstead’s 2013 Rutgers philosophy dissertation, “On the overwhelming importance of shaping the far future.” It’s a glorious mindfuck of a thesis, not least because Beckstead shows very convincingly that this is a conclusion any plausible moral view would reach. It’s not just something that weird utilitarians have to deal with. And Beckstead, to his considerable credit, walks the walk on this. He works at the Open Philanthropy Project on grants relating to the far future and runs a charitable fund for donors who want to prioritize the far future. And arguments from him and others have turned “long-termism” into a very vibrant, important strand of the effective altruism community. But what does prioritizing the far future even mean? The most **literal** thing it could mean is preventing human **extinction**, to ensure that the species persists as long as possible. For the long-term-focused effective altruists I know, that typically means identifying concrete threats to humanity’s continued existence — like unfriendly artificial intelligence, or a pandemic, or global warming/out of control geoengineering — and engaging in activities to prevent that specific eventuality. But in a set of slides he made in 2013, Beckstead makes a compelling case that while that’s certainly **part** of what caring about the far future entails, approaches that address **specific threats** to humanity (which he calls “**targeted**” approaches to the far future) have to **complement** “**broad**” approaches, where instead of trying to **predict** what’s going to kill us all, you just **generally** try to keep **civilization running as best it can**, so that it is, as a whole, well-equipped to deal with **potential** extinction events in the **future**, not just in 2030 or 2040 but in 3500 or 95000 or even 37 million. In other words, caring about the far future **doesn’t mean just paying attention to low-probability risks of total annihilation**; it also means acting on pressing needs **now**. For example: We’re going to be **better prepared** to prevent extinction from AI or a supervirus or **global** warming if society as a whole makes **a lot of** scientific progress. And a significant bottleneck there is that the vast majority of humanity doesn’t get high-enough-quality education to engage in scientific research, if they want to, which reduces the odds that we have enough trained scientists to come up with the breakthroughs we need as a civilization to survive and thrive. So maybe one of the best things we can do for the **far future** is to improve school systems — here and now — to harness the group economist Raj Chetty calls “lost Einsteins” (**potential** innovators who are thwarted by poverty and inequality in rich countries) and, more importantly, the hundreds of millions of kids in developing countries dealing with even worse education systems than those in depressed communities in the rich world. What if living ethically for the far future means living ethically now? Beckstead mentions some other broad, or very broad, ideas (these are all his descriptions): Help make computers faster so that people everywhere can work more efficiently Change intellectual property law so that technological innovation can happen more quickly Advocate for open borders so that people from poorly governed countries can move to better-governed countries and be more productive Meta-research: improve **incentives** and norms in **academic work** to better advance human knowledge Improve education Advocate for political party X to make future people have values more like political party X ”If you look at these areas (economic growth and technological progress, access to information, individual capability, social coordination, motives) a lot of everyday good works contribute,” Beckstead writes. “An implication of this is that a lot of everyday good works are good from a broad perspective, even though hardly anyone thinks explicitly in terms of far future standards.” Look at those examples again: It’s just a list of what normal altruistically motivated people, not effective altruism folks, generally do. Charities in the US love talking about the lost opportunities for innovation that poverty creates. Lots of smart people who want to make a difference become scientists, or try to work as teachers or on improving education policy, and lord knows there are plenty of people who become political party operatives out of a conviction that the moral consequences of the party’s platform are good. All of which is to say: Maybe effective altruists aren’t that special, or at least maybe we don’t have access to that many specific and weird conclusions about how best to help the world. If the far future is what matters, and generally trying to make the world work better is among the best ways to help the far future, then effective altruism just becomes plain ol’ do-goodery.

## Contention 3: Hospitals

#### **Nurse strikes devastates hospitals.**

Wright 10 *Sarah H. Wright July 2010 "Evidence on the Effects of Nurses' Strikes" https://www.nber.org/digest/jul10/evidence-effects-nurses-strikes (Researcher at National Bureau of Economic Research)*

U.S. hospitals were excluded from collective bargaining laws for three decades longer than other sectors because of fears that strikes by nurses might imperil patients' health. Today, while unionization has been declining in general, it is growing rapidly in hospitals, with the number of unionized workers rising from 679,000 in 1990 to nearly one million in 2008. In Do Strikes Kill? Evidence from New York State (NBER Working Paper No. 15855), co-authors Jonathan Gruber and Samuel Kleiner carefully examine the effects of nursing strikes on patient care and outcomes. The researchers match data on nurses' strikes in New York State from 1984 to 2004 to data on hospital discharges, including information on treatment intensity, patient mortality, and hospital readmission. They conclude that nurses' strikes were costly to hospital patients: in-hospital mortality increased by 19.4 percent and hospital readmissions increased by 6.5 percent for patients admitted during a strike. Among their sample of 38,228 such patients, an estimated 138 more individuals died than would have without a strike, and 344 more patients were readmitted to the hospital than if there had been no strike. "Hospitals functioning during nurses' strikes do so at a lower quality of patient care," they write. Still, at hospitals experiencing strikes, the measures of treatment intensity -- that is, the length of hospital stay and the number of procedures performed during the patient's stay -- show no significant differences between striking and non-striking periods. Patients appear to receive the same intensity of care during union work stoppages as during normal hospital operations. Thus, the poor outcomes associated with strikes suggest that they might reduce hospital productivity. These poor health outcomes increased for both emergency and non-emergency hospital patients, even as admissions of both groups decreased by about 28 percent at hospitals with strikes. The poor health outcomes were not apparent either before or after the strike in the striking hospitals, suggesting that they are attributable to the strike itself. And, the poor health outcomes do not appear to do be due to different types of patients being admitted during strike periods, because patients admitted during a strike are very similar to those admitted during other periods. Hiring replacement workers apparently does not help: hospitals that hired replacement workers performed no better during strikes than those that did not hire substitute employees. In each case, patients with conditions that required intensive nursing were more likely to fare worse in the presence of nurses' strikes.

#### Hospitals are the critical internal link for pandemic preparedness.

Thobaity 20, *Abdullelah, and Farhan Alshammari. "Nurses on the frontline against the COVID-19 pandemic: an Integrative review." Dubai Medical Journal 3.3 (2020): 87-92. (Associate Professor of Nursing at Taif University)*

The majority of infected or symptomatic people seek medical treatment in medical facilities, particularly hospitals , as a high number of cases, especially those in critical condition, will have an impact on hospitals [4]. The concept of hospital resilience in disaster situations is defined as the ability to recover from the damage caused by huge disturbances quickly [2]. The resilience of hospitals to pandemic cases depends on the preparedness of the institutions, and not all hospitals have the same resilience. A lower resilience will affect the sustainability of the health services. This also affects healthcare providers such as doctors, nurses, and allied health professionals [5, 6]. Despite the impact on healthcare providers, excellent management of a pandemic depends on the level of preparedness of healthcare providers, including nurses. This means that if it was impossible to be ready before a crisis or disaster, responsible people will do all but the impossible save lives.

#### New pandemics are deadlier and faster are coming – COVID is just the beginning.

Antonelli 20 As*hley Fuoco Antonelli 5-15-2020 https://www.advisory.com/daily- briefing/2020/05/15/weekly-line "Weekly line: Why deadly disease outbreaks could become more common—even after Covid-19" (Associate Editor — American Health Line)*

While the new coronavirus pandemic suddenly took the world by storm, the truth is public health experts for years have warned that a virus similar to the new coronavirus would cause the next pandemic – and they say deadly infectious disease outbreaks could become more common. Infectious disease experts are always on the lookout for the next pandemic, and in a report published two years ago, researchers from the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health predicted that the pathogen most likely to cause the next pandemic would be a virus similar to the common cold. Specifically, the researchers predicted that the pathogen at fault for the next pandemic would be: A microbe for which people have not yet developed immunities, meaning that a large portion of the human population would be susceptible to infection; Contagious during the so-called "incubation period"—the time when people are infected with a pathogen but are not yet showing symptoms of the infection or are showing only mild symptoms; and Resistant to any known prevention or treatment methods. The researchers also concluded that such a pathogen would have a "low but significant" fatality rate, meaning the pathogen wouldn't kill human hosts fast enough to inhibit its spread. As Amesh Adalja—a senior scholar at the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security, who led the report—told Live Science's Rachael Rettner at the time, "It just has to make a lot of people sick" to disrupt society. The researchers said RNA viruses—which include the common cold, influenza, and severe acute respiratory syndrome (or SARS, which is caused by a type of coronavirus)—fit that bill. And even though we had a good bit of experience dealing with common RNA viruses like the flu, Adalja at the time told Rettner that there were "a whole host of viral families that get very little attention when it comes to pandemic preparedness." Not even two years later, the new coronavirus, which causes Covid-19, emerged and quickly spread throughout the world, reaching pandemic status in just a few months. To date, officials have reported more than 4.4 million cases of Covid-19 and 302,160 deaths tied to the new coronavirus globally. In the United States, the number of reported Covid-19 cases has reached more than 1.4 million and the number of reported deaths tied to the new coronavirus has risen to nearly 86,000 in just over three months. Although public health experts had warned about the likelihood of a respiratory-borne RNA virus causing the next global pandemic, many say the world was largely unprepared to handle this type of infectious disease outbreak. And as concerning as that revelation may be on its own, perhaps even more worrisome is that public health experts predict life-threatening infectious disease outbreaks are likely to become more common—meaning we could be susceptible to another pandemic in the future. Why experts think deadly infectious disease outbreaks could become more common As the Los Angeles Times's Joshua Emerson Smith notes, infectious disease experts for more than ten years now have noted that "[o]utbreaks of dangerous new diseases with the potential to become pandemics have been on the rise- from HIV to swine flu to SARS to Ebola”. For instance, a report published in Nature in 2008 found that the number of emerging infectious disease events that occurred in the 1990s was more than three times higher than it was in the 1940s. Many experts believe the recent increase in infectious disease outbreaks is tied of human behaviors that disrupt the environment, “such as deforestation and poaching,” which have led "to increased contact between highly mobile, urbanized human populations and wild animals," Emerson Smith writes. In the 2008 report, for example, researchers noted that about 60% of 355 emerging infectious disease events that occurred over a 50-year period could be largely linked to wild animals, livestock, and, to a lesser extent, pets. Now, researchers believe the new coronavirus first jumped to humans from animals at a wildlife market in Wuhan, China. Along those same lines, some experts have argued that global climate change has driven an increase in infectious diseases—and could continue to do so. A federally mandated report released by the U.S. Global Change Research Program in 2018 warned that warmer temperatures could expand the geographic range covered by disease-carrying insects and pests, which could result in more Americans being exposed to ticks carrying Lyme disease and mosquitos carrying the dengue, West Nile, and Zika viruses. And experts now say continued warming in global temperatures, deforestation, and other environmentally disruptive behaviors have broadened that risk by bringing more people into contact with disease-carrying animals. Further, experts notes that infectious diseases today are able to spread much faster and farther than they could decades ago because of increasing globalization and travel. While some have suggested the Covid-19 pandemic could stifle that trend, others argue globalization is likely to continue—meaning so could infectious diseases' far spread.

#### Future pandemics will cause extinction – it only takes one ‘super-spreader’ – US prevention is key.

Bar-Yam 16 *Yaneer Bar-Yam 7-3-2016 “Transition to extinction: Pandemics in a connected world” http://necsi.edu/research/social/pandemics/transition (Professor and President, New England Complex System Institute; PhD in Physics, MIT)*

Watch as one of the more aggressive—brighter red — strains rapidly expands. After a time it goes extinct leaving a black region. Why does it go extinct? The answer is that it spreads so rapidly that it kills the hosts around it. Without new hosts to infect it then dies out itself. That the rapidly spreading pathogens die out has important implications for evolutionary research which we have talked about elsewhere [1–7]. In the research I want to discuss here, what we were interested in is the effect of adding long range transportation [8]. This includes natural means of dispersal as well as unintentional dispersal by humans, like adding airplane routes, which is being done by real world airlines (Figure 2). When we introduce long range transportation into the model, the success of more aggressive strains changes. They can use the long range transportation to find new hosts and escape location extinction. Figure 3 shows that the more transportation routes introduced into the model, the more higher aggressive pathogens are able to survive and spread. As we add more long range transportation, there is a critical point at which pathogens become so aggressive that the entire host population dies. The pathogens die at the same time, but that is not exactly a consolation to the hosts. We call this the phase transition to extinction (Figure 4). With increasing levels of global transportation, human civilization may be approaching such a critical threshold. In the paper we wrote in 2006 about the dangers of global transportation for pathogen evolution and pandemics [8], we mentioned the risk from Ebola. Ebola is a horrendous disease that was present only in isolated villages in Africa. It was far away from the rest of the world only because of that isolation. Since Africa was developing, it was only a matter of time before it reached population centers and airports. While the model is about evolution, it is really about which pathogens will be found in a system that is highly connected, and Ebola can spread in a highly connected world. The traditional approach to public health uses historical evidence analyzed statistically to assess the potential impacts of a disease. As a result, many were surprised by the spread of Ebola through West Africa in 2014. As the connectivity of the world increases, past experience is not a good guide to future events. A key point about the phase transition to extinction is suddenness. Even a system that seems stable, can be destabilized by a few more long-range connections, and connectivity is continuing to increase. So how close are we to the tipping point? We don’t know but it would be good to find out before it happens. While Ebola ravaged three countries in West Africa, it only resulted in a handful of cases outside that region. One possible reason is that many of the airlines that fly to west Africa stopped or reduced flights during the epidemic [9]. In the absence of a clear connection, public health authorities who downplayed the dangers of the epidemic spreading to the West might seem to be vindicated. As with the choice of airlines to stop flying to west Africa, our analysis didn’t take into consideration how people respond to epidemics. It does tell us what the outcome will be unless we respond fast enough and well enough to stop the spread of future diseases, which may not be the same as the ones we saw in the past. As the world becomes more connected, the dangers increase. Are people in western countries safe because of higher quality health systems? Countries like the U.S. have highly skewed networks of social interactions with some very highly connected individuals that can be “superspreaders.” The chances of such an individual becoming infected may be low but events like a mass outbreak pose a much greater risk if they do happen. If a sick food service worker in an airport infects 100 passengers, or a contagion event happens in mass transportation, an outbreak could very well prove unstoppable.

# On Case

### Warming D

#### [2] On Ivanova – [a] they haven’t established a right to strike actually causes strikes – decks solvency – specifically enough to solve the aff [b] it proves people [c] they say ben and jerry took action – there is 0 explanation for why they get solvency – they recognize but don’t do anything [d] their impact evidence is about governments solving, but their links are about companies [e] they just companies recognize climate, they don’t take action – assign them 0 solvency

#### [3] On extinction – hold them to specificity framing – they don’t solve climate or enough to solve extinction

#### Extinction from warming requires 12 degrees, far greater than their internal link, and intervening actors will solve before then

Sebastian **Farquhar 17**, leads the Global Priorities Project (GPP) at the Centre for Effective Altruism, et al., 2017, “Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance,” https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf

The **most likely** levels of global warming are **very unlikely to cause human extinction**.15 The existential risks of climate change instead stem from tail risk climate change – the **low probability** of extreme levels of warming – and interaction with other sources of risk. It is impossible to say with confidence at what point global warming would become severe enough to pose an existential threat. Research has suggested that **warming of 11-12°C** would render most of the planet uninhabitable,16 and would completely devastate agriculture.17 This would pose an extreme threat to human civilisation as we know it.18 Warming of around 7°C or more could potentially produce conflict and instability on such a scale that the indirect effects could be an existential risk, although it is extremely uncertain how likely such scenarios are.19 Moreover, the timescales over which such changes might happen could mean that **humanity is able to adapt** enough to avoid extinction in **even very extreme scenarios**. The probability of these levels of warming depends on eventual greenhouse gas concentrations. According to some experts, unless strong action is taken soon by major emitters, it is likely that we will pursue a medium-high emissions pathway.20 If we do, the chance of extreme warming is highly uncertain but appears non-negligible. Current concentrations of greenhouse gases are higher than they have been for hundreds of thousands of years,21 which means that there are significant unknown unknowns about how the climate system will respond. Particularly concerning is the risk of positive feedback loops, such as the release of vast amounts of methane from melting of the arctic permafrost, which would cause rapid and disastrous warming.22 The economists Gernot Wagner and Martin Weitzman have used IPCC figures (which do not include modelling of feedback loops such as those from melting permafrost) to estimate that if we continue to pursue a medium-high emissions pathway, the probability of eventual warming of 6°C is around **10%**,23 and of 10°C is around **3%**.24 These estimates are of course **highly uncertain**. It is **likely** that the world will take action against climate change once it begins to impose large costs on human society, **long before there is warming of 10°C**. Unfortunately, there is significant inertia in the climate system: there is a 25 to 50 year lag between CO2 emissions and eventual warming,25 and it is expected that 40% of the peak concentration of CO2 will remain in the atmosphere 1,000 years after the peak is reached.26 Consequently, it is impossible to reduce temperatures quickly by reducing CO2 emissions. If the world does start to face costly warming, the international community will therefore face strong incentives to find other ways to reduce global temperatures.

#### Ecological tipping points are “scientific garbage” and lack data---effects are slow and localized

**Brook et al. 18** — Barry W. Brook, ARC Australian Laureate Professor and Chair of Environmental Sustainability at the University of Tasmania in the Faculty of Science, Engineering & Technology, Erle C. Ellis, Ph.D., Cornell University, 1990 Professor, Geography & Environmental Systems University of Maryland, and Jessie C. Buettel, “What Is the Evidence for Planetary Tipping Points?” In Effective Conservation Science: Data Not Dogma, Chapter 8, Oxford University Press (2018). http://ecotope.org/people/ellis/papers/brook\_2018.pdf

\*The Nine Planetary Boundaries Brook Et Al. Refer Too Are, “Land-Use Change, Rate of Biodiversity Loss, Phosphorus Cycle, Global Freshwater Use, Ocean Acidification, Climate Change, Stratospheric Ozone Depletion, Atmospheric Aerosol Loading, Chemical Pollution, Terrestrial Net Primary Production, and Biodiversity Intactness”

As **living standards**, technological capacities,

and **human welfare** have continued to improve, concerns have mounted about **possible natural limits** to economic and population **growth**. Climate change, habitat loss, and recent extinctions are examples of impacts on natural systems that have been used as markers of global environmental degradation associated with the expanding influence of humans (Barnosky et al., 2012; McGill et al., 2015). Past civilizations have faced rapid declines and even collapsed in the face of regional environmental degradation, drought, and other environmental challenges (Scheffer, 2016; Butzer and Endfield, 2012). This **begs the question of whether** long-term societal relationships with the planet’s ecology may **be approaching a global tipping point** as the human population hurtles toward **ten billion people**. If this is indeed the case, the future of both biodiversity and humanity hangs in the balance. The hypothesis is that without urgent action to prevent reaching a global tipping point, the natural life support systems that sustain humanity may fail abruptly, with drastic consequences. 8.1 Regional tipping points yes— but what about global tipping points? There is strong evidence for **rapid global shifts** in the biosphere in the **distant past**, sometimes taking the form of **mass extinction events**, which have been linked to biophysical tipping points (Hughes et al., 2013). Tipping points occur when components of a system respond gradually to an external forcing to a point at which the response becomes nonlinear and abrupt. This response is often amplified through positive feedback interactions that induce an eventual state (or regime) shift (Lenton, 2013). Tipping points are well documented in studies of local ecosystems, such as lakes, that undergo regime shifts driven by alterations of energy or nutrient flows when thresholds are crossed and hysteresis prevails (Scheffer et al., 2015). Various tipping elements, some definite and others speculative, have also been noted in the Earth’s climate system (Lenton et al., 2008). Given this context, it would seem **logical and indeed intuitive** to conclude that the **Earth system is susceptible** and sensitive to **planetary regime shifts** caused by **human alteration** of Earth’s ecology. James Lovelock’s original Earth-system conception of “Gaia,” for instance, focused on interconnections and positive feedbacks between the geosphere and the biosphere, which act to promote stability and resilience (Lovelock and Margulis, 1974). But within this same framework, a temporary global forcing event, invoking disconnections and positive feedbacks, could lead to a rapid transition to an alternative stable state, as has been observed in many local systems (Kefi et al., 2016). This conceptual model invites the question of whether identifiable “boundaries” exist within the interacting components of the Earth system. If they do—and they are transgressed—then the planetary biosphere might be dramatically and permanently altered (Brook et al., 2013). 8.2 Planetary boundaries as a seductive policy framework The planetary **boundaries concept**, coined less than a decade ago (Rockström et al., 2009), represents the idea that contemporary **societies** have potentially transgressed the **historical “natural” conditions**— the **“safe operating space”**—under which **human societies** have historically **thrived**. However, to **mark the boundaries** of a planetary safe “reference state,” defined **baselines are required**. One possibility that has been suggested is the climatic conditions that marked the last 10 000 years of our current warm interglacial period, the Holocene, in which agricultural and urban societies first arose, should be used as a safe space (Steffen et al., 2015). Other safe spaces (or conversely boundaries) might be similarly recognized. In total, nine planetary boundaries have been hypothesized in association with Earth-system processes that, if sufficiently distorted, might potentially cause harmful changes in Earth’s functioning as a wholistic system (Table 8.1). This perspective has led some to postulate the potential breaching of critical thresholds, pushing the Earth out of the Holocene and consequently inducing a shift in the stability of the system (Barnosky et al., 2012). To quote: “Crossing these boundaries could generate abrupt or irreversible environmental changes.” (stockholmresilience.org/ research/planetary-boundaries.html). A hope often expressed is that flagging the crossing of these boundaries as a significant risk will provoke decision makers and the public into taking actions to mitigate harmful global changes (McAlpine et al., 2015). Such a framework, of global tipping points counterbalanced by secure safe spaces within planetary boundaries, is conceptually elegant and politically seductive. Notably, this implies two possible conditions—a state in which environmental change is without risk, and another in which risk is clear and action necessary. Such a framework is both constraining and liberating, and clearly defines a safe zone in which human societies may go about their activities without risk. As a consequence, if such clear knowledge on the risks of altering global environmental processes existed, a defined set of boundaries could be extremely useful to decision makers. But is there **evidence of global tipping-point** dynamics with **safe space and global risk** clearly **demarcated?** 8.3 The search for **mechanisms and evidence** in support of the **nine** planetary **boundaries** Since its **original publication**, the planetary boundaries framework, including the **related** concepts of a **“safe operating space”** and **global regime shifts**, have become increasingly prevalent in **scientific** and policy **discussions** concerned with global change (Corlett, 2015). This work **has been heavily cited**, updated, and actively promoted as a policy tool. But there has also been a counter-vailing critique that challenges the universality, utility, and even the underlying validity of the planetary boundaries framework (Brook and Blomqvist, 2016; Lenton and Williams, 2013). The underlying bases for this debate stem from disagreements over technical and scientific issues, including questions of scale, scientific underpinning, deterministic “boundary setting,” and the generality of mechanisms proposed. Most of the **nine processes** and systems **listed** in Table 8.1 lack **theoretical mechanisms** or **evidence** for a **causal connection** from **local perturbations** to **global “boundary crossing”** (Brook et al., 2013). The exceptions are the atmospheric and oceanic systems, which seem to most closely fit the characteristics required for a globally “scaled-up” version of the coupled, non-linear dynamics that have been shown to undergo phase shifts. But for others, like global land use or worldwide biodiversity, it is difficult to conceive how aggregated **local-to-regional measures** are **representative** of a coherent planetary system that is **prone to tipping** (Mace et al., 2014). Moreover, **anthropogenic pressures** vary geographically, and the system **responses** to stressors can be highly **heterogeneous** (Reyer et al., 2015). While global tipping points have **been hypothesized**, their **exact “position”** has not been determined. If the boundaries did **exist at a global level**, there is a good chance they could not be known until well after the regime shift or boundary crossing had occurred. This is because of our **lack of our understanding** of **complex systems** and the **wild fluctuations in state variables** that have occurred historically and continue to occur, without any **evidence of an irreversible global collapse**. Finally, implementing policies that avoid crossing planetary boundaries is a “global commons” problem, and everything we know from climate action indicates that it is difficult to generate agreements that address such risk when there is uncertainty about thresholds (Barrett and Dannenberg, 2012). 8.4 The problem with **going from local process** to a **global tipping point** For at least six of the nine proposed boundaries, the operational scales of these **“Earth system processes”** are **local or regional** (Table 8.1), yet the **proposed** boundaries represent **global aggregations** (the sum of many component sub-systems). The value **assigned** to any particular boundary **is**, in virtually all cases, **speculative** and represents **an arbitrary point** along a continuum of possible values, as opposed to a **phase shift** due to **global non-linear dynamics**. The most plausible threshold is for ocean acidification, because it is directly related to the calcite and aragonite compensation depth (i.e., something that is inherently quantifiable). The others are purely supported by a **statement to the** effect that “this stress or change from the **baseline is deemed excessive.”** This lack of **scientific underpinning** for these **boundaries** raises **significant questions** on the biological and physical **relevance of such thresholds** for the Earth system. What is currently needed are explicit efforts to link long-term monitoring to the choice of these boundary values (Robert et al., 2013). Unquestioning acceptance of **these boundaries** that in turn guide subsequent global assessment (as in Newbold et al., 2016) will only inhibit our understanding of **human impacts**. In addition to masking finer-grained detail, globally averaged or aggregated metrics are also often difficult to link to directed action. For instance, the recent Paris Agreement to limit average global temperature rise to less than 2 °C above pre-industrial levels was ultimately re-framed as a plethora of national goals or aspirations based on carbon-emissions intensity (Rogelj et al., 2016). This is partly because a “global temperature,” averaged across all the Earth system, is not a real physical phenomenon or quantity observed in any place. As such, it cannot be used to guide or monitor local system states. What can be monitored and altered are the trajectories of the underlying drivers of system changes (e.g., carbon emissions intensity, in the climate case), and these therefore ought to be the domain of targets. Even if one can identify and **measure a global environmental attribute**, it does not automatically follow that it is associated with a **real-world threshold that**, when crossed, leads to **irreversible change**. Asserting **“safe” global limits** on indicators like land-use change (the boundary of a maximum of 15% of land given over to cultivation, see Table 8.1) or decline in the **local species abundance** of originally present species (e.g., “10% loss relative to undisturbed habitat” as is the case in Newbold et al., 2016) is totally arbitrary. Such thinking ignores **inherent complexity** and promotes a **“one size fits all”** mode of thinking for conservation management that elides the very real need for locally appropriate solutions. Trying to avoid crossing a global land-use or biodiversity boundary might also lead to perverse outcomes locally, such as if restoring a “safe level” of biodiversity intactness in the world’s most fertile and productive regions (where most food originates) triggers undesirable trade-offs such as the displacement of farming to marginal regions that require more land, greater inputs, and hardship. In the context of food production, Running (2012) recently argued that at most an additional 10% of harvestable annual net global primary production (NPP) of terrestrial plants could be co-opted for future human use without crossing out of the planetary safe space. The implications of this assertion are draconian. Global NPP has been essentially steady, even with the massive agricultural expansion that has occurred over the last century. Thus, because the allocation of NPP is essentially a zerosum activity, asserting that humans can only get at most an additional 10% of that NPP implies future shortages of food, fiber, fodder, and fuel for people (Erb et al., 2012; Lewis, 2012). Policy based on this boundary would be fraught with human suffering, while the boundary itself has little mechanistic support or clear evidence of existence. In a similar vein, seeking to achieve uniform limits on practices such as nitrogen or phosphorus fertilizer use would inevitably lead to winners and losers at local scales (de Vries et al., 2013), because of differences in soil fertility and the legacies of historical farming practices (Erb et al., 2012; Carpenter and Bennett, 2011). For instance, while nitrogen fertilizer has been over-used in many developed countries, increases are urgently needed in sub-Saharan Africa to close the yield gap (Mueller et al., 2014). Given the consistent need for regionally appropriate limits, what practical use is a globally defined boundary? 8.5 Finding the research questions in an arena that is rife with competing visions of desirable futures Planetary boundaries are typically based on biogeochemical and ecological principles. Their frame is simple: **if we pass threshold “X,”** then the following **ecological degradation** or regime shift will occur. What this framing neglects is that there are inevitable trade-offs between human development goals and environmental protection/risk. Policy based on any assumed boundary will substantially impact development options. For the most part, truly natural areas are not the main “life support systems” for humanity; instead, people rely on those ecosystems that have been modified or engineered (Ellis et al., 2013). If it comes **down to a choice** between improved **human development** and the **potential risk** of transgressing an **uncertain (and data poor)** planetary boundary, it may be that **society is willing to accept** that risk. Science has a vital role in guiding environmental management. Ultimately, however, science must intersect with human decisions: physical laws are not negotiable, but our response to them is (Larsen et al., 2015). Global change is not a societal construct, so we must avoid the temptation to couch scientific models as policy directives. Value judgements do (and must) play a key role in determining how people respond to global environmental challenges and the possibility of inflexible planetary boundaries. What has become starkly apparent from the debate on planetary tipping points and possible global regime changes is the need for a concerted research agenda aimed at the potential links between biophysical and social systems to determine possible boundary “positions.” This research could come in the form of: (1) empirical examinations of regime shifts (or not) under gradual degradation; (2) models that explicitly link ecosystem changes and hypothesized boundaries to specific upheavals; and (3) explorations of how the framing of a boundary influences decision makers. For instance, our approach to Earth-system simulations is sophisticated for climatic components but lacks the resolution and mechanisms needed to test ideas on the planetary interconnectedness of nutrient and energy flows, or feedbacks across global biomes (Harfoot et al., 2014). The Madingley model of ecosystem dynamics (https://madingley.github. io/about) offers one promising example of an innovative attempt in this direction, because its design goals are to explicitly capture the scaling of processes that affect biodiversity from local to global scales (Purves et al., 2013). We can also seek a better understanding of the mechanistic underpinnings of the drivers of changes in global systems, such as land-use change and agricultural intensification. This could generate empirically based “bottomup” forecasts of trajectories, which, when linked to multi-ecosystem models, should improve our forecasts of the risks of planetary state shifts (Brook and Blomqvist, 2016). One of the appeals of **planetary boundaries** is the hypothesis that it resonates as **a narrative for environmental action**. The question is: how do decision-makers respond to these boundary arguments? Some research suggests that thresholds inhibit collective actions against tragedies of the commons (Barrett and Dannenberg, 2012). This is a field ripe for theoretical and empirical study. We also need to ask the hard questions about whether conceptual models like planetary boundaries the most effective strategy and engagement tool for conservation and mitigation are. The difficulty in getting international agreement on climate targets (e.g., the 2 °C “guardrail”) is an obvious case in point (Symons and Karlsson, 2015). Perhaps focusing on planetary opportunities: leverage points for guiding global change in better directions (e.g., carbon-neutral energy systems) is potentially a more effective focus of scientific attention (DeFries et al., 2012). By focusing on something to be averted as opposed to an outcome to be achieved, we risk breeding complacency on one side of a boundary, and hopelessness on the other. To summarize the above: the biosphere, and much of the geosphere, responds to **external pressures** in many and **varied ways**. The global human enterprise is **driving large-scale changes** in most components of the Earth system, but in a **haphazard fashion**, with responses often being **weakly connected** or **transmitted slowly** at a **cross-continental scale**. What we observe, for the global processes compiled in Table 8.1, is largely just the sum of all those changes. Acknowledging this reality should not be taken as diminishing the seriousness of these impacts or denying that major changes are occurring to the biosphere, atmosphere, and hydrosphere due to human activity. But it does **make it implausible that the planet**, or indeed most of its component systems, are primed **to tip irreversibly** to a **radically different state** that is **inhospitable**. Although the goal of sustainable stewardship of our planet is a laudable and an achievable one, the mechanisms and opportunities to conserve biodiversity and ecosystems lie mostly in targeted, localized actions (Jonas et al., 2014).

### Democracy ADV

Democracy is high right now, they rprovide no uniqueness for why unconditional right to strike is necessary.

#### [2] On McElwee – [a] there’s a distinction between a right to protest and strike, you don’t need the aff – proven because their evidence doesn’t say strike once [b] they say unions good – mot strikes good [c] alt causes—jerry mandering, voter suppression, voter apathy – they don’t solve these

#### [3] corruption – [a] your evidence just asserts the word corruption and nothing about the right to strike and corruption – the evidence says nothing – have a high threshold for the 1ar’s explanation [b] unions are more corrupt – they like political institutions – they have other interests aside the public good [c] the ev indicates that’s already in Ilaw either 2 things 1] the aff is inherent or 2] the aff fails bc no one follows ilaw so additional wouldn’t do anything

#### [4] backsliding – [a] evidence talks about hungary – nothing about why its uniquely key

#### Unions are inaccessible to minorities – that leads to increasing inequality.

Ahlquist 17 [John; School of Global Policy and Strategy, University of California San Diego; “Labor Unions, Political Representation, and Economic Inequality,” 3/9/17; AnnualReviews; https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051215-023225] Justin

Immigration may exacerbate inequality to the extent that immigrants take jobs for lower wages than native workers do. Immigration may also put pressure on existing unions, since immigrants may be harder to organize owing to linguistic or cultural differences. For these reasons—along with simple prejudice—unions in immigrant-receiving countries, mainly Australia, Canada, and the United States, opposed immigration for several decades. Rosenfeld & Kleykamp (2009) use CPS data to look at the most recent wave of Hispanic immigration and find that Hispanics continue to join unions. They find that Hispanic unionization rates, unlike those for African Americans, can largely be explained by positional factors. Many American unions have recognized that organizing immigrants is crucial to their survival (Milkman 2006), but immigrants’ more precarious job status has made union gains harder to consolidate through the Great Recession (Catron 2013).The situation for female workers is more complicated. The gendering of employment and the expectation that women would leave the labor force after marriage have long limited women’s access to unionized parts of the economy (Iversen & Rosenbluth 2011). In some countries union bargaining objectives, norms of fairness, and public policy were predicated on an assumed singleearner household. But standardized terms of employment and promotion along with an expanded public sector may attract more women into union jobs. The effect of unionization on wage inequality between men and women is therefore ambiguous. Union density in rich democracies shows no association with the gap between median male and female wages. However, in the United States and United Kingdom, the gender wage gap narrowed at the same time unionization fell.

This turns AC solvency as the reversal doesn’t occur