I Affirm: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike

Framing

I value morality

Research shows that morality must come from physical phenomena, not a priori knowledge – implies util since morality must be based on empirical outcomes

Papineau 7 (David, "Naturalism," Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2007.)

In the middle of the nineteenth century the conservation of kinetic plus potential energy came to be accepted as a basic principle of physics (Elkana 1974). In itself this does not rule out distinct mental or vital forces, for there is no reason why such forces should not be 'conservative', operating in such a way as to compensate losses of kinetic energy by gains in potential energy and vice versa. (The term 'nervous energy' is a relic of the widespread late nineteenth-century assumption that mental processes store up a species of potential energy that is then released in action.) However, the conservation of energy does imply that any such special forces must be governed by strict deterministic laws: if mental or vital forces arose spontaneously, then there would be nothing to ensure that they never led to energy increases. During the course of the twentieth century received scientific opinion became even more restrictive about possible causes of physical effects, and came to reject sui generis mental or vital causes, even of a law-governed and predictable kind. Detailed physiological research, especially into nerve cells, gave no indication of any physical effects that cannot be explained in terms of basic physical forces that also occur outside living bodies. Thus, for example, consider J.J.C. Smart's (1958) thought that we should identify mental states with brain states, for otherwise those mental states would be "nomological danglers" which play no role in the explanation of behaviour. Or take David Lewis's (1966) and David Armstrong's (1968) argument that, since mental states are picked out by their causal roles, and since we know that physical states play these roles, mental states must be identical with those physical states. Again, consider Donald Davidson's (1970) argument that, since the only laws governing behaviour are those connecting behaviour with physical antecedents, mental events can only be causes of behaviour if they are identical with those physical antecedents.

Pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable – they're where we reach the end of the line in matters of value

Moen 16 [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo "An Argument for Hedonism" Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] SJDI

Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues. This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. "Pleasure" and "pain" are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values. If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: "What for?" This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: "To buy soda." This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: "What is buying the soda good for?" This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: "Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it." If I then proceed by asking "But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?" the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further: it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.3 As Aristotle observes: "We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself."4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says "This is painful!" we never respond by asking: "And why is that a problem?" We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value.

Thus, the standard is maximizing expected well being.

Prefer:

1] Actor specificty:

A – governments have to aggregate since collective actions necessarily benefit some people while hurting others either due to resource tradeoffs or scope of effect, deontic side constraints freeze action.

B – no act omission distinction for governments since policies create permissions and prohibitions so authorizing action cannot be an omission since the state assumes culpability in regulating the public domain.

Takes out and turns calc indicts, consequentialism might be hard but it's not impossible, and the alternative is no action which is worse; and actor spec outweighs since different actors have different ethical standings.

A philosophical model is an explanation of how the world operates. As a model becomes more complete, we are less able to understand it. This means that a we are not able to comprehend a perfect model of the world meaning that we can never completely analyze the truth value of the resolution so resort to presumption.

2] No intent foresight distinction:

A – if we foresee a consequence it becomes part of our deliberation which makes it intrinsic to our action since we intend it to happen.

3] Lexical prereq – a. can't access any value if we're dead b. you can't properly perform ethical calculus if you're under threat of death or pain.

Presumption affirms

- **since if I told you my name you'd believe me absent reason not to**
- **If presumption negates we never can start train of reasoning thus no actions will occur**

4. Extinction comes first under any framework.

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

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we're consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there's nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there's a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But **that is a huge mistake.** Non-consequentialism is the view that there's more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; **it is not the view that the latter don't matter**. Even John Rawls wrote, "All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy." **Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good**, from an impartial point of view. They'd thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn't significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one's character. What's even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial "point of view of the universe," indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one's own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don't care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in

mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler's recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I'd have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. **We should also take into account moral uncertainty.** What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I've just argued that there's agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It's possible they'll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, **all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world**. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won't get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: "We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly." (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

Advantage 1: Worker Welfare

Inherency: in the squo, most governments do not recognize a 100% unconditional right of workers to strike

Strikes are heavily regulated in America under section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act

National Labor Relations Board, "The Right to Strike | National Labor Relations Board", https://www.nlrb.gov/strikes. Accessed 6/22/2021 [AV]

Effect of no-strike contract. **A strike that violates a no-strike provision of a contract is not protected** by the Act, and the **striking employees can be discharged or otherwise disciplined**, unless the strike is called to protest certain kinds of unfair labor practices committed by the employer. It should be noted that not all refusals to work are considered strikes and thus violations of no-strike provisions. A walkout because of conditions abnormally dangerous to health, such as a defective ventilation system in a spray-painting shop, has been held not to violate a no-strike provision. **Section 8(d) provides that when either party desires to terminate or change an existing contract, it must comply with certain conditions. If these requirements are not met, a strike to terminate or change a contract is unlawful** and **participating strikers lose their status as employees** of the employer engaged in the labor dispute. If the strike was caused by the unfair labor practice of the employer, however, the strikers are classified as unfair labor practice strikers and their status is not affected by failure to follow the required procedure. **Strikers who engage in** serious **misconduct in the course of a strike may be refused reinstatement to their former jobs**. This applies to both economic strikers and unfair labor practice strikers. Serious misconduct has been held to include, among other things, violence and threats of violence. **The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that a "sitdown" strike, when employees simply stay in the plant and refuse to work, thus depriving the owner of property, is not protected by the law.**

Impact: We cannot end injustices and inequalities in the workplace if we cannot speak out on it unconditionally

Collective bargaining is key to reducing income inequality and wages. The link is reversal causal.

Bivens et al, 17 (Josh, director of research at the Economic Policy Institute (EPI), "How today's unions help working people," 8/24/17, Economic Policy Institute, https://www.epi.org/publication/how-todays-unions-help-working-people-giving-workers-the-power-to-improve-their-jobs-and-unrig-the-economy/)

As union coverage has declined and the voice of workers has correspondingly diminished, many of the key workplace standards past generations counted on have been eroded. For instance, there has been an erosion of overtime pay protection, slashing of workers' compensation programs, and a decline in the real value of the minimum wage, which is lower now than it was in 1968.

Unions reduce inequality and are essential for low- and middle-wage workers' ability to obtain a fair share of economic growth

The spread of collective bargaining that followed the passage of the National Labor Relations Act in 1935 led to decades of faster and fairer economic growth that persisted until the late 1970s. But since the 1970s, declining unionization has fueled rising inequality

and stalled economic progress for the broad American middle class. Figures A and B show that when unions are weak, the highest incomes go up even more, but when unions are strong, middle incomes go up.

Research by EPI and other institutions shows this correlation is no accident. First, unions have strong positive effects not only on the wages of union workers but also on the wages of comparable nonunion workers, as unions set standards for entire industries and occupations (these union and nonunion wage boosts are explored in detail in the next section of this report). Second, unions make wages among occupations more equal because they give a larger wage boost to low- and middle-wage occupations than to high-wage occupations. Third, unions make wages of workers with similar characteristics more equal because of the standards unions set. Fourth, unions have historically been more likely to organize middle-wage than high-wage workers, which lowers inequality by closing gaps between, say, blue-collar and white-collar workers. Finally, the union wage boost is largest for low-wage workers and larger at the middle than at the highest wage levels, larger for black and Hispanic workers than for white workers, and larger for those with lower levels of education—wage increases for these groups help narrow wage inequalities.16

High wages lead to lower poverty levels and thus better working conditions. Group, 21 (Income Group, 1-1-2021, accessed on 6-22-2021, Cbo, "How Increasing the Federal Minimum Wage Could Affect Employment and Family Income | Congressional Budget Office", https://www.cbo.gov/publication/55681)/PE

How would increasing the minimum wage affect family income? By boosting the income of low-wage workers who had jobs, a higher minimum wage would raise their families' real income, lifting some of those families out of poverty. However, income would fall for some families because other workers would not be employed and because business owners would have to absorb at least some of the higher costs of labor.

(and if we wanna get spicy we can link this to economic collapse and/or nuclear war)
https://gsdrc.org/professional-dev/poverty-and-conflict/

Poverty causes conflict

Marks, 16 (Zoe Marks, Director of Edinburgh University's Global Development, October 2016, accessed on 6-23-2021, GSDRC, "Poverty and conflict - GSDRC", https://gsdrc.org/professional-dev/poverty-and-conflict/)/PE

Poverty and conflict are widely understood to be closely interconnected; with poverty making countries more prone to civil war, and armed conflict weakening governance and economic performance, thus increasing the risk of conflict relapse (Goodhand 2001). The selected readings in this pack move beyond reductive and harmful assumptions about 'pathologies' of poverty to examine the latest research into the poverty-conflict nexus. Earlier studies identified macro-level factors that made countries more likely to experience armed conflict. For example, low per capita income and large populations correlates with civil war, whereas ethnic and religious diversity does not make countries more prone to conflict (Fearon & Laitin 2003). Newer research examines the processes and mechanisms that precipitate and shape violence on the ground. At the state level, poverty can lower resilience to conflict by weakening government institutions, stripping capacity for public goods provision, and limiting the projection of power and authority, whether soft or coercive. Poverty also compounds vulnerability to insurgency at the individual and community level by lowering the opportunity cost of mobilising for violence. High rates of unemployment and inequality, combined with low levels of education and development, are thought to soften the ground for recruitment and provide motives to fight (Humphreys & Weinstein

2008; see also this GSDRC Reading Pack on jobs, unemployment and violence). These individual correlates of poverty often follow systematic patterns that lead to 'horizontal inequalities'. Horizontal inequalities occur when members of ethnic, religious, or other identity groups have unequal access to public goods, opportunities and resources. Group-level inequalities can generate social and economic polarisation that increases the risk of violent conflict (Østby 2008; Stewart 2009). Of course, these dynamics alone do not start wars. Political grievances and conflict proneness are most likely to lead to violence—from terrorism to civil war—when poverty and inequality combine with repression, particularly in anocracies, regimes that are neither strongly democratic, nor wholly autocratic (Abadie 2004; Mousseau et al. 2003). Yet, governance can also mitigate the link between poverty and conflict. Resource governance plays a key role in shaping countries' economic and structural vulnerability to conflict (Ross 2004; Thies 2010). While social welfare spending, particularly on education and healthcare, and stable aid flows reduce the risk of war, aid shocks and excessive military spending increase its likelihood (De Ree & Nillesen 2009; Nielsen et al. 2011; Savun & Tirone 2011; Taydas & Peksen 2012). Similarly, economic shocks, such as the 2008 spike in global food prices, can spark social unrest that escalates into armed conflict in vulnerable political settings (Blattman & Miguel 2010; Lagi et al. 2011). Once conflict breaks out, it hits the poor the hardest: social welfare is depleted as goods and services are diverted to the war effort; rural infrastructure is destroyed in contested territory; and justice and security provision retracts into urban areas and elite enclaves. Conflict causes and compounds poverty. First depleting labour and human capital, then destroying productive assets and financial capital, and finally, eroding the social capital of trust and cooperation upon which strong political and economic systems depend (Mercier et al. 2016). The war economies and institutions that are created in conflict are overwhelmingly extractive, and tend to warp local political economies through their reliance on smuggling and coercion (Keen 1997). These practices can become conflict drivers in their own right, and can perpetuate conflict-related violence and inequality even after war has officially ended (Justino 2013).

Escalation to nuclear war occurs rapidly even at low levels of conflict

Boehlefeld , 20 (Kathryn Boehlefeld , assistant professor of military and security studies at Air University's Air Command and StaffCollege and a faculty member for the School of Advanced Nuclear Deterrence Studies (SANDS), 2020, accessed on 6-23-2021, Media.defense, "Sticks and Stones", https://media.defense.gov/2020/Nov/23/2002540351/-1/-1/1/BOEHLEFELD.PDF)/PE

Nuclear weapons tend to make nuclear adversaries wearier of engaging in conventional warfare with one another because they fear inadvertent escalation: that a war[s] will spiral out of control and end in a nuclear exchange even if the war's aims were originally fairly limited. However, this fear has not fully prevented the Chinese and Indian militaries from engaging in skirmishes, like the one that occurred in June 2020. Where does escalation toward nuclear war start, and what does this conflict teach both us and major world players about the dangers and opportunities associated with low levels of conflict between nuclear powers? Escalation to nuclear use may occur as a deliberate and premeditated choice or inadvertently as the result of a security dilemma, the offensive nature of militaries, and/or due to the fog of war.2 This article argues that the Sino-Indian border dispute demonstrates that the drivers of inadvertent escalation may be [is] present even at exceptionally low levels of conflict. Thus, even though nuclear weapons induce caution, there are good reasons to worry about the dangers of inadvertent escalation to nuclear use despite the longstanding global tradition of nonuse.

Nuclear war causes extinction.

Starr '17

(Steven; director of the University of Missouri's Clinical Laboratory Science Program, senior scientist at the Physicians for Social Responsibility, Associate member of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, expert in the environmental consequences of nuclear war; 1/9/17; "Turning a Blind Eye Towards Armageddon — U.S. Leaders Reject Nuclear Winter Studies";

https://fas.org/2017/01/turning-a-blind-eye-towards-armageddon-u-s-leaders-reject-nuclear-winter-studies/; Federation of American Scientists; accessed 11/24/18; TV) [AV]

The detonation of an atomic bomb with this explosive power will **instantly ignite fires** over a surface area of three to five square miles. In the recent studies, the scientists calculated that the **blast, fire**, and **radiation** from a war fought with 100 atomic bombs could produce **direct fatalities** comparable to all of those worldwide in World War II, or to those once estimated for a "**counterforce**" **nuclear war** between the superpowers. However, the **long-term environmental effects** of the war **could** significantly disrupt the global weather for at least a decade, which would likely **result in** a vast **global famine**. The scientists predicted that **nuclear firestorms** in the burning cities would cause at least five million tons of **black carbon smoke** to quickly rise above cloud level into the stratosphere, where it could not be rained out. The smoke would circle the Earth in **less than two weeks** and would form **a** global **stratospheric smoke layer** that **would remain for** more than **a decade**. The smoke would absorb warming sunlight, which would **heat the smoke** to temperatures near the boiling point of water, producing **ozone losses of** 20 to **50 percent** over populated areas. This would almost double the amount of UV-B reaching the most populated regions of the mid-latitudes, and it would create UV-B indices unprecedented in human history. In North America and Central Europe, the time required to get a painful sunburn at mid-day in June could decrease to as little as six minutes for fair-skinned individuals. As the smoke layer blocked warming sunlight from reaching the Earth's surface, it would produce the **coldest** average **surface temperatures** in the last 1,000 years. The scientists calculated that global **food production would decrease** by 20 to **40 percent** during a five-year period following such a war. Medical experts have predicted that the shortening of growing seasons and corresponding decreases in agricultural production could cause up to **two billion** people to perish from **famine**. The climatologists also investigated the effects of a nuclear war fought with the vastly more powerful modern **thermonuclear** weapons possessed by the United States, Russia, China, France, and England. Some of the thermonuclear weapons constructed during the 1950s and 1960s were 1,000 times more powerful than an atomic bomb. During the last 30 years, the average size of thermonuclear or "strategic" nuclear weapons has decreased. Yet today, each of the approximately 3,540 strategic weapons deployed by the United States and Russia is seven to **80 times** more powerful than the atomic bombs modeled in the India-Pakistan study.

The smallest strategic nuclear weapon has an explosive power of **100,000 tons of TNT**, compared to an atomic bomb with an average explosive power of 15,000 tons of TNT. Strategic nuclear weapons produce much larger nuclear firestorms than do atomic bombs. For example, a standard Russian 800-kiloton warhead, on an average day, will ignite fires covering a surface area of 90 to 152 square miles. A **war** fought with hundreds or thousands of U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons would **ignite immense nuclear firestorms** covering land surface areas of many thousands or **tens of thousands** of square miles. The scientists calculated that these fires would produce up to **180 million tons** of black carbon soot and **smoke**, which would form a dense, **global stratospheric smoke layer**. The smoke would remain in the stratosphere for 10 to **20 years**, and it **would block** as much as **70 percent of sunlight** from reaching the surface of the Northern Hemisphere and 35 percent from the Southern Hemisphere. So much sunlight would be blocked by the smoke that the noonday sun would resemble a full moon at midnight. Under such conditions, it would only require a matter of days or weeks for daily minimum **temperatures** to **fall below freezing** in the largest agricultural areas of the Northern Hemisphere, where freezing temperatures would occur every day for a period of between one to more than two years. Average surface temperatures would become colder than those experienced 18,000 years ago at the height of the last Ice Age, and the prolonged cold would cause average rainfall to decrease by up to 90%. Growing seasons would be completely eliminated for more than a decade; it would be **too cold and dark** to grow food crops, **which would doom the** majority of the **human population.** NUCLEAR WINTER IN BRIEF The profound cold and darkness following nuclear war became known as nuclear winter and was first predicted in 1983 by a group of NASA scientists led by Carl Sagan. During the mid-1980s, a large body of research was done by such groups as the Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (SCOPE), the World Meteorological Organization, and the U.S. National Research Council of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences; their work essentially supported the initial findings of the 1983 studies. The idea of nuclear winter, published and supported by prominent scientists, generated extensive public alarm and put political pressure on the United States and Soviet Union to reverse a runaway nuclear arms race, which, by 1986, had created a global nuclear arsenal of more than 65,000 nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, this created a backlash among many powerful military and industrial interests, who undertook an extensive media campaign to brand nuclear winter as “bad science” and the scientists who discovered it as “irresponsible.” Critics used various uncertainties in the studies and the first climate models (which are primitive by today’s standards) as a basis to criticize and reject the concept of nuclear winter. In 1986, the Council on Foreign Relations published an article by scientists from the National Center for Atmospheric Research, who predicted drops in global cooling about half as large as those first predicted by the 1983 studies and described this as a “nuclear autumn.”

Solvency: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike

Strikes DO WORK and improve working conditions, even if companies try to replace workers. Gourevitch 18,

Gourevitch, Alex. “The Right to Strike: A Radical View: American Political Science Review.” Cambridge Core, Cambridge University Press, 21 June 2018,

www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-political-science-review/article/abs/right-to-strike-a-radical-view/8B521F67E28D4FAE1967B17959620424. am an associate professor of political science in the Department of Political Science. I have been an assistant professor at McMaster University, a Post-Doctoral Research Associate at Brown University's Political Theory Project, and a College Fellow at Harvard University. I received my Ph.D in political science from Columbia University in 2010. 6/22/21 HJ

Here are some general facts about strikes and labor markets that present liberal societies with a dilemma.A **strike** is a work stoppage to achieve some end. Higher skilled, low-supply **workers**, who usually enjoy better wages, hours and conditions, can carry off a reasonably effective strike with little coercion and no significant lawbreaking.2 That is because they **are hard to replace**. So long as they exercise adequate discipline, workers will have a reasonable chance of succeeding **if they refuse to work. Production slows or stops altogether**. For instance, during the Verizon strike of 2016, Verizon 2 There are a number of reasonable empirical assumptions built into this statement. For the moment, I am characterizing a broad differ[1]ence in what it takes to carry off a strike with a reasonable chance of success. Therefore, I make generalizations that are reasonable but that might not hold in particular cases. 1 Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. Nagoya University Library, on 24 Jun 2018 at 18:27:59, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055418000321Alex Gourevitch used many replacement workers, as it was their legal right to do, but those **replacements could not do the job effectively**. **Installing, servicing, and repairing** copper[1]wire and FIOS systems **turned out to require weeks of training and further** on-the-job **experience**.**After seven weeks, the company still was unable to service existing lines, let alone install new ones**. Exercising a great deal of discipline and commitment, but no coercion or vi[1]olence against replacements or managers, the Verizon **workers** slowed production enough to **win concessions** (Gourevitch 2016b).

*This uses verizon as an example, it's unhighlighted but you can bring up the verizon strike in 2016 that this card refers to in round

Climate change advantage

Employee strikes drive climate action

Clifford 19

Catherine Clifford is the senior entrepreneurship writer at CNBC. She was formerly a senior writer at Entrepreneur.com, the small business reporter at CNNMoney and an assistant in the New York bureau for CNN. Clifford attended Columbia University where she earned a bachelor's degree

Clifford, Catherine. "Amazon Employee on Walkout for Climate Change: I Was Feeling 'Hopeless,' 'Ashamed' of My Role There." *CNBC*, CNBC, 11 Sept. 2019, www.cnbc.com/2019/09/11/amazon-employee-on-walkout-for-climate-change.html.

6/23/2021 HJ

But Sheppard and the other 1,000 employees walking out aren't waiting. "I remember learning about global warming in school. I remember thinking that all these problems would be fixed by the time I graduated from college because we have leaders," but it's not fixed, Sheppard said. "Then I changed how I thought about who leaders are. ... Those of us who are walking out of our offices on 20 September, we are leaders." "A lot of people don't realize the strength they can wield in their workplace. I certainly didn't," Sheppard said. "Amazon is not Jeff Bezos alone. Amazon is Amazon because of the workers who work for it. It needs all of us to function, from the people in the offices writing software to the people in the warehouses packing boxes. When you realize that, you realize the power is not at the top. It's at the bottom, collectively, with all of the people working together to keep the company running." Amazon employees "are in a unique position as a significant stakeholder in the fastest-growing global consumer and logistics company," Ethan Powell, the CEO and founder of impact-investing nonprofit Impact Shares, told CNBC Make It. "Amazon stands to control a majority of consumption activity moving forward, as they already control 5% of all retail spend and half of the online market." And Amazon's climate impact could get even more significant. "As they push quick, convenient deliveries they also stand to be the largest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions as they execute on their growth initiatives," Powell said. TWEET: We're investing $1.5 billion in our new air hub to get you your packages faster. Three million square feet, and it's going to create 2,000 jobs. At the very least, "the climate action mobilization by Amazon employees already has elevated public attention to the issue" Sue Reid, the vice president of climate and energy at sustainability nonprofit Ceres, told CNBC Make It. Amazon isn't the only company to see its employees plan a high profile walkout. Hundreds of Google employees in more than 20 offices around the world walked out in November to protest the company's handling of sexual misconduct, and Wayfair employees walked out in June to protest its sale of children's beds to migrant detention camps on the U.S.-Mexico border. "It's part of a broader trend of customers, employees and public officials asking tougher questions about the role of corporations in society," Reid told CNBC Make It.

Climate Strikes DO work - they bring media attention to climate change and influence policy makers. Neves 20,

Felipe Schaeffer Neves, Leaders For Climate Action, "Climate Strikes: how effective is it to participate in them? - Leaders for Climate Action", 1/9/2020, https://lfca.earth/strikes/. Accessed 6/23. [AV]

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, **cover**ing **in detail what was taking place around the globe, the numbers, their demands, and rationale**. Politically, Striking can have a great effect on policy-making. That is, **politicians tend to listen to what is being demanded from the masses** after all, they are the electorate. The **big**ger the **strike**, the **more** of a **chance of gaining space in political agendas**. Eventually, there will be an election right down the road, which is why politicians take these actions seriously. An **example** of this **is in England**, where **campaigners** managed to **pressure** their **government into banning** various single-use **plastic items, like straws, stirrers, and cotton buds**, earlier this year. In Europe, **the European Parliament passed a law banning disposable plastic**, which will take effect next year, and **in the US eight states have already banned it**, with the prospect of more states following suit. **More**over, an increasing number of **countries are pledging to become carbon neutral in the next few years**, ranging from 2030 to 2050. This is much **owed to the efforts of climate activists**, who use collective action as their weapon for policy-change. As this recent empirical research concluded, climate activism indeed leads to a legislation change in favor of the environment

Earth could cross the global warming threshold as soon as 2027

cardenas, 21 (shirley cardenas, Researcher and Writer, McGill University, 1-7-2021, accessed on 6-24-2021, World Economic Forum, "Earth could cross the global warming threshold as soon as 2027", https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2021/01/global-warming-threshold-reached-by-2027/)/PE

In analyzing the results, the researchers found that we'll likely cross threshold for dangerous warming (+1.5 C) between 2027 and 2042. This is a much narrower window than GCMs estimates of between now and 2052. On average, the researchers also found that expected warming was a little lower, by about 10 to 15%. They also find, however, that the "very likely warming ranges" of the SCRF were within those of the GCMs, giving the latter support.

Corporate action is K2 solving climate change-corporations have the most power to do so

Axelrod 19

Josh Axelrod focuses on issues including public land protection and conservation, renewable energy siting on public lands, limiting oil and gas development on public lands, energy transmission, and climate policy. Since joining NRDC in 2013, Axelrod has also developed expertise in oil spill response and preparedness, forest management, forest product production, forest carbon dynamics, fossil fuel production in Alberta's tar sands, North American fossil fuel transport, the health impacts associated crude oil, and Arctic resource development. He holds a bachelor's degree

from Middlebury College and a J.D. from American University's Washington College of Law.
February 26, 2019 Joshua Axelrod. “Corporate Honesty and Climate Change: Time to Own Up and Act.” NRDC, NRDC, 27 Feb. 2019, www.nrdc.org/experts/josh-axelrod/corporate-honesty-and-climate-change-time-own-and-act. 6/23/2021 HJ
Government and individual actions are vital to addressing climate change, but corporations, with their outsized influence and power in today’s world, have an even larger role to play. They are able to drive policy change, shape consumer preferences, and rapidly respond to the necessities of climate change at a scale and pace beyond any other political or private entity. Meaningful corporate action is not only necessary as climate change accelerates by the day, it is a global obligation. As some of the entities most responsible for putting us in the crisis we’re in today, it’s time for companies to take full responsibility for their climate footprints.

Humans will face extinction if we don’t stop climate change now

Specktor, 19 (Brandon Specktor, 6-4-2019, accessed on 6-24-2021, Live Science, "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims", https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html)/PE

It seems every week there's a scary new report about how man-made climate change is going to cause the collapse of the world's ice sheets, result in the extinction of up to 1 million animal species and — if that wasn't bad enough — make our beer very, very expensive. This week, a new policy paper from an Australian think tank claims that those other reports are slightly off; the risks of climate change are actually much, much worse than anyone can imagine. According to the paper, climate change poses a "near- to mid-term existential threat to human civilization," and there's a good chance society could collapse as soon as 2050 if serious mitigation actions aren't taken in the next decade. Published by the Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration in Melbourne (an independent think tank focused on climate policy) and authored by a climate researcher and a former fossil fuel executive, the paper's central thesis is that climate scientists are too restrained in their predictions of how climate change will affect the planet in the near future. [Top 9 Ways the World Could End] The current climate crisis, they say, is larger and more complex than any humans have ever dealt with before. General climate models — like the one that the United Nations' Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) used in 2018 to predict that a global temperature increase of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) could put hundreds of millions of people at risk — fail to account for the sheer complexity of Earth's many interlinked geological processes; as such, they fail to adequately predict the scale of the potential consequences. The truth, the authors wrote, is probably far worse than any models can fathom. What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill many of the trees in the Amazon rainforest (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the planet plunges into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions. "Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and 55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of lethal heat conditions, beyond the threshold of human survivability," the authors hypothesized. Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly one-third of the world's land surface turns to desert. Entire ecosystems collapse, beginning with the planet's coral reefs, the rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets. The world's tropics are hit hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than 1 billion people into refugees. This mass movement of refugees — coupled with shrinking coastlines and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to stress the fabric of the world's largest nations, including the United States. Armed conflicts over resources, perhaps culminating in nuclear war, are likely. The result, according to the new paper, is "outright chaos" and perhaps "the end of human global civilization as we know it."

Thus, I affirm resolved: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike

Additional info >> **https://cepr.net/documents/state-public-cb-2014-03.pdf**