



|

|

**1AC**



## **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.nlr.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 striking employees can be discharged or otherwise disciplined

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. participating strikers lose their status as employees

Strikers who engage in misconduct in the course of a strike may be refused reinstatement to their former jobs 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

An inability to strike without negative repercussions leads to the perpetuation of injustices like low wages and exploitation.

Low wages hinder social stability, employment and income growth. Yarrow 15,

Andrew Yarrow. Coalition on Human Needs, "How Low Wages Hurt Families and Perpetuate Poverty - Coalition on Human Needs", 4/9/2015, <https://www.chn.org/voices/how-low-wages-hurt-families-and-perpetuate-poverty/>. Accessed 6/22/2021. [AV]

research suggests that workers in low-wage careers experience family instability. Single parents generally have lower living standards, this hits single mothers especially hard. Low wages make child care unaffordable, causing enormous strains on families and single parents. For working parents who are paid poverty-level wages, 30 percent of their income goes to child care. For those paid between the poverty line and double that level, child care consumes about 20 percent of income. Low wages are unhealthy. Low-wage workers are less likely to get decent health care simply because they cannot afford it. Also, a strong relationship between low wages and obesity and hypertension, increased stress, low self-esteem, and a greater tendency to engage in unhealthy behaviors like smoking. Poor health hinders employment and income growth.

If workers are allowed to strike without fear of repercussions, then abuses by employers can be avoided, ending the slew of negative outcomes of low wages and bad working conditions.

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 Staff College 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.**<sup>2</sup> 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 has devastating consequences

**International Committee To The Red Cross, 20** (International Committee To The Red Cross, 8-28-2020, accessed on 6-23-2021, International Committee of the Red Cross, "Humanitarian impacts and risks of use of nuclear weapons", <https://www.icrc.org/en/document/humanitarian-impacts-and-risks-use-nuclear-weapons>)/PE

A **nuclear weapon detonations** in or near a populated area would – as a result of the blast wave, intense heat, and radiation and radioactive fallout – **cause massive death and destruction,** trigger large-scale displacement<sup>[6]</sup> and cause long-term harm to human health **and** well-being, as well as **long-term damage to the environment, infrastructure, socioeconomic development and social order.** Modern environmental modelling techniques demonstrates that **even** a “small-scale” use of **some 100 nuclear weapons** against urban targets **would,** in addition to **spread**ing radiation around the world, **lead to a cooling of the atmosphere, shorter growing seasons, food shortages and a global famine**



## 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](https://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.<sup>2</sup> 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 difference 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/S0003055418000321>Alex 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 violence 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

Strikes are essential in order to make positive changes - and are empirically proven to work.

United Electrical, "Restore the Right to Strike | UE", <https://www.ueunion.org/ue-policy/restore-the-right-to-strike>. Accessed 6/22/2021 [AV]

The right to strike is vital to maintain and improve our wages, benefits, and working conditions, and to resist the attack on democracy by anti-working class elements. **When Wabtec imposed unreasonable terms and conditions on the members of UE Locals 506 and 618, locals struck for nine days. Strike action forced the company back to the negotiating table, resulting in a new, fair contract which preserved most of the conditions UE members had worked under at GE.** **an eight-day strike by members of UE Local 234 in St. Johnsbury, VT backed the company off of draconian concession demands. A one-day strike in March of 2019 was crucial to winning a first contract for Local 1018 at Lanterman Regional Center in Los Angeles. credible strike threats by many UE locals, including Local 121, Local 243, Local 329, Local 610, and Local 1135, also helped to achieve excellent results at the bargaining table.**





## Advantage 2: Climate Strikes

Strikes drive action and force companies to adopt climate pledges-K2 solving climate change

Palmer 19

Writing about Amazon and e-commerce, News associate @CNBC

Palmer, Annie. "Jeff Bezos Unveils Sweeping Plan to Tackle Climate Change." CNBC, CNBC, 20 Sept. 2019, [www.cnbc.com/2019/09/19/jeff-bezos-speaks-about-amazon-sustainability-in-washington-dc.html](http://www.cnbc.com/2019/09/19/jeff-bezos-speaks-about-amazon-sustainability-in-washington-dc.html). 6/23/2021 HJ

In what he is calling the "Climate Pledge," Bezos also promised to **measure and report the company's emissions on a regular basis**, implement decarbonization strategies and alter its business strategies to **offset remaining emissions**. Bezos expects 80% of **Amazon's energy** use **to** come from renewable sources by 2024, up from a current rate of 40%, before **transitioning to zero emissions** by 2030. "We want to use our scale and our scope to lead the way," Bezos said at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. "One of the things we know about Amazon as a role model for this is that it's a difficult challenge for us because we have deep, large physical infrastructure. So, if we can do this, anyone can do this." The plan **calls for other companies to join** Amazon in pledging **to have net zero carbon emissions** by 2040 — **a decade ahead of the Paris accord's** goal. As part of the announcement, **Amazon has** agreed to purchase 100,000 **electric delivery vans** from vehicle manufacturer Rivian. Bezos said the first electric delivery vans will be on the road by 2021, and he estimates **100,000** vehicles **will be deployed** by 2024. The move builds on Rivian's \$700 million investment round in February, which was led by Amazon. Amazon has invested \$440 million in Rivian, the announcement said. Amazon electric vehicles tweet Amazon will work with companies in its supply chain to help them decarbonize and reach the same goals outlined in the plan. It also plans to meet with other large corporations to get them to sign onto the agreement. The **company** also **announced a \$100 million donation to The Nature Conservancy** to form the Right Now Climate Fund, which will work to restore and protect forests, wetlands and peatlands around the world, with the goal of removing carbon from the atmosphere. Dara O'Rourke, a senior principal scientist on Amazon's sustainability team, said the company built a "comprehensive" carbon accounting system that helps it pull data from its various businesses. "Amazon is as complex as many companies combined," O'Rourke said. "That forced us to build one of the most sophisticated carbon accounting systems in the world. We had to build a system that had the granular data, but at an Amazon scale." The Paris climate agreement of 2015 seeks to limit global warming to less than 2 degrees Celsius and meaningfully reduce man-made emissions by 2050. In 2017, President Donald Trump withdrew the United States from the landmark accord — a decision that has since attracted widespread scrutiny. Additionally, Trump and Bezos have sparred on several occasions, with Trump focusing his ire on the newspaper Bezos owns, The Washington Post. Bezos' plan comes as Amazon faces mounting pressure from employees to address its environmental impact. At Amazon's annual shareholder meeting in May, thousands of **employees submitted a proposal asking** Bezos **to develop a comprehensive climate-change plan** and reduce its carbon footprint, though it was ultimately rejected. The proposal was built on an employee letter published in April that accused Amazon of donating to climate-delaying legislators and urged the company to transition away from fossil fuels. Additionally, over 1,000 **Amazon employees** have said they plan to **walk out** on Friday **as part of the Global Climate Strike**, of which Google and Microsoft employees also plan to participate. The employee walkout represents the first strike at Amazon's Seattle headquarters in the company's 25-year history, according to Wired. When asked about the employee walkouts, Bezos said that while he doesn't support all of Amazon employees' demands, he understands why people are passionate about climate change. Among the specific demands Bezos said he doesn't support is ending AWS' cloud contracts with fossil fuel companies. "The global **strike** tomorrow, I think **it's totally understandable**," he said. "We **don't want this to be the tragedy of the commons**. We all have to work together on this." He added that Amazon is committed to looking at its campaign contributions to determine whether they include "active climate deniers." The company also intends to focus more lobbying efforts in Washington around political solutions to climate change, Bezos said.

Or

**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](http://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.

## 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.

## 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-added 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."

## 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. JAV

The uproar caused by press is also a major contribution by the strikes. The more people participate, the bigger the interest of the media, 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, publish articles about climate strikes.

during climate week, in September, the Guardian cover in detail what was taking place around the globe, the numbers, their demands, and rationale politicians tend to listen to what is being demanded from the masses big strike more chance of gaining space in political agendas example is in England campaigners pressure government into banning plastic items, like straws, stirrers, and cotton buds the European Parliament passed a law banning disposable plastic in the US eight states have already banned it More countries are pledging to become carbon neutral in the next few years owed to the efforts of climate activists

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