# 1NC

## 1

### OFF

#### Interpretation – debaters must have a wiki with contract information specific to the debater who is debating

#### Violation – they don’t ss in doc

Graphical user interface

Description automatically generated

#### They’ll say theyre a novice but there’s still no contact information

Graphical user interface, application

Description automatically generated

#### I’ll still win that having contact information is a good idea

#### [1] Safety – having a wiki is key to understand any accessibility concerns like trigger warnings or potentially sensitive topics. Absent a wiki there’s no way to tell – not having contact information makes it worse because there’s no way to verify it preround which kills 1NC strat construction. Inclusion is a voter – you can’t debate if you can’t participate

#### [2] Disclosure is good – open sourcing and disclosing round reports are a good thing because it levels the playing field – big schools have flows and docs but small schools won’t have access to such resources without things like open source – you don’t do that and our norm necessitates that everyone discloses everything – I didn’t get the aff 30 minutes before the round which means err neg on offense. They’ll say its’ disclosed, but if you download the doc the aff is about intellectual property which is not this topic

#### [1] DTD on 1nc theory and disclosure – a) disclosure cannot be drop the argument because it would just drop you because you’re the norm b) deterrence

#### [2] Reject all responses to disclosure – they selectively comply with our norm because they disclose some docs that meet our criteria which proves we can’t verify what norms they actually agree with.

#### [3] No RVI on NC theory – logicl, baiting, infinite abuse

#### [4] CI – 1] reasonability is arbitrary – impossible to know what is reasonable until you establish a brightline 2] bites judge intervention cuz they have to gut check what they think is good 3] reasonability collapses cuz u use offense defense to evaluate offense under the BL 4] norms – you can sidestep norms by selectively choosing a different brightline you meet every round.

#### [5] Disclosure outweighs – it’s key to assessing the honesty of the form of your argumentation and how you presented arguments which means it precludes 1nc claims.

#### [6] Fairness is a voter because debate is a game governed by rules and you can’t tell who actually won if the layer was skewed.

## 2

### OFF

#### I’ve returned from the year 2050 and I’ve got one goal – this ballot. I’ve seen what happens in the world, I’ve read it in history books, I’ve witnessed it happen in front of me. You do not want to vote affirmative. Voting affirmative leads to a mass extinction event with the final Armageddon of the human race. Super species aliens are monitoring Tabroom, and if this round shows an affirmative ballot they end all life in the universe through collapse of the universe through supertechnology. I know this now, and I was sent back as the universe’s last hope. This comes first – direct correlation to the ballot proximity and exportability.

#### The plan is also a bad idea – before the universe began it’s collapse, the affirmative was passed and caused extinction (except me because I’m different) because policy makers decided to destroy oxygen in the environment. Also even if it’s a good idea, you can endorse it with a negative ballot with the net benefit of giving me the ballot.

#### Time travel is real – relativity, wormholes, etc. I’m the warrant.

**Boogaard 20** [Chenoa van den Boogaard, 11-16-2020, "Time travel is possible, but it’s a one-way ticket," ScienceBorealis.ca Blog, Chenoa van den Boogaard has a B.Sc. from the University of British Columbia, majoring in astronomy and minoring in English literature, [https://blog.scienceborealis.ca/time-travel-is-possible-but-its-a-one-way-ticket //](https://blog.scienceborealis.ca/time-travel-is-possible-but-its-a-one-way-ticket%20//) JB]

The ability to travel **through time**, whether it is to fix a mistake in the past or gain insight into the future, has long been embraced by **science fiction** and **debated by theoretical physicists**. While the **debate** **continues** over whether travelling into the past is **possible, physicists** have **determined** that **travelling to the future most certainly is**. And you don’t need a wormhole or a DeLorean to do it. Real-life time travel occurs through time dilation, a property of **Einstein’s**[**special relativity**](https://www.universetoday.com/45484/einsteins-theory-of-relativity/). Einstein was the first to realize that time is not constant, as previously believed, but instead slows down as you move faster through space. As part of his theory, Einstein re-envisioned space itself. He coined the phrase “spacetime,” fusing the three **dimensions of space** and one dimension of time into a single term. Instead of treating space as a flat and rigid place that holds all the objects in the **universe**, Einstein thought of it as curved and **malleable**, able to form gravitational **dips around masses that pull other objects** in, just as a bowling ball placed in the centre of a trampoline would **cause** any **smaller object placed on the trampoline to slide towards the centre**. The closer an object gets to the centre of the dip, the faster it accelerates. The centre of the Earth’s gravitational dip is located at the Earth’s core, where gravitational acceleration is strongest. According to Einstein’s theory, because **time moves more slowly** as **you move faster through space**, the closer an object is to the **centre of the Earth**, the slower time moves for that object. This effect can be seen in GPS satellites, which orbit 20,200 kilometres above the Earth’s surface. These satellites have highly precise clocks onboard that gain an average of [38 microseconds per day](https://physicscentral.com/explore/writers/will.cfm) due to time dilation. While this time gain seems insignificant, GPS satellites rely on their onboard clocks to maintain precise global positioning. **Running** 38 microseconds **fast** would **result in a positioning error** of nearly 10 kilometres, an error that would increase daily if the time difference were not constantly corrected. A more dramatic example of time dilation can be seen in the movie [*Interstellar*](https://www.empireonline.com/movies/features/interstellar-explained/) when Matthew McConaughey and his crew land on a planet with an extreme gravitational field caused by a nearby black hole. Because of the black hole’s intense gravitational influence, **time slows dramatically** for the crew on the planet, making **one hour** on the surface equal to **seven years on Earth**. This is why, when the crew returns to Earth, Matthew McConaughey’s daughter is an old woman while he appears to be the same age as when he left. So why hasn’t humanity succeeded in making such drastic leaps forward in time? The answer to this question comes down to velocity. In order for humanity to send a traveller years into the future, we would either have to take advantage of the intense gravitational acceleration caused by black holes or send the traveller rocketing into space at [close to the speed of light](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l4u4wV_dOi0&feature=youtu.be&ab_channel=NASAGoddard) (about 1 billion km/h). With our [current technology](https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20150809-how-fast-could-humans-travel-safely-through-space), jumping a few microseconds into the future is all humans can manage. But if technology one day allows us to send a human into the future by travelling close to the speed of light, would there be any way for the traveller to use time dilation to return to the past and report her findings? “Interstellar travel reaching close to the speed of light might be possible,” says [Dr. Jaymie Matthews](https://phas.ubc.ca/users/jaymie-matthews), professor of astrophysics at the University of British Columbia, “[but] this voyage is one way – into the future, not back to the past.” If we can’t use time dilation to return to the past, does this mean that the past is forever inaccessible? Perhaps **no**t. Einstein proposed that **time travel into the past** could be achieved **through** an Einstein-Rosen bridge, a type of **wormhole**. Wormholes are theoretical areas of spacetime that are warped in a way that connects two distant points in space. Einstein’s equations suggested that this bridge in space could **hypothetically connect two points in time** instead if it were stable enough. “At the moment, even an Einstein-Rosen bridge cannot [be used to] go back in the past because it doesn’t live long enough – it is not stable,” Matthews explains.

#### Their weighing arguments flow negative –

#### 1) - Epistemic modesty – compare the probability of the framework times the magnitude of the impact under a framework – it’s true since it maximizes the probability of achieving net most moral value—beating a framework acts as mitigation to their impacts but the strength of that mitigation is contingent. It’s the best model for clash because we clash on all layers of the debate instead of strategic concessions which also promotes fairness because it doesn’t moot offense.

#### 2) - The future epistemologically knows more than the past – progress of ideas like humans thinking the Earth was the center of the universe prior proves that you should err neg because we have more knowledge

#### 3) - You should reject answers – they’re in a flawed futuristic mindset which is what brought us to extinction in the first place. Only this time rupture can rectify the flow of time. Also means they can’t weigh case because their sense of value doesn’t exist.

## 3

### OFF

#### Biden has PC for infrastructure but it needs to maintained in the face of impatient democrats.

**Sullivan and Kane 6/11** [Sean and Paul. Sean Sullivan covers national politics, with a focus on the 2020 presidential campaign. Paul Kane. Washington, D.C.Senior congressional correspondent and columnist. Education: University of Delaware, BA. “‘Time is running out’: Democrats split over Biden’s relentless focus on infrastructure”. 6-9-2021. . https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/democrats-split-biden-infrastructure/2021/06/10/f1f95a8e-c91f-11eb-afd0-9726f7ec0ba6\_story.html.]

“The infrastructure bill — its status is up in the air, but its long-term prognosis is okay,” said Brian Fallon, a former Senate Democratic aide who heads the liberal group Demand Justice. “You have another patient that’s dying on the table, and that’s the one you need to triage.” As pressure built in the party, Attorney General Merrick Garland signaled Friday that the Justice Department not only would scrutinize voting laws for signs of discrimination, but also would apply oversight to post-election audits. Supporters of former president Donald Trump have spearheaded audits in various states despite no evidence of fraud. “Where we see violations, we will not hesitate to act,” Garland said. Story continues below advertisement NAACP President Derrick Johnson said his group was “encouraged by the new tone on voting rights set by the Biden-Harris administration” but warned that the battle “is far from over.” As Garland spoke, the infrastructure talks remained fluid. Many Senate Democrats think that a bipartisan deal will never be reached, and that the prolonged bipartisan talks are only delaying the inevitable fallback to party-line legislation. White House press secretary Jen Psaki said Biden remains committed to pushing a bill through Congress this summer. Other Democrats strongly doubt that timetable can be achieved, however, and they worry that it will be even harder to pass anything next year, with congressional elections looming in November. Story continues below advertisement Many liberals initially accepted Biden’s push for a big infrastructure package as a follow-up to his covid-19 relief bill. But now they are alarmed at the plan’s slow progress, combined with aggressive moves by Republicans in Florida, Georgia, Arizona and Texas to pass restrictive voting laws, and they want the White House to redirect the power of the presidency to combat those efforts. [*After blocking voting bill, Texas Democrats call on Congress to do more*](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/texas-voting-rights-congress/2021/05/31/a3ff5f6a-c229-11eb-93f5-ee9558eecf4b_story.html?itid=lk_interstitial_manual_32) Fallon said Biden’s priorities are evident in his trips around the country to tout his infrastructure plan, punctuated by colorful activities such as [driving an electric vehicle in Michigan](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/biden-electric-truck/2021/05/18/168abee0-b815-11eb-a6b1-81296da0339b_story.html?itid=lk_inline_manual_33). “He’s test-driving Ford F-150s. He’s not going to Selma to talk about voting rights,” Fallon said. “That needs to happen.” Republicans see it differently, contending that Biden is trying to have it both ways by cramming his infrastructure bill with unrelated Democratic priorities. Story continues below advertisement “From the day the White House rolled out its first infrastructure plan in March, it’s been clear that the left’s definition of the word is evolving faster than even some Democrats can keep track,” Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) said on the Senate floor this week. “Medicaid expansion as infrastructure. Paid leave as infrastructure. And job-killing tax increases to hold the assortment together.” On the other hand, some liberal Democrats say they will oppose a deal with Republicans if it fails to address issues such as climate change, illustrating how hard a bipartisan deal will be in the evenly divided Senate. “From my perspective — no climate, no deal,” said Sen. Edward J. Markey (D-Mass.). “I’m not voting for an infrastructure bill that does not have climate.” He also rejected the idea of passing a more traditional bill that focuses on roads and bridges with the promise that a climate-centered bill would come later. Story continues below advertisement Markey recalled a climate bill passed by the House in 2009 that died in the Senate due to Republican opposition. “We now have a second chance at passing a piece of climate legislation that matches the scope and the scale of the problem,” Markey said. “We can’t allow Republican dilatory tactics to block consideration of a climate bill.” The prospects for a voting rights bill are if anything even more dire. All but one Democratic senator has signed on to the For the People Act, which has passed the House. The legislation, which Biden supports, would [set standards](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/manchin-voting-rights/2021/06/02/103db892-c320-11eb-93f5-ee9558eecf4b_story.html?itid=lk_inline_manual_43) for early voting and vote-by-mail that could override some state Republican voting laws. But Sen. Joe Manchin III (D-W.Va.), the lone holdout, said definitively this week that he would not vote for the plan, nor would he support changing the Senate filibuster rules to enable Democrats to pass it with a simple majority rather than 60 votes. White House officials have refrained from public criticism of Manchin, a reflection of his pivotal role in the Washington landscape. In a Senate that is divided 50-50, Manchin could single-handedly torpedo the infrastructure bill, prompting many in the White House to carefully mind what they say about him. White House officials said they are not taking voting rights any less seriously than infrastructure, pointing to recent remarks Biden made on the matter in Tulsa, his decision to [tap Vice President Harris to work on the issue](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/ahead-of-tulsa-trip-biden-to-unveil-new-plans-to-reduce-black-white-wealth-gap/2021/05/31/b80c9c4e-c269-11eb-8c18-fd53a628b992_story.html?itid=lk_inline_manual_47) and his executive order expanding ballot access. But voting rights activists note that those moves haven’t prevented the GOP voting laws from taking effect. The White House official working on voting rights expressed strong support for the For the People Act, even though the official thought it was not a panacea. The official said there are other means of fighting the Republican voting laws, through the courts or the executive branch. But the official said such efforts would be cumbersome and acknowledged that none would be as effective as the legislation. When it comes to infrastructure, in contrast, the president’s urgency has been in plain sight. Biden has traveled the country to promote his proposal. He’s enlisted Cabinet secretaries to help sell it. He’s holding Oval Office meetings where he negotiates directly on it. And he is expending significant political capital to get it across the finish line. In the eyes of Biden’s allies, this is a good recipe for success in the midterms and beyond. “The White House is right to make infrastructure a priority,” said Sen. Richard Blumenthal (D-Conn.), who is up for reelection. “It’s urgently time-sensitive because it’s so key to jobs and economic recovery, not to mention faith in the basic capacity of government to build bridges and roads.” Infrastructure is also an appealing goal for the White House because its passage may not require a long-shot effort to end the filibuster. If all 50 Democratic senators stick together, they could pass it with no Republican support using a special budgetary maneuver. That is not true for measures such as the voting rights bill, which has no connection to the budget, making it much more difficult to shepherd into law. Even if the bipartisan talks do not result in a deal, they are important to Manchin, who might not join a Democratic-only bill unless he thinks a real effort has been made to court Republicans, Democrats close to the process said. Underlying Democrats’ anxieties are painful memories of the early months of the Obama administration, when they passed a stimulus bill that many now think was too small, and talks on the Affordable Care Act dragged on without resulting in any GOP support. Now, some fear that if the party doesn’t move more swiftly, it could miss its chance to get an infrastructure bill passed. With no margin for error in the Senate, circumstances could shift at any moment, they say, noting that in 2010, Democrats unexpectedly lost a special Senate election, costing them a filibuster-proof majority and nearly dooming the ACA. “During the Obama admin, folks thought we’d have a 60 Dem majority for a while. It lasted 4 months. Dems are burning precious time & impact,” Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-N.Y.) tweeted. “It’s a hustle. We need to move now.” Others warn that even if Biden is ultimately successful on infrastructure, his victory could be short-lived without action on voting rights, given next year’s midterm elections. “You can win a round, but it doesn’t mean you win the fight,” said the Rev. Al Sharpton.

#### Preserving comfortable union relations maintains PC.

**Kerrissey and Schofer 13** [Kerrissey, Jasmine, and Evan Schofer. Jasmine Kerrissey Department of Sociology University of California, Irvine Evan Schofer Department of Sociology University of California, Irvine. “Union Membership and Political Participation in the United States.” *Social Forces*, vol. 91, no. 3, 2013, pp. 895–928. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/23361125]

Discussion and Conclusion We observe consistent evidence that union members are more politically engaged than non-members. The effect of union membership is broad, spanning most types of political and civic involvement, including voting, protesting, signing petitions, association membership, and so on, and holds up with a large range of control variables. 36 The prior literature looks mainly at voting outcomes – and often finds weak results when many variables are controlled – so even these basic findings represent a step forward. The magnitude of the union membership effect varies across outcomes, but is generally substantial. For instance, union members have 20% greater odds of voting than comparable non-members. The odds of participating in a protest were 73% to 100% higher among union members, according to the Roper and Verba datasets, respectively. Many of the large and highly significant effects are in areas of social protest and electoral participation. In the case of volunteering and charitable donations, for instance, we see substantially larger effects in political forms of those activities – whereas general measures of volunteering and donations show smaller effects. We observe weaker or non-significant effects of union membership on activities that are far removed from union agendas, such as general civic membership, volunteering, or blood donation. It appears that unions build ‘political capital’ more than generalized ‘social capital’.8 These patterns are broadly consistent with our structural arguments, discussed above, that contemporary American labor unions face strong pressures to mobilize members to prepare for collective action with employers and to maintain political capital with the Democratic party.

#### Strike would divide the Union

Israelstam 17 [Ivan. Ivan Israelstam is the Chief Executive of Labour Law Management Consulting. “What is the impact of strikes for employers and employees?”. 11-22-2017. Skills Portal. https://www.skillsportal.co.za/content/what-impact-strikes-employers-and-employees.]

The loss of production and of customers is usually the first consequence of a strike. However, indirect strike costs incurred later can be just as serious. In the case of *NUM and others vs Chrober Slate (Pty) Ltd* (2008, 3 BLLR 287) the mine dismissed its quarry workers and factory staff due to an unprocedural strike by the quarry workers. The employer admitted that the factory staff were not to blame for the work stoppage as it had been the quarry workers who had refused to work. The dismissals of the factory staff were found to be unfair and the Labour Court ordered the mine to reinstate the 42 dismissed employees with back pay. In order to avoid the snowballing costs and loss of business that strikes can cause the employer needs to understand: What constitutes a strike in legal terms, The economic effects of a strike for both parties, The effects of a strike on the employment relationship, How to resolve constructively the conflict that causes industrial action, How to minimise the damage caused by a strike, and How to bring a strike to a speedy end. WHAT CONSTITUTES A STRIKE? A strike is any concerted withholding of labour by a group of employees in support of a demand made by them to the employer. Examples of this are work stoppages, go-slows, overtime bans and work-to-rule. THE ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF A STRIKE FOR BOTH PARTIES. The employer is likely to lose money due to delayed service to clients or to lost production time. The employees will lose their pay due to the no work, no pay principle. If the strikers are dismissed they will lose their livelihoods altogether. THE EFFECTS OF A STRIKE ON THE EMPLOYMENT RELATIONSHIP. Once the strike is over, even if the business has not been closed down by it, the feelings of hostility resulting from the strike can severely damage teamwork, productivity and profitability. HOW TO RESOLVE CONSTRUCTIVELY THE CONFLICT THAT CAUSES INDUSTRIAL ACTION. Before the conflict gets to the stage of impasse that results in a strike the parties need to utilise the services of an expert in conflict resolution. The CCMA was set up with the purpose of helping the parties to resolve conflict peacefully. However, in practice, the warring parties too often go to the CCMA because the law says they must rather than in a sincere attempt to sort out their differences. In other words, by the time the parties end up at the CCMA the conflict is often beyond the point of no return. For this reason, during times of industrial peace, employers and employees should identify and agree upon the use of a trained and reputable conflict resolution expert to be called in when the parties are unable to solve the problem themselves. HOW TO MINIMISE THE DAMAGE CAUSED BY A STRIKE. Employees should allow the business to continue to run in order to avert the likelihood of a closure that could result in job losses. Employers should use the services of a reputable labour broker who can provide alternative labour during the strike. Both parties should behave in a civil and professional manner towards each other. HOW TO BRING A STRIKE TO A SPEEDY END. Where the parties are unable to find common ground they should not delay in bringing in the services of their mutually agreed strike resolution expert. An expert in this field will not only have techniques of bringing the parties together but will also be able to see solutions that the emotions of the parties have prevented them from seeing. The expert should also be able to help the parties rebuild their relationship once the strike is over.

#### Infrastructure bill is necessary to tackle emission reduction goals.

**Newburger 3/29** [Emma. Emma Newburger is a Climate policy reporter at [@CNBC](https://twitter.com/CNBC). [@Cornell](https://twitter.com/Cornell) grad. “Here’s how Biden’s infrastructure package will likely tackle climate change”. 1-27-2021. CNBC. https://www.cnbc.com/2021/03/29/biden-infrastructure-bill-what-to-expect-on-climate-change.html.]

President Joe Biden delivers remarks on tackling climate change prior to signing executive actions as White House climate envoy John Kerry and Vice President Kamala Harris listen in the State Dining Room at the White House in Washington, U.S., January 27, 2021. President [Joe Biden](https://www.cnbc.com/joe-biden/) this week is set to unveil details of a major infrastructure package that’s expected to include record spending on mitigating [climate change](https://www.cnbc.com/environment/) and accelerating a nationwide transition to clean energy. The president is expected to introduce up to $3 trillion in spending on efforts to boost the economy, including rebuilding aging infrastructure like highways, bridges and rail lines, and investing in technologies to reduce planet-warming greenhouse gas emissions. Some of the policies on the table include:

Installing thousands of new electric vehicle charging stations

Funds to build energy-efficient homes

Constructing new electric power lines

The package may be split between two bills, starting with legislation that incorporates Biden’s [Build Back Better agenda](https://joebiden.com/build-back-better/) and supports his goal to achieve carbon-free power generation by 2035 and net-zero emissions by 2050. The recovery plan will potentially involve installing thousands of electric vehicle charging stations and providing incentives to encourage Americans to purchase electric vehicles. As a candidate, Biden vowed to establish ambitious fuel economy standards for gasoline cars to encourage a shift to electric vehicles. The transportation sector accounts for the [largest share of U.S. emissions](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/sources-greenhouse-gas-emissions#:~:text=Transportation%20(28.2%20percent%20of%202018,ships%2C%20trains%2C%20and%20planes.), according to the Environmental Protection Agency, and could be the most difficult to decarbonize. The package also is primed to include funding to build millions of new energy-efficient homes and retrofit existing buildings to increase efficiency. There’s money to construct electric power lines that provide renewable energy and expand electricity storage. Paul Bledsoe, a former Clinton White House climate advisor now with the Progressive Policy Institute, said Biden’s goal is to jumpstart the economy and create new jobs during the transition away from fossil fuels. “Electrifying America’s cars and trucks, creating a nationwide smart grid, expanding electricity storage to allow more renewable energy, establishing universal high speed internet — all of these are intended to boost the productivity and competitiveness of the economy, while also cutting emissions,” Bledsoe said. Loading low-carbon energy initiatives into an infrastructure bill will likely be more divisive in Congress than previous Covid stimulus legislation. The last major push to pass climate legislation through the Senate was in 2009, when congressional Democrats failed to pass a carbon-pricing system. Some Democrats and climate activists fear that another failure to pass meaningful climate legislation amid concerns that a clean energy transition will cost jobs. Some Republicans who opposed Biden’s pandemic relief package have also condemned the president’s goal to incorporate climate policy into infrastructure legislation. Rep. Sam Graves, R-Mo., the top Republican on the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, said he’ll work with Democrats on infrastructure but that prioritizing climate issues would not receive GOP support. “A transportation bill needs to be a transportation bill, not a Green New Deal,” Graves said during a hearing Thursday. “It needs to be about roads and bridges.” House Speaker [Nancy Pelosi](https://www.cnbc.com/nancy-pelosi/) said Thursday she’ll support a bipartisan bill but will not eliminate components addressing climate change due to Republican objections. “We cannot just settle for what we can agree on without recognizing that this has to be a bill for the future, that we have to recognize the climate crisis,” Pelosi [told reporters.](https://www.speaker.gov/newsroom/32521-0) Biden has argued that his actions on climate will create millions of jobs. The president has already issued a series of climate executive orders, including suspending new oil and gas leasing on federal lands and [rejoining the U.S. into the Paris climate accord](https://www.cnbc.com/2021/01/20/biden-inauguration-us-rejoins-paris-climate-accord.html). The administration is leaning toward pursuing the bipartisan infrastructure legislation and passing other components through budget reconciliation, which would require only Senate Democrats to vote. “To gain the broadest support in Congress, Biden must emphasize the economic and jobs benefits of these investments first and foremost, not simply the climate benefits,” Bledsoe said. Stephanie Gidigbi Jenkins, director for policy and partnerships at the Natural Resources Defense Council, said the administration’s infrastructure proposal so far is “clearly focused on the right problems.” “Making these investments will create millions of good, American jobs and help us address the legacy of racial injustice,” Jenkins said. “Given the ambitions from the Biden administration and the commitment from key congressional leaders, we now have a historic opportunity to rebuild our economy for a cleaner, brighter future,” Jenkins added. “We are confident that Congress can achieve these goals.”

#### Warming causes extinction

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

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

## Case

### OV

#### Not reading a standard text is a voting issue – kills phil debate because people don’t have to justify things like utilitarianism. It’s also bad for fairness

#### Affirmatives that don’t read inherency based on their internal link should lose – recirpcority – I have to read uniqueness – logic – the aff doesn’t make sense

### Adv

#### Vote negative on presumption – the aff only fiats that the government recognizes ability to strike, however they have no evidence that says that recognition increases strikes or a lack of recognition means no strikes which means the aff doesn’t do anything. Zero risk exists – they have the burden of proof to warrant arguments

#### Workers don’t care about legality – strikes are on the rise absent the aff.

Notes 19 [Labor Notes; Media and organizing project that has been the voice of union activists who want to put the movement back in the labor movement since 1979; “Why Strikes Matter,” LN; 10/17/19; <https://labornotes.org/2019/10/why-strikes-matter>]//SJWen

“Why do you rob banks?” a reporter once asked Willie Sutton. “Because that’s where the money is,” the infamous thief replied. Why go on strike? Because that’s where our power is. Teachers in West Virginia showed it in 2018 when they walked out, in a strike that bubbled up from below, surprising even their statewide union leaders. No one seemed concerned that public sector strikes were unlawful in West Virginia. “What are they going to do, fire us all?” said Jay O’Neal, treasurer for the Kanawha County local. “Who would they get to replace us?” Already the state had 700 teaching vacancies, thanks to the rock-bottom pay the strikers were protesting. After 13 days out, the teachers declared victory and returned to their classrooms with a 5 percent raise. They had also backed off corporate education “reformers” on a host of other issues. The biggest lesson: “Our labor is ours first,” West Virginia teacher Nicole McCormick told the crowd at the Labor Notes Conference that spring. “It is up to us to give our labor, or to withhold it.” That’s the fundamental truth on which the labor movement was built. Strikes by unorganized workers led to the founding of unions. Strikes won the first union contracts. Strikes over the years won bigger paychecks, vacations, seniority rights, and the right to tell the foreman “that’s not my job.” Without strikes we would have no labor movement, no unions, no contracts, and a far worse working and living situation. In short, strikes are the strongest tool in workers’ toolbox—our power not just to ask, but to force our employers to concede something. DISCOVER YOUR POWER The key word is “force.” A strike is not just a symbolic protest. It works because we withhold something that the employer needs—its production, its good public image, its profits, and above all its control over us. As one union slogan has it, “this university works because we do”—or this company, or this city. A strike reveals something that employers would prefer we not notice: they need us. Workplaces are typically run as dictatorships. The discovery that your boss does not have absolute power over you—and that in fact, you and your co-workers can exert power over him—is a revelation. There’s no feeling like it. Going on strike changes you, personally and as a union. “Walking into work the first day back chanting ‘one day longer, one day stronger’ was the best morning I’ve ever had at Verizon,” said Pam Galpern, a field tech and mobilizer with Communication Workers Local 1101, after workers beat the corporate giant in a 45-day strike in 2016. “There was such a tremendous feeling of accomplishment. People were smiling and happy. It was like a complete 180-degree difference from before the strike,” when supervisors had been micromanaging and writing workers up for the smallest infractions. In a good strike, everyone has a meaningful role. Strikers develop new skills and a deeper sense that they own and run their union. New leaders emerge from the ranks and go on to become stewards. New friendships are formed; workers who didn’t know or trust one another before forge bonds of solidarity. A few stubborn co-workers finally see why the union matters and sign on as members. Allies from faith groups, neighborhood groups, or other unions adopt your cause. You and your co-workers lose some fear of the boss—and the boss gains some fear of you. In all these ways and more—not to mention the contract gains you may win—a strike can be a tremendous union-building activity.

#### Every empiric flows neg.
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In the five states where teachers have gone on strike this year, teachers complain about many of the same things: low salaries, an education funding squeeze and teacher shortages. They have something else in common. In four of the five — Arizona, Kentucky, Oklahoma and West Virginia — these strikes are illegal under state law. (Colorado, the fifth state where teachers walked out, allows them.)

While private-sector workers generally have a right to strike under federal law, state law governs whether teachers and other state and local government workers can strike. Three dozen states have laws prohibiting teachers from striking. Clearly, making teacher strikes illegal will not necessarily prevent them.

In the states where teachers walked out, many teachers felt they had to beg their state legislatures to approve raises and the funding to pay for them. But their pleas were largely ignored. Joseph McCartin, a labor historian at Georgetown University, says that when workers feel they are at a dead end in negotiating raises, militant outbursts — such as illegal walkouts — are inevitable. “When collective bargaining isn’t allowed or doesn’t work, that doesn’t mean collective action isn’t possible,” he said.

Labor’s most potent weapon is the strike, even when it’s illegal. Workers will often risk engaging in an illegal strike, even though it could mean getting fined, fired and conceivably jailed. In a legal strike, workers typically lose just a few days’ or weeks’ pay.

Explosions of worker militancy have been a recurring pattern throughout American history. West Virginia teachers, for example, said their walkout was inspired by their state’s coal miners, who were part of a historic miners’ strike during World War II.

Ten days after Pearl Harbor was attacked in 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt summoned labor and business leaders to a conference where unions pledged not to strike during the war. The National War Labor Board, which included labor representatives, dictated a nationwide formula that capped how large a raise unions could obtain in bargaining. But the raises often failed to keep up with inflation, angering millions of workers.

As a result, there were dozens of short wildcat strikes — strikes without union authorization — in defiance of Roosevelt and union leaders. The biggest confrontation came in 1943, when the United Mine Workers’ brilliant but bullheaded president, John L. Lewis, gave 500,000 coal miners a wink and a nod, tacit approval for a walkout.

Roosevelt implored the miners to return to work. “Every idle miner directly and individually is obstructing the war effort,” he said in a fireside chat. He had the federal government seize the mines and ordered miners back to work, but eager to restore labor peace, he figured out a way to meet most of their pay demands.

In 1962, President John F. Kennedy issued an executive order giving most federal employees the right to bargain collectively over some working conditions, but not wages, and he barred them from striking. For years, postal workers seethed about low pay, and their frustration boiled over after members of Congress received a 41 percent raise in 1969.

On March 18, 1970, letter carriers walked out in New York City, and within days, more than 150,000 of the nation’s 600,000 postal workers had joined the illegal strike. One letter carrier boasted that the strikers were “standing 10 feet tall, instead of groveling in the dust.”

During the 1970 postal workers’ strike, military personnel sorted mail at New York City’s main post office.

President Richard M. Nixon denounced the strike, but he didn’t seek to fire or jail the strikers. He mobilized 24,000 military personnel to deliver the mail — not very successfully — and reached a deal that ended the strike after eight days. The postal workers won an initial 6 percent raise, and when Nixon signed the Postal Reorganization Act that summer, they received an additional 8 percent.

H. R. Haldeman, Nixon’s chief of staff, acknowledged a big obstacle to punishing these unlawful strikers. “The mailman is a family friend, so you can’t hurt him,” Haldeman said.

State officials unhappy about the recent strikes have realized the same thing: They can’t really punish or replace the teachers. They’re too popular, there are too many to replace, and if state officials try to jail a few ringleaders, that might spur new strikes.

Not every illegal walkout ends well for workers. When air traffic controllers went on strike in 1981, President Ronald Reagan fired 11,345 controllers and rallied the public against their union, the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization, emphasizing that every controller had taken a no-strike pledge upon being hired. Reagan also lambasted the union for rejecting the 11 percent raise his administration was offering, about twice what other federal employees had received at the time.

With the end of the Arizona teachers’ walkout last Thursday, there are rumblings about which state might be next. In North Carolina, educators are angry that teacher salaries and per-pupil spending have not kept up with inflation. Even though teacher strikes are illegal in North Carolina, teachers there say they will walk out next Wednesday, the day that the state legislature opens. Lawmakers should take them seriously. Teachers have so far managed to win gains and skirt the law without any penalty because public opinion — and a lot of history — seems to be on their side.