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### Framework

**Agents must be practical reasoners -**

**[1] Regress - we can always ask why we should follow a theory, so they aren’t binding because they don’t have a starting point. Practical reason solves – When we ask why we should follow reason, we demand a reason, which concedes to the authority of reason itself, so it’s the only thing we can follow**

**[2] Action Theory - every action can be broken down to infinite amounts of movements, Only reason can unify these movements because we use practical reason to achieve our goals, means all actions collapse to reason**

**[3] Inescapability - the exercise of practical rationality requires that one regards practical rationality as intrinsically good – that justifies a right to freedom.**

**Wood** 07[Allen W. Wood, (Stanford University, California) "Kantian Ethics" Cambridge University Press, 2007, https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/kantian-ethics/769B8CD9FCC74DB6870189AE1645FAC8, DOA:8-12-2020 // WWBW rct st]

Kant holds that **the most basic act through which people exercise their practical rationality is that of setting an end** (G 4:437). **To set an end is, analytically, to subject yourself to the hypothetical imperative that you should take the necessary means to the end you have set** (G 4:417). This is the claim that you rationally ought to do something whether or not you are at the moment inclined to do it. It represents the action of applying that means as good (G 4:414) – in the sense of “good” that Kant explicates as: what is required by reason independently of inclination (G 4:413). Kant correctly infers that **any being which sets itself ends is committed to regarding its end as good in this sense, and also to regarding the goodness of its end as what also makes application of the means good** – that is, rationally required independently of any inclination to apply it. **The act of setting an end, therefore, must be taken as committing you to represent some other act (the act of applying the means) as good.** In doing all this, however, **the rational being must also necessarily regard its own rational capacities as authoritative for what is good in general.** For it treats these capacities as capable of determining which ends are good, and at the same time as grounding the goodness of the means taken toward those good ends. **But to regard one’s capacities in this way is also to take a certain attitude toward oneself as the being that has and exercises those capacities. It is to esteem oneself – and also to esteem the correct exercise of one’s rational capacities in determining what is good both as an end and as a means to it.** One’s other capacities, such as those needed to perform the action that is good as a means, are also regarded as good as means. **But that capacity through which we can represent the very idea of something as good both as end and as means is not represented merely as the object of a contingent inclination, nor is it represented as good only as a means. It must be esteemed as unconditionally good, as an end in itself. To find this value in oneself is not at all the same as thinking of oneself as a good person. Even those who misuse their rational capacities are committed to esteeming themselves as possessing rational nature.** It also does not imply that a more intelligent person (in that sense, more “rational”) is “better” than a less intelligent one. The self-esteem involved in setting an end applies to any being capable of setting an end at all, irrespective of the cleverness or even the morality of the end setting. Kant’s argument supports the conclusion, to which he adheres with admirable consistency throughout his writings, that all rational beings, clever or stupid, even good or evil, have equal (absolute) worth as ends in themselves. For Kantian ethics **the rational nature in every person is an end in itself whether the person is morally good or bad.**

**We have a unified perspective – If I say that 1+1=2, I understand that everyone can arrive at the same conclusion too because they create practical arguments to justify their conclusion. But, willing a maxim that violates the freedom of others is a contradiction**

**Engstrom**, Stephen (Professor of Ethics at UPitt). “Universal Legislation As the Form of Practical Knowledge.”<http://www.philosophie.uni-hd.de/md/philsem/engstrom_vortrag.pdf> rct st

Given the preceding considerations, it’s a straightforward matter to see how **a maxim of action that assaults the freedom of others with a view to furthering one’s own ends results in a contradiction when we attempt to will it as a universal law** in accordance with the foregoing account of the formula of universal law. **Such a maxim would lie in a practical judgment that deems it good on the whole to act to limit others’ outer freedom, and hence their self-sufficiency, their capacity to realize their ends, where doing so augments, or extends, one’s own outer freedom and so also one’s own self-sufficiency.** In this passage, Kant mentions assaults on property as well as on freedom. But since property is a specific, socially instituted form of freedom, I have omitted mention of it to focus on the primitive case. Now on the interpretation we’ve been entertaining, **applying the formula of universal law involves considering whether it’s possible for every person—every subject capable of practical judgment—to share[s] the practical judgment asserting the goodness of every person’s acting according to the maxim in question.** Thus in the present case the application of **the formula involves considering whether it’s possible for every person to deem good every person’s acting to limit others’ freedom, where practicable, with a view to augmenting their own freedom**. Since here **all persons are on the one hand deeming good both the limitation of others’ freedom and the extension of their own freedom,** while on the other hand, insofar as they agree with the similar judgments of others, **also deeming good the limitation of their own freedom and the extension of others’ freedom, they are all deeming good both the extension and the limitation of both their own and others’ freedom.**

**Only a collective will that can have power over individuals can guarantee the enforcement of good maxims. Thus, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative.**

**To clarify, the framework does not value the ability to set any end, but rather the ability to decide which ends to pursue.**

**Ripstein 1**, (Arthur Ripstein, Arthur Ripstein is Professor of Law and Philosophy and University Professor. He was appointed to the Department of Philosophy in 1987, promoted to Full Professor in 1996, appointed to the Faculty of Law in 1999, and appointed to the rank of University Professor in 2016. He received a doctorate in philosophy from the University of Pittsburgh, a master’s degree in law from Yale, and an undergraduate degree from the University of Manitoba. He was Chair of the Philosophy Department 2011-14 and Acting Chair 2019-20., 2009, accessed on 8-18-2020, Harvard University Press, "Force and Freedom",) NP 8/4/16. rct st

**Independence is the basic principle of right. It guarantees equal free- dom, and so requires that no person be subject to the choice of another.** The idea of independence is similar to one that has been the target of many objections. The basic form of almost all of these focuses on the fact that **any set of rules prohibits some acts that people would otherwise do**, so that, for example, **laws prohibiting personal injury** and property dam- age **put limits on the ability of people to do as they wish.** Because differ- ent **people have incompatible wants, to let one person do what [they] want[] will typically require preventing others from doing what they want.** Thus, it has been contended, **freedom cannot even be articulated as a political value, because freedoms always come into conflict,** and **the only way to mediate those conflicts is by appealing to goods other than freedom.** As I will explain in more detail in Chapter 2, such an objection has some force against freedom understood as the ability to do whatever you wish, but fails to engage Kant’s conception of independence. **Limits on indepen- dence generate a set of restrictions that are by their nature equally appli- cable to all.** Their **generality depends on the** fact that they **abstract from** what Kant calls **the “matter” of choice—the particular purposes being pursued—and focus instead on the capacity to set purposes without hav- ing them set by others.** **What you can accomplish depends on what oth- ers are doing—someone else can frustrate your plans by getting the last quart of milk in the store. If they do so, they don’t interfere with your in- dependence, because they impose no limits on your ability to use your powers to set and pursue your own purposes. They** just change the world in ways that **make your means useless for the particular purpose you would have set. Their entitlement to change the world in those ways just is their right to independence.** In the same way, your ability to enter into cooperative activities with others depends upon their willingness to co- operate with you, and their entitlement to accept or decline your invita- tions is simply their right to independence

**Performativity – freedom is the key to the process of justification of arguments. Willing that we should abide by their ethical theory presupposes that we own ourselves in the first place. Thus, it is logically incoherent to justify the NC standard without first willing that we can pursue ends free from others.**

**Impact Calc -**

[1] **- the aff is not consequentialist - we can only know if the structure of an action is universalizable. Consequences assume that we can predict what happens in the future but that’s impossible – we only have prior knowledge of intentions, so they come first**

[2] **Consequentialism Fails –**

**a] Butterfly Effect – Every action has an infinite number of consequences that stem from it – me coughing could cause nuclear war a hundred years later– you can’t quantify the infinite amount of pain and pleasure to come**

**b] Aggregation fails – everyone has different feelings of pain and pleasure, so you can’t universalize that and say it’s good – it’s impossible to measure something that’s completely subjective**

[3] **Oppression is caused by arbitrary exclusion of others – only universalizability makes sure that includes everyone equally. Farr 2**

Farr 02 Arnold Farr (prof of phil @ UKentucky, focusing on German idealism, philosophy of race, postmodernism, psychoanalysis, and liberation philosophy). “Can a Philosophy of Race Afford to Abandon the Kantian Categorical Imperative?” JOURNAL of SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY, Vol. 33 No. 1, Spring 2002, 17–32. // NB

One of the most popular criticisms of **Kant’s** moral philosophy is that it is too formalistic.13 That is, the universal nature of the categorical imperative leaves it devoid of content. Such a principle is useless since moral decisions are made by concrete individuals in a concrete, historical, and social situation. This type of criticism lies behind Lewis Gordon’s rejection of any attempt to ground an antiracist position on Kantian principles. The rejection of universal principles for the sake of emphasizing the historical embeddedness of the human agent is widespread in recent philosophy and social theory. I will argue here on Kantian grounds that although a distinction between the **universal and** the **concrete** is a valid distinction, the **unity** of the two **is required** for an understanding of human agency. The attack on Kantian formalism began with Hegel’s criticism of the Kantian philosophy.14 The list of contemporary theorists who follow Hegel’s line of criticism is far too long to deal with in the scope of this paper. Although these theorists may approach the problem of Kantian formalism from a variety of angles, the spirit of their criticism is basically the same: The universality of the categorical imperative is an abstraction from one’s empirical conditions. Kant is often accused of making the moral agent an abstract, empty, noumenal subject. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Kantian subject is an embodied, empirical, concrete subject. However, this concrete subject has a dual nature. Kant claims in the Critique of Pure Reason as well as in the Grounding that human beings have an intelligible and empirical character.15 It is impossible to understand and do justice to Kant’s moral theory without taking seriously the relation between these two characters. The very concept of morality is impossible without the tension between the two. By “empirical character” Kant simply means that we have a sensual nature. We are physical creatures with physical drives or desires. The very fact that **I cannot simply satisfy** my **desires without considering** the **rightness** or wrongness of my actions suggests that my **empirical character must be** held **in check** by something, or else I behave like a Freudian id. My empiri- cal character must be held in check by my intelligible character, which is the legislative activity of practical reason. It is through our intelligible character that we formulate **principles** that keep our empirical impulses in check. The categorical imperative is the supreme principle of morality that is constructed by the moral agent in his/her moment of self-transcendence. What I have called self-transcendence may be best explained in the following passage by Onora O’Neill: In restricting our maxims to those that meet the test of the categorical imperative we refuse to base our lives on maxims that necessarily make our own case an exception. The reason why a universilizability criterion is morally signiﬁcant is that it makes our own case no special exception (G, IV, 404). In accepting the Categorical Imperative we accept the moral reality of other selves, and hence the possibility (not, note, the reality) of a moral community. The Formula **of Universal Law** enjoins no more than that **we act only on maxims that are open to others also**.16 O’Neill’s description of the universalizability criterion includes the notion of self-transcendence that I am working to explicate here to the extent that like self-transcendence, universalizable moral principles require that the individ- ual think beyond his or her own particular desires. **The individual is** **not allowed to exclude others** as rational moral agents who have the right to act as he acts in a given situation. For example, if I decide to use another person merely as a means for my own end I must recognize the other person’s right to do the same to me. I cannot consistently will that I use another as a means only and will that I not be used in the same manner by another. Hence, the universalizability criterion is a principle of consistency and a principle of inclusion. That is, in choosing my maxims I attempt to include the perspective of other moral agents. … Whereas most criticisms are aimed at the formulation of universal law and the formula of autonomy, our analysis here will focus on the formula of an end in itself and the formula of the kingdom of ends, since we have already addressed the problem of universality. The latter will be discussed ﬁrst. At issue here is what Kant means by “kingdom of ends.” Kant writes: “By ‘kingdom’ I understand a systematic union of different rational beings through common laws.”32 The above passage indicates that Kant recognizes different, perhaps different kinds, of rational beings; however, the problem for most critics of Kant lies in the assumption that Kant suggests that the “kingdom of ends” requires that we abstract from personal differences and content of private ends. The Kantian conception of rational beings requires such an abstraction. Some feminists and philosophers of race have found this abstract notion of rational beings problematic because they take it to mean that rationality is necessarily white, male, and European.33 Hence, the systematic union of rational beings can mean only the systematic union of white, European males. I ﬁnd this interpretation of Kant’s moral theory quite puzzling. Surely another interpretation is available. That is, the implication that in Kant’s philosophy, rationality can only apply to white, European males does not seem to be the only alternative. The problem seems to lie in the requirement of abstraction. There are two ways of looking at the abstraction requirement that I think are faithful to Kant’s text and that overcome the criticisms of this requirement. First, the **abstraction** requirement may be best understood **as a demand for intersubjectivity** or recognition. Second, it may be understood as an attempt **to avoid ethical egoism** in determining maxims for our actions. It is unfortunate that Kant never worked out a theory of intersubjectivity, as did his successors Fichte and Hegel. However, this is not to say that there is not in Kant’s philosophy a tacit theory of intersubjectivity or recognition. The abstraction requirement simply demands that in the midst of our concrete differences we recognize ourselves in the other and the other in ourselves. That is, we recognize in others the humanity that we have in common. Recognition of our common humanity is at the same time recognition of rationality in the other. We recognize in the other the capacity for selfdetermination and the capacity to legislate for a kingdom of ends. This brings us to the second interpretation of the abstraction requirement. **To avoid** ethical **egoism one must abstract from** (think beyond) one’s own personal interest and **subjective maxims**. That is, the categorical imperative requires that I recognize that I am a member of the realm of rational beings. Hence, I organize my maxims in consideration of other rational beings. Under such a principle other people cannot be treated merely as a means for my end but must be treated as ends in themselves. The merit of the categorical imperative for a philosophy of race is **that** it **contravenes racist ideology** to the extent that racist ideology is based **on the use of persons** of a different race **as a means to an end** rather than as ends in themselves. Embedded in the formulation of an end in itself and the formula of the kingdom of ends is the recognition of the common hope for humanity. That is, maxims ought to be chosen on the basis of an ideal, a hope for the amelioration of humanity. This ideal or ethical commonwealth (as Kant calls it in the Religion) is the kingdom of ends.34 Although the merits of Kant’s moral theory may be recognizable at this point, we are still in a bit of a bind. It still seems problematic that the moral theory of a racist is essentially an antiracist theory. Further, what shall we do with Henry Louis Gates’s suggestion that we use the Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime to deconstruct the Grounding? What I have tried to suggest is that instead of abandoning the categorical imperative we should attempt to deepen our understanding of it and its place in Kant’s critical philosophy. A deeper reading of the Grounding and Kant’s philosophy in general may produce the deconstruction35 suggested by Gates. However, a text is not necessarily deconstructed by reading it against another. Texts often deconstruct themselves if read properly. To be sure, the best way to understand a text is to read it in context. Hence, if the Grounding is read within the context of the critical philosophy, the tools for a deconstruction of the text are provided by its context and the tensions within the text. Gates is right to suggest that the Grounding must be deconstructed. However, this deconstruction requires much more than reading the Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime against the Grounding. It requires a complete engagement with the critical philosophy. Such an engagement discloses some of Kant’s very signiﬁcant claims about humanity and the practical role of reason. With this disclosure, deconstruction of the Grounding can begin. What **deconstruction will reveal** is not necessarily the inconsistency of Kant’s moral philosophy or the racist or sexist nature of the categorical imperative, but rather, it will disclose the **disunity** between Kant’s theory and his own feelings about blacks and women. Although the theory is consistent and emancipatory and should apply to all persons, **Kant** the man **has his own** personal and moral **problems**. Although Kant’s attitude toward people of African descent was deplorable, **it would be equally deplorable to reject** the categorical imperative **without ﬁrst exploring** its **emancipatory potential**.

### Advocacy – 1:58

#### Thus the advocacy – Resolved: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

**Findlaw 17** [Created By Findlaw'S, 5-2-2017, "Labor Strike FAQs," Findlaw, <https://www.findlaw.com/employment/wages-and-benefits/labor-strike-faqs.html> // LEX JB]

* Definition of worker and strike, explains process

For **a strike** to occur, a [union or group of workers](https://www.findlaw.com/smallbusiness/employment-law-and-human-resources/unions-basics.html)**begins negotiations with an employer**. A threat of strike action is the main weapon that the workers has—**essentially the workers** will walk off the job if **their** collective demands are not met. For a strike to occur, **union leadership must call for a strike, which can only occur if enough union members have voted for the strike**. Each individual union has rules dictating what percentage of workers must vote for a strike in order for it to occur. Once the workers strike and stop coming to work, the business might shut down and feel financial strain, which **puts pressure on the employer and** gives the workers leverage in the negotiations**.**

#### I’ll defend the actor as an ideal government in relation to Kantian principles as per the resolution’s use of just which implies morality. If a government is just then it is one that recognizes workers’ strike.

### Offense – 2:52

#### **[1] The formula of autonomy demands a workers’ right to strike. The NC’s universalizability objections WILL miss the boat – it’s a question of how workers exercise their agency and autonomy which outweighs**

**Chima 13** [Chima, S. C. (2013). Global medicine: Is it ethical or morally justifiable for doctors and other healthcare workers to go on strike? BMC Medical Ethics, 14(Suppl 1), S5. doi:10.1186/1472-6939-14-s1-s5 // LEX JB]

Some philosophers have described moral obligations or duties, which ought to guide ethical behavior, such as the duty of fidelity or the obligation to keep promises, and beneficence - the obligation to do ‘good’ [10]. However, it has been suggested that some other equally compelling moral duties or ethical obligations may conflict with the above duties, such as the right to justice. Justice is the right to fair treatment in light of what is owed a person [63]. For example, it may be argued that everybody is equally entitled to a just wage for just work. The philosopher Immanuel Kant based his moral theory on a categorical imperative which encourages moral agents to act, based on a principle, which they would deem to become a universal law [64]. One can argue that the decision by any HCW to go on strike may not be universalisable. However, looking at this decision from the principle of respect for autonomy, or freedom of choice, one can conclude that individual autonomy is a sentiment which is desirable for all human beings. Accordingly, every worker should be free to choose whether to work or not, based on a whether any specific set of conditions of their own choosing have been met. Kant argues further that moral agents or individuals should be treated, “whether in your own person or in that of any other, never solely as a means, but always as an end” [64]. This idea that individuals should be treated as ends in themselves has influenced political philosophy for centuries, and stresses the libertarian ideology that people should not have their individual freedoms curtailed either for others or for the good of society in general [10,64]. From this axiomatic considerations, one can conclude that it would be unethical for people to be used as slaves or be forced to work for inadequate wages or under slave-like conditions [4,10,12,51]. The issue of HCW strikes can also be analyzed from utilitarian principles as formulated by one of its major disciples JS Mills as follows [65]: The creed which accepts as the foundation of morals, utility, or the greatest happiness principle, holds that Chima BMC Medical Ethics 2013, 14(Suppl 1):S5 http://www.biomedcentral.com/1472-6939/14/S1/S5 Page 6 of 10 actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness.

#### [2] Recognizing ability to strike is a unique obligation of the institution – anything else allows coercive workplaces and treating workers as a means to an end

**Howard 20** [Danielle Howard,, Mar 2020, "What Should Physicians Consider Prior to Unionizing?," Journal of Ethics | American Medical Association, [https://journalofethics.ama-assn.org/article/what-should-physicians-consider-prior-unionizing/2020-03 //](https://journalofethics.ama-assn.org/article/what-should-physicians-consider-prior-unionizing/2020-03%20//) LEX JB]

* Written in the context of doctors, warrant can be used for all jobs

When discussing ethics, practicalities, and outcomes of physician unions, the focus is almost always entirely on physicians. Yet to place the weight of responsibility for patient care entirely on unionized clinicians is unjust, as Kant’s reasoning applies to the employing organization as well (hereafter referred to as “the health system”). The health system benefits from physicians providing patient care; if it then creates working conditions that its employed clinicians do not find sustainable, it violates the categorical imperative by using clinicians as a means to its end. The same can be said of patients, who are used as means to an end if the health system places restrictions on patient care for financial gain. When evaluating the ethics of physician unionization, it is important to realize that the health system has its own corporate social responsibility to both patients and physicians that is independent of physicians’ commitment to patient care.26 Physicians are expected to consider the effects that their unionization will have on the patient population because they have a responsibility to patient care. The health system shares equally in this responsibility.

#### [3] Strikes are just an extension of the right to self defense and a core part of human value

Waas 12 [Professor Dr. Bernd Waas, Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany [https://islssl.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Strike-Waas.pdf September 2012](https://islssl.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Strike-Waas.pdf%20September%202012)]

Second, entirely different attitudes exist towards strikes. In some countries, strikes are considered “a right to self-defence” which is not necessarily directed at the employer; in other countries, the area of admissible industrial action may be necessarily congruent with the relationship between employers and employees. In yet other countries, strikes are seen as acts of “self-empowerment” which have very little to do with a legal order granting certain powers or rights. Finally, in some countries, the right to strike is viewed as being firmly rooted in human dignity, granted to each individual worker and not waivable by him or her, and in others, the perspective may be more “technical” with a considerable power to dispose of the right to strike.

#### [4] The offense can’t be turned – strikes are an omission of action

**Benjamin 78** [Walter Benjamin, On Violence, Reflections: Essays, Aphorisms, Autobiographical Writings [Walter Bendix Schönflies Benjamin was a German Jewish philosopher, cultural critic and essayist]

This is above all the case in the class struggle, in the form of the workers' guaranteed right to strike. **Organized labor is, apart from the state, probably today the only legal subject en­titled to exercise violence. Against this view there is certainly the objection that an omission of actions, a nonaction, which a strike really is, cannot be described as violence**. Such a consideration doubtless made it easier for a state power to conceive the right to strike, once this was no longer avoidable. But its truth is not unconditional, and therefore not unrestricted. It is true that the omission of an action, or service, where it amounts simply to a "severing of relations," can be an entirely nonviolent, pure means. **And as in the view of the state, or the law, the right to strike conceded to labor is certainly not a right to exercise violence but, rather, to escape from a violence indirectly exercised by the employer**, **strikes conforming to this may undoubtedly occur from time to time and involve only a "withdrawal" or "estrangement" from the employer.** The mo­ment of violence, however, is necessarily introduced, in the form of extortion, into such an omission, if it takes place in the context of a conscious readiness to resume the suspended action under certain circumstances that either have nothing whatever to do with this action or only superficially modify it. Understood in this way, the right to strike constitutes in the view of labor, which is opposed to that of the state, the right to use force in attaining certain ends. The antithesis between the two conceptions emerges in all its bitterness in face of a revolu­tionary general strike. In this, labor will always appeal to its right to strike, and the state will call this appeal an abuse, since the right to strike was not "so intended," and take emer­gency measures.

## Underview

### Climate Advantage – 4:33

#### Climate strike participants get arrested now.

**Scanlan 19** [Quinn. Quinn Scanlan. Voting, campaigns & elections for [@ABC](https://twitter.com/ABC). “Jane Fonda arrested in climate change strike outside Capitol”. 10-11-2019. ABC News. https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/jane-fonda-arrested-climate-change-strike-capitol/story?id=66209415.]

Academy Award winning actress Jane Fonda, 81, was arrested by police with a group of about a dozen protesters Friday after being warned repeatedly to leave the steps of the U.S. Capitol. Inspired by youth climate activists like Sweden's Greta Thunberg, 16, who herself recently came to Washington to [testify in front of Congress](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/greta-thunberg-teen-climate-activist-tells-us-lawmakers/story?id=65692288), Fonda, who, throughout her long career, has engaged in activism, dating as far back as the Vietnam War, recently told ABC News that while she's in the nation's capital, every Friday, she'll attend "Fire Drill Friday," a weekly event featuring scientists, celebrities and activists addressing the various facets and impacts of climate change. The event title is a play on Thunberg saying during a speech at the World Economic Forum's annual meeting in Davos, Switzerland in January, "I want you to act as if our house is on fire. Because it is." "11 o'clock every Friday morning come get arrested with me or choose not to it doesn't matter," told ABC News in an earlier interview about her planned effort. Fonda said she decided to leave her home, and comfort zone, through the holidays, and move to Washington for four months, because she wanted to "make a commitment to" the issue of climate change. In an interview with ABC News Deputy Political director MaryAlice Parks for an episode of of ABC News Live's "The Briefing Room," Fonda said that while they bear no blame for causing it, the [kids are leading the charge](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/teenage-climate-change-activist-greta-thunbeerg-takes-global/story?id=65601228) on fighting climate change. "They're saying, 'Come on, you know, you're taking our future away from us. We need -- we need you to support us.' And so grandmas unite," she said. "I want to stand with them and raise up... their message. This is -- this is serious... This is a crisis unlike anything that has ever faced humankind." Stressing she was not being hyperbolic, Fonda said this is the "one issue" that matters because it "will [determine the survival of our species](https://abcnews.go.com/International/united-nations-report-details-looming-climate-crisis/story?id=58354235)," and said that's why she'll be attending Fire Drill Fridays weekly. David Swanson/AP, FILE *Actress and activist Jane Fonda talks to a crowd of protestors during a global climate rall...Read More* "I think every single human being has to say, 'What can I do to put this at the forefront?'" she said. "(With) everything that's going on in the news, well, we have to fight our way through that and find ways to get climate change in people's minds." The esteemed actress pushed back against criticism that Hollywood's presence could make climate change a more polarizing issue. "What we're facing is so important and so urgent, it doesn't matter. Those -- those things don't even matter," she told Parks. "This is the future. This is whether we're going to survive." Fonda also said that the United States needs "to lead the way" on this issue, so that other countries who contribute heavily to greenhouse gas emissions, like China and India, "follow suit." While she's been passionate about this issue for "decades," she credits her current endeavors on [Thunberg's recurring protest](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/teenage-climate-change-activist-greta-thunbeerg-takes-global/story?id=65601228) outside Swedish parliament, and other student climate strikers around the world for taking on this issue so passionately.

#### Strikes incentivize companies to take climate action seriously.

**Ivanova 19** [Irin. Work, tech, climate and data for [@CBSNews](https://twitter.com/CBSNews). Priors: [@HuffPost](https://twitter.com/HuffPost), [@CrainsNewYork](https://twitter.com/CrainsNewYork), [@newmarkjschool](https://twitter.com/newmarkjschool). “These businesses are closing for Friday's climate strike”. 9-20-2019. No Publication. https://www.cbsnews.com/news/global-climate-strike-businesses-close-their-doors-in-time-for-climate-strike-2019/.]

Thousands of people are planning to walk out of work or school on Friday to press global leaders for solutions to rapidly escalating climate change. And while it was students who started the movement, more and more workers—and even companies—are joining them in support. Some businesses are letting workers take the day off to protest, while others plan to close their doors outright. They tend to be small or mid-sized businesses — most of the country's largest corporations have yet to weigh in on the strike, although plenty of people who work at them might yet participate when walkouts are set to start Friday afternoon. Here are the ways workers and companies are supporting the strike. **Walkouts** Amazon is expected to see more than 1,500 employees walk out, with the largest contingent exiting its Seattle headquarters, as they push the company to cut ties with fossil-fuel companies and stop funding groups that deny climate science. The company on Thursday announced it would make its operations carbon-neutral by 2040 and run entirely on renewable energy within a decade. More than 900 **Google** workers and unknown numbers of workers from **Facebook, Atlassian, Cobot, Ecosia, Microsoft** and **Twitter** are vowing walkouts. The strikers have details at [Tech Workers Coalition.](https://techworkerscoalition.org/climate-strike/) Some smaller companies are giving workers paid time off to participate in the walkouts. These include **Atlassian, Sustain Natural, Grove Collaborative** and others. **Closures** Ben & Jerry's corporate offices in South Burlington, Vermont, will be closed during the strike on Friday, while shops worldwide will either be closed or open later than usual. The company is also stopping production at its manufacturing plants in Vermont and the Netherlands, according to [Adweek](https://www.adweek.com/brand-marketing/brands-are-closing-their-doors-in-support-of-the-global-climate-strike/). "We recognize that climate change is an existential threat to our planet and all its inhabitants, and therefore we are proud standing with the youth-led movement demanding bold action in response to the climate emergency," a spokesperson said. **Patagonia** is closing its retail stores for 24 hours on Friday. "For decades, many corporations have single-mindedly pursued profits at the expense of everything else — employees, communities and the air, land and water we all share," CEO Rose Marcario wrote on [LinkedIn](https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/enough-join-climate-strikes-demand-action-rose-marcario/?sf219300827=1). "[C]apitalism needs to evolve if humanity is going to survive." Lush Cosmetics will close its manufacturing facilities and retail outlets on September 20 in the U.S. and on September 27 in Canada. It's also halting online sales on Friday. **Badger Balm** is closing for the day and giving workers paid time off to demonstrate or volunteer. The company is also donating 5% of online sales from September 16 to 27 to AmazonWatch.org to aid in preserving the shrinking Amazon's ecological systems, it said. **Burton**, the outdoor retailer, is closing its offices and owned retail stores on September 20th or 27th (depending on their country of location). It also won't make any online sales for 24 hours on Friday. **SodaStream**, the seltzer maker owned by PepsiCo, is shuttering its headquarters and closing e-commerce on Friday. **Digital doings and more** The heart of the strike will be in the streets, but that doesn't mean the action stops there. More than 7,000 [companies](https://digital.globalclimatestrike.net/) have pledged to draw attention to the protest by either donating ad space or putting banners on their sites. Participants include Tumblr, WordPress, Imgur, Kickstarter, BitTorrent, Tor, BoingBoing, Greenpeace, Change.org, among many others.

**Strong STEM education solves climate change, SITU 10-4**

[StudyUSA, 10-4-2021, "Why Is STEM Important? The Impact of STEM Education on Society", Study in the USA, https://www.studyusa.com/en/a/2157/why-is-stem-important-the-impact-of-stem-education-on-society, date accessed 10-25-2021] //Lex AT

Preparation of STEM Experts Who Can Make a Difference STEM education gives people skills that make them more employable and ready to meet the current labor demand. It encompasses the whole range of experiences and skills. Each STEM component brings a valuable contribution to a well-rounded education. Science gives learners an in-depth understanding of the world around us. It helps them to become better at research and critical thinking. Technology prepares young people to work in an environment full of high-tech innovations. Engineering allows students to enhance problem-solving skills and apply knowledge in new projects. Mathematics enables people to analyze information, eliminate errors, and make conscious decisions when designing solutions. STEM education links these disciplines into a cohesive system. Thus, it prepares professionals who can transform society with innovation and sustainable solutions. The STEM approach to education fosters creativity and divergent thinking alongside fundamental disciplines. It motivates and inspires young people to generate new technologies and ideas. With a focus on practice and innovation, students get to learn from [inquiry-based assignments](https://www.prodigygame.com/main-en/blog/inquiry-based-learning-definition-benefits-strategies). STEM education gives an understanding of concepts and encourages knowledge application. To keep it short, its aim can be formulated in two simple actions: explore and experience. Students are free to exercise what they learn and embrace mistakes in a risk-free environment. Project-based learning and problem-solving help learners to form a special mindset. Its core is in flexibility and curiosity, which equips learners to respond to real-world challenges. STEM-Enhanced Teamwork and Communication STEM education prepares the world for the future. It is based on teamwork and collaboration of professionals from different disciplines. As a STEM student, you do not need to be an expert in each particular subject. You rather acquire a mindset that enables you to become a part of the highly qualified workforce, which functions in collaboration. Teamwork brings a significant increase in productivity, work satisfaction, and profitability. Bottom of Form Active engagement of experts from diverse fields will drive change in our society. STEM education exposes students to effective interdisciplinary communication. Scientists research and experiment, offering the team discoveries. Technology experts provide gadgets that can make the work of the team more effective. Engineers help to solve challenges by designing and running platforms that enable change. Mathematicians analyze information to eliminate mistakes and provide precise calculations. Our world is continuously changing. The only way we can be ready for its challenges is through communication and collaboration. Collaborative experience also helps to broaden the impact of STEM education. Working with local experts and our international colleagues, we can promote our values and move towards a single purpose. This way, we improve communities, offering new educational and employment opportunities. Such open access to world-class experience is possible only when we combine our knowledge and capabilities. Social Awareness There is a high demand for STEM skills in society. STEM education enables people to make informed decisions within the discussed subject areas. Moreover, STEM awareness is necessary for any job as most industries are more or less connected to science and technology: from an [essay writing service](https://essayservice.com/) and college to a paper company. Thus, such education will allow children to grow into active citizens who can speak up in STEM discussions with sound knowledge of the subject. STEM awareness promotes interest in a range of exciting careers. Currently, some STEM occupations are understaffed. For example, according to the projections, the U.S. will need [1 million more STEM experts](https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2015/article/stem-crisis-or-stem-surplus-yes-and-yes.htm) in the near future. Besides, one of the goals of STEM initiatives is to encourage broader participation of women and minorities in the STEM workforce. This allows us to bridge ethnic and gender gaps. We need the engagement and participation of schools, policymakers, parents, students, and educators. This is the only way to continue technological and scientific progress. Sustainable Solutions to Challenges STEM subjects are focused on providing solutions to the concerns society has today. Human history had seen years of thoughtless exhaustion of natural resources. Such a lack of environmental education led to numerous challenges. These issues affect the health and well-being of all living organisms on our planet. Our environment needs protection. Thus, sustainability became one of the most urgent aspects studied by STEM disciplines. The youth is more worried about climate change than the older generation. As statistics shows, [70% of young people](https://news.gallup.com/poll/234314/global-warming-age-gap-younger-americans-worried.aspx) aged 18 to 34 worry about global warming. STEM education can answer their questions. It can teach them how to find the necessary solutions for sustainable development. Education is a powerful tool that ensures the rise of STEM literate society. Well-educated community members can find ways to work in a competitive world. They will use sustainable practices that do not harm nature. In the bigger picture, economic and social progress is tightly connected to the environment. We need to work our way to a sustainable future. Yet, it is possible to accomplish only with STEM skills, experiences, and a multi-disciplinary approach.

#### 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> Justin

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."

### Theory

#### [1] 1ar theory since the neg can do infinite bad things and I can’t check. It’s drop the debater since the 1ar is too short to win both layers. No RVI since they’d dump on it for 6 minutes. CI since reasonability is arbitrary and bites intervention.

#### [2] Permissibility and presumption substantively affirm: a) Statements are true before false since if I told you my name, you’d believe me b) Epistemics – we wouldn’t be able to start a strand of reasoning since we’d have to question that reason. c) If anything is permissible, then definitionally so is the aff since there is nothing that prevents us from doing it

#### [3] No omissions: All neg theory violations and kritik links must come from the text of the AC, not the absence of specification a) I have a limited time to speak so it’s an infinite aff burden b) Race to bottom – incentivizes people to not engage the aff and make a bunch spec argument to preclude

#### [4] RVI on NC theory – you can read arguments such as T that are exclusively neg so I need them to compensate

#### [5] Reject Determinism – a) proves that we should never do anything because there’s no purpose to attempts which justifies never solving violence b) it affirms because the aff can be uninherent which means it was already determined