I negate the resolution resolved

**Standard-** Upholding Utilitarianism;

My criterion is upholding utilitarianism, Prefer...

1. Life is needed to make any moral decision and it pre-requisites all other frameworks
2. Our morals are shaped by the consequences, negative and positive, for us to have any morals we need consequences first; this also pre-reqs any other moral theory
3. Usage of government in the resolution requires public officials to make decisions and public officials act based on util

**Goodin 95** (Robert, philosopher at the Research School of the Social Sciences, Utilitarianism as Public Philosophy. P. 62-63)

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more probable for them than private individuals. Before proceeding with the large argument, I must therefore say what it is that makes it so special about public officials and their situations that make it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism. Consider, first, the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices–public and private alike–are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, are relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices, but that is all. That is enough to allow public policy-makers to use the utilitarian calculus–assuming they want to use it at all–to choose general rules or conduct.

1. All other frameworks boil down to utilitarianism; they all try to maximize some sort of good and minimize some sort of bad

Observation: The usage of unconditional in the resolution means that the burden of the affirmative is to prove under every situation the government ought to recognize a workers right to strike.

**Contention 1- Climate Strikes**

**Climate strikes aren’t sufficient to reduce reliance on fuels.**

**Hayes 19** [Jason; Contributor to The Hill, director of environmental policy at the Mackinac Center for Public Policy, a research and education institute in Midland, Mich; “A global climate strike isn't enough,” The Hill; 9/19/19; <https://thehill.com/opinion/energy-environment/461809-a-global-climate-strike-isnt-enough>]

A collective of influential green groups and corporations is supporting a campaign for a **global** **climate** **strike** from Sept. 20-27. The strike pushes young people to walk out of schools and  workplaces to protest the energy sources that keep us alive and thriving. That many people are concerned about the global climate is obvious, but how will **encouraging** them to abandon their jobs or schools for a **day** or **two**, or seven, **reduce** greenhouse gas **emissions**?

The campaign website — globalclimatestrike.net — tells people they must “demand an end to the age of fossil fuels.” But, in the United States, we rely on these fuels for over **80** **percent** of the **energy** we use to provide basic necessities such as food, clean water, heating and air conditioning, medicine, transportation and so much more.

To make things worse, the energy sources **offered** up as replacements for fossil fuels — typically wind and solar — couldn’t even **exist** without fossil fuels. **Natural** **gas**, **oil** and **coal** are needed to **mine**, **refine**, **process** and **ship** the **metals**, **rare** **earth** **minerals**, **silicone**, **plastics** and **various** **chemicals** that go into **renewables**. Without steel, there are **no** **towers** to hold up wind turbines. Without **rare** **earths**, there are **no** **solar** panels. Adding to this conundrum is the fact that wind and solar cannot provide **reliable** **power**. They are **intermittent**, meaning they must be propped up by more **reliable** **energy** **sources**, such as natural gas.

A group of environmental policy experts has put together MyClimatePledge.com as our response, because we’d like to challenge climate strikers and to help them appreciate that striking **won’t** be **enough**.

**Climate strikers don’t have enough leverage.**

**Dolsak and Prakash 19** [Nives and Aseem; We write on environmental issues, climate politics and NGOs; “Climate Strikes: What They Accomplish And How They Could Have More Impact,” 9/14/19; Forbes; <https://www.forbes.com/sites/prakashdolsak/2019/09/14/climate-strikes-what-they-accomplish-and-how-they-could-have-more-impact/?sh=2244a9bd5eed>]

But strikers must have the **leverage to accomplish their goals**

Strikers represent the demand for climate action. But **who** will **supply these policies and** what **leverage** do strikers have over these **policymakers**? This is where climate strikes could **run into a problem.**

Strikers have leverage when their absence from work **disrupts activities that are valuable to policymakers**. If railway workers go on strike, trains cannot run and the public is upset. When airline pilots go on strike, people cannot fly, and airlines lose revenue. By some accounts, the 48-hour strike of British Airways pilots (regarding a pay dispute) in September 2019 will cost the company about £100 million.

What leverage do the climate strikers have? Assuming most of the strikers are students, what costs might their strikes impose on the **actors that need to change their climate policies** (namely, governments and fossil fuel firms)?

Student strikes probably **do not** disrupt the government **or** fossil fuel firms. The **main bearer** of these costs are the **conscientious teachers** who need to figure out how they are going to **make up for the lost teaching time.**

#### Strikes cause climate change to be taken less seriously – that prevents material solutions.

**Chung 19** [Climate change is a real problem, but strikes won't change anything, <https://www.stuff.co.nz/environment/climate-news/112807046/how-not-to-solve-the-issue-why-climate-change-strikes-wont-do-anything>, May 17 2019

Hundreds of students stand outside Parliament, the fervour of do-goodery tainting the air with its saccharine scent. They proclaim their heart’s desires, their bottled-up pleas for change. For action. They all yell up at those pristine steps, yelling…for what? As a high school student, it has been very difficult to ignore the constant mentions of the climate change strikes. Feel-good phrases have been hammered into us for weeks ‒ that by striking, we could change the world. We can convince the government that things need to change. We can actively reverse climate change and environmental havoc. To which I say...no? The world is at a strange point when it comes to the environment. **We are all aware of the issue, but unsure of what to do next.** The media feeds us scary facts ‒ that by 2020 the ocean will be filled with more plastic than fish, that the global sea level has risen 6.7 inches in the last century, that we only have 12 years to reverse what we have done to the environment. So I get it. I totally understand feeling the antsy need to do something, anything to help combat our environmental crisis. But **yelling about climate change isn’t going to do anything**. ADVERTISING First of all, as I previously stated, nobody knows what to do next about our environmental crisis. So we all respond by being extremely vague. Just ‘climate change’ is such a broad topic to protest about. **We are not going to get anywhere by being** so **vague**. READ MORE: \* You'll do anything for your kids? How about saving the planet?! \* We need to act on climate change for the sake of our children \* What you need to know about the previously withheld climate report **A problem isn’t solved by preaching emptily about the fact that it exists, and then expecting the government to magically come up with a solution for it.** To solve the climate change issue, we need to get specific. We need to get intelligent. Yes, there is power in numbers, but not when those numbers are all yelling about a problem without any semblance of how to solve it. How about this ‒ New Zealand mostly recycles plastic type 1 (PET), type 2 (HPDE), and type 4 (LPDE). Most other types of plastic and packaging is sent to third world countries where they are unprofessionally burned or otherwise dealt with, thus releasing countless toxins into the atmosphere. Or, if they aren’t sent to these places, they simply sit in landfill, secreting greenhouse gases and oozing leachate. Sure, recycling is not the ultimate solution, but it is still so much better than letting this waste sit around further contributing to global warming. Why don’t we use our collective passion to propose that the government sets up more recycling facilities in NZ ‒ a plausible action that could actually be implemented? Or, while we’re on a waste tangent, why don’t we mention that food waste is one of the biggest contributors to climate change, producing methane which is 28 times more potent than your regular carbon dioxide. How are you adapting for climate change? What are you doing to save our planet? Contribute How about we propose to the government or the council that a composting scheme is set up around neighbourhoods, in order to harness our food waste for good and not let it further wreck our ozone? We cannot afford to just rant about the general problem anymore, people. By proposing specific aspects that would majorly reduce the climate change problem, the government would have something clear to latch onto and would thus be more likely to implement these solutions. Secondly, **striking is not the best way to gain likeability** in the public eye. Perhaps this is just my opinion as a reserved person, but I just don’t see the point in getting needlessly fired up about something. Yes, absolutely, you should feel free to express your emotions and feel outraged at the government’s lack of action ‒ as a human who intends to live on this earth in the future, I am absolutely disgusted with how the world’s powers aren’t changing things. But we shouldn’t let this anger simply come out as...anger. **Problems are not solved by yelling in a fit of rage, letting emotions override logic**. We are students. We are intelligent, opinionated people. Let’s make speeches. Let’s write letters. Let’s plan protests that are thought-out, impactful, and effective in not only acknowledging the problem, but also suggesting and encouraging solutions. **Holding our signs and yelling ourselves hoarse at the government steps isn’t going to help our problem at all, and our anger will honestly just cause us to be taken less seriously.** "Why don’t we use our collective passion to propose that the government sets up more recycling facilities in NZ ‒ a plausible action that could actually be implemented?" DUSTAN WOODHOUSE/UNSPLASH "Why don’t we use our collective passion to propose that the government sets up more recycling facilities in NZ ‒ a plausible action that could actually be implemented?" Lastly, the whole awareness thing. **People constantly say that this protest will make** government and general **society more aware** of climate change. But here’s the thing...**they are aware**. Us regular people have the media constantly reminding **us** of our environmental turmoil, and undoubtedly **the government are aware** too, judging by Labour’s policies at the time of election and **all of the environmental conferences** they are attending. **They know. Everyone knows. We don’t need to remind people anymore**. To truly get on top of this problem, **we need to stop being aware and start taking action**. The two ideas for action that I mentioned previously are two of countless options. We are all so passionate about our planet, and that is amazing, so why don’t we harness that passion and put it into a tangible form, instead of making ourselves more uncomfortably aware of a problem without ever solving it? All in all, I’m not against the strike. If it makes you feel good, then sure. Do it. Go up with your signs and do something good that you believe in ‒ I’ll never try to stop you from doing that. But in order to solve this problem, we can’t be vague anymore. We can’t just be aware anymore. We can’t just be angry about the problem. Things are only going to change if we implement tactics. If we express our ideas intelligently. If we think of actual, attainable solutions. The world has never been changed through acknowledgement of a problem ‒ it is what comes after the acknowledgement that makes all the difference.

**Contention 2- Striking is ineffective in the long term**

**Inflation prevents any gains in wage or benefits to make impact on the value of workers assets Guida 21** Victoria Guida [an economics reporter covering the Federal Reserve, the Treasury Department and the broader economy. She has spent her Washington career writing about bank regulations, monetary policy and trade negotiations.

A Dallas native, she graduated from the University of Missouri with a double major in journalism and political science.] , 6-4-2021, "Biden’s back door to wage hikes," POLITICO, <https://www.politico.com/news/2021/06/04/bidens-back-door-to-wage-hikes-491911>

“The ‘shortages’ we are seeing in lower-wage jobs and the accompanying wage pressures are an early sign of success” for the president's agenda, said Julia Coronado, founder of MacroPolicy Perspectives. That success may be short-lived. **Higher wages could be among the biggest factors in pressuring the Federal Reserve to raise interest rates** if clear signs of an inflation spike appear. They also risk slowing hiring for those who will increasingly seek to return to the workforce as the pandemic subsides, as companies try to keep costs down. **That’s why workers’ pay was a major focus for Fed officials** in Friday's U.S. employment report for May. **They want to see wage gains** for the workforce — **but what’s behind those raises matters.** Wage growth “is positive if it reduces hardship, reduces inequality and is not eaten away or reversed by higher inflation,” said Tim Duy, an economics professor at the University of Oregon and a former U.S. Treasury economist. “But **we should be cognizant of the possibility that we’re inducing more inflation**.” Income growth has been relatively strong, particularly in the last couple of months, despite disappointing overall job growth. Wages were up about 2 percent in May compared to the year before, and that number likely underestimates the real amount of income growth for technical reasons; lower-wage workers disproportionately lost jobs last year, making the overall average for those who kept their positions look higher then, and the opposite effect is now occurring as Americans return to the labor market. "Anyone looking at the 2.0% increase in yr/yr wages is missing the story," Jason Furman, a Harvard professor and former top economic adviser to President Barack Obama, said in a tweet. "Nominal wages up 1.2% in April/May. That is a 7.4% annual rate. That is huge." The pressure to do more to attract employees could continue to grow in certain public-facing industries. According to the Labor Department‘s jobs report, about 2.5 million people are still being held back from looking for work because of the pandemic. Wages for non-managerial leisure and hospitality workers grew 1.3 percent last month and are up 3.7 percent compared to May 2020. **At the heart of the fight for higher pay is a desire for workers to share in a greater portion of the nation's economic rewards after decades of sluggish wage growth — the result of the weakening of labor unions**, companies shifting production overseas and increased use of job-displacing automation. This would ideally show up as bigger raises as the economy expands faster. **But if higher wages are instead passed along to customers at higher prices, that can create an inflationary cycle, as opposed to the one-time price increases** that many experts believe the economy can absorb as people’s behavior, and global supply chains, return to normal. “In the near term, I wouldn’t say this is necessarily a dangerous situation if we’re just raising wages for a group of people who have been traditionally disadvantaged,” Duy said. But **the longer** there are shortages that make **employers feel more comfortable raising prices as well as wages**, “that’s where **you get into this potential shift in the psychology where the wage gains and the price gains become linked**.” Heidi Shierholz, director of policy at the left-leaning Economic Policy Institute and a former chief economist at the Labor Department, said Americans are not seeing the type of widespread shortage-induced wage increases that would be cause for concern. “Things are re-normalizing; it’s not like things are out of whack,” she said, adding that **some of the wage increases for leisure and hospitality workers** might have **come from a return to normal tipping practices** as restaurants reopened. “I have **longer-run concerns,”** she added. “**The wages were too low in that sector before Covid hit, so re-normalizing is not exactly where we want to be**.” For its part, the Fed is pursuing a state of “full employment,” where wages rise because most people have jobs, and **the central bank has said it’s willing to tolerate inflation above its 2 percent target** to get there. **But** the **hesitance by** some **workers to return to the labor force is only creating the illusion of that dynamic,** said Adam Ozimek, chief economist at Upwork. “**If employers are raising wages right now due to temporary shortages, then that risks slowing job growth when those temporary shortages are gone**,” with millions still out of work, Ozimek said. “If we were at **full employment, and** we were seeing **inflationary pressures**, that **wouldn’t concern me** at all,” he added. “You’re getting it because of good and sustainable reasons. **That’s not the same thing as inflation due to temporary supply shortages**.

#### Increased strikes sabotage the economy – they cause major disruptions and lower income for workers.

**Grabianowski 6** [Ed; Author and freelance writer. He’s worked as a contributing writer for io9, HowStuffWorks, and Sweethome. His fiction has appeared in Black Static, Fear Project, and other publications and anthologies, including Fear After Fear; “How Strikes Work,” HSW; 3/24/06; https://money.howstuffworks.com/strike.htm]

Labor strikes can cause **major disruptions to industry**, **commerce** and the **lives of many people** who aren't even connected to the strike itself. The Professional Air Traffic Controllers Association strike in 1981 resulted in the firing of thousands of air traffic controllers, and the New York City transit strike in late 2005 affected **millions** of people. The history of strikes and labor unions is a key chapter in the story of the Industrial Revolution.

While the reasons behind strikes can be complex, they all boil down to two key elements: money and power. In this article, we'll find out how labor strikes have affected the balance of power between corporations and workers, what laws regulate strikes and learn about some important strikes in history.

It's difficult to say when the first real labor strike occurred. The word "strike" was first used in the 1700s, and probably comes from to notion of dealing a blow to the employer [ref]. In 1786, a group of printers in Philadelphia requested a raise and the company rejected it. They stopped working in protest and eventually received their raise. Other professionals followed suit in the next few decades. Everyone in a city who practiced the same profession agreed to set prices and wages at the same rate. Members would shun anyone who diverged from the agreement, refusing to work in the same shop and forcing employers to fire them. By the 1800s, formal trade societies and guilds began to emerge.

To have a strike today, you must have a union (though not necessarily an official union) -- an organization of workers that bargain collectively with an employer. Workers form unions because an individual worker is powerless compared to an employer, who can set low wages and long working hours as long as it adheres to labor laws. When workers combine to form a union, they collectively have enough power to negotiate with the employer. The main weapon the union has against the employer is the threat of a strike action.

At its most basic level, a strike occurs when all the workers in the union **stop coming to work.** With no workers, the business **shuts down**. The employer **stops making money**, though it is still **spending money on taxes**, **rent**, **electricity** and **maintenance**. The longer the strike lasts, the **more money the employer loses**. Of course, the workers aren't getting paid either, so they're losing money as well. Some unions build up "war chests" -- funds to pay striking workers. But it isn't usually very much, and it's often not enough for a prolonged strike.

Strikes help explain why unions are more powerful than individuals. Imagine if an employer refuses to give a raise to an individual worker. She then decides to stop coming to work in protest. The employer simply fires her for not coming to work. That one worker has no power to influence the employer. However, it can be very costly for an employer to fire every single worker when a union goes on strike (though it has happened).

#### Strikes fail and spark backlash – this turns the contention because they’re more marginalized

**Grant and Wallace 91** [Don Sherman Grant; Ohio State University; Michael Wallace; Indiana University; “Why Do Strikes Turn Violent?” University of Chicago Press; March 1991; <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2781338.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Aca3144a9ae9e4ac65e285f2c67451ffb>]

\*\*RM = Resource-Mobilization, or Strikes

3. Violent tactics.-Violent tactics are viewed by RM theorists **exclu- sively** as purposeful strategies by challengers for inciting social change with **little recognition** of how **countermobilization** strategies of elites also **create violence**. The role of elite counterstrategies has been **virtually ig- nored in research on collective violence**. Of course, history is **replete** with examples of elites' inflicting violence on challenging groups with the full sanction of the state. Typically, elite-sponsored violence occurs when the power resources and legal apparatus are so one-sidedly in the elites' favor that the outcome is never in doubt. In conflicts with weak insiders, elites may not act so openly unless weak insiders flaunt the law. Typically, elite strategies **do not** overtly promote violence but rather **provoke violence by the other side in hopes of eliciting public condemnation** or more vigorous state repression of challenger initiatives. This is a critical dynamic in struggles involving weak insiders such as unions. In these cases, worker violence, even when it appears justified, erodes **public support for the workers' cause and damages the union's insider status**.

4. Homogeneity and similarity.-Many RM theorists **incorrectly** as- sume that members of aggrieved groups are **homogeneous** in their inter- ests and share similar positions in the social structure. This (assumed) homogeneity of interests is rare for members of outsider groups and even more suspect for members of weak-insider groups. Indeed, groups are **rarely uniform** and often include relatively advantaged persons who have other, more peaceful channels in which to **pursue their goals**. Internal stratification processes mean that different persons have **varying invest- ments** in current structural arrangements, in addition to their collective interest in affecting social change. Again, these forces are especially prev- alent for weak insiders: even the group's lowest-status members are likely to have a marginal stake in the system; high-status members are likely to have a larger stake and, therefore, less commitment to dramatic change in the status quo.

Internal differences may lead to **fragmentation of interests** and **lack of consensus about tactics**, especially tactics suggesting violent confronta- tion. While group members share common grievances, individual mem- bers may be **differentially aggrieved by the current state of affairs** or differentially exposed to elite repression. White's (1989) research on the violent tactics of the Irish Republican Army shows that working-class members and student activists, when compared with middle-class partici- pants, are more vulnerable to **state-sponsored repression**, more likely to be available for protest activities, and reap more benefits from political violence. When we apply them to our study of strike violence, we find that differences in skill levels are known to coincide with major intraclass 1120 Strikes divisions in material interests (Form 1985) and are likely to coincide with the tendency for violent action. For instance, skilled-craft workers, who are more socially and politically conservative than unskilled workers, are less likely to view relations with employers as inherently antagonistic and are prone to separate themselves from unskilled workers, factors that should decrease their participation in violence.