### 1AC: Climate Change

#### Climate Strikes are illegal and threaten the employment and wages of strikers – legal recognition solves

Chilton 19 [Sarah Chilton; an employment, discrimination and partnership lawyer qualified in England and Wales, Scotland and Ireland, and a partner at CM Murray LLP in London; 9/16/19; "Climate Strike: The End Of Your Employment?"; Forbes; https://www.forbes.com/sites/sarahchilton/2019/09/16/extinction-rebellion-the-end-of-your-employment/?sh=ef8e0eb3ad82; 10-21-2021] //Miller

This is not a strike in response to a particular workplace issue, making it quite different to the strikes we are used to seeing. Over the years we have seen strikes by train drivers, junior doctors and pilots, usually in relation to pay, conditions and health and safety. This strike would be quite different. It is not a protest against the conditions imposed by a particular employer, but a strike about an issue much bigger than any one employer or industry. Is there a right to strike in the U.K.? Strikes are almost always unlawful as they involve employees breaching their employment contracts, by withdrawing their work from the employer. The law in the U.K. provides that, as long as certain strict conditions are met, employees will not be dismissed, and the trade union organizing the strikes would not be sued for inducement to breach the employee contracts (which action could otherwise be taken if the strike was not in compliance with the legal requirements). Strikes complying with these conditions are typically called “lawful strikes.” Before the trade union can organize a “lawful strike” it needs to ballot the members in compliance with strict rules, and needs a majority to vote in favor of the industrial action. If it does not comply with these requirements the strike will be unlawful, meaning that the employer can take legal action against the union, either to seek an injunction from the courts to prevent the strike, or to seek financial damages. The individual employees participating in an unlawful strike could be dismissed for breaching their employment contracts . Any employee participating in a strike, even a lawful one, is not entitled to be paid for the time they are on strike and therefore withholding their labor from the employer. Longer strikes can therefore have a significant impact on an employee’s earnings in the relevant period. What are the consequences of an “unlawful strike”? The Climate Change Strike is not organized by a union, there has been no ballot or compliance with any requirements. Employees who choose to strike and not turn up to work on September 20 or 27 will most likely breach their employment contracts and will not be entitled to pay for the time on strike and, perhaps more importantly, they may be dismissed by their employers. It doesn’t matter the reason, not turning up to work in this way is an unauthorized absence and can be treated by an employer in the same way as an employee not turning up to work for any other reason without permission, including, for example, faking a sick day. So, for those keen to make their voices heard, is there a way for employees to participate without running the risk of dismissal? An employee could take part in the strike by seeking an authorized absence from the employer, i.e. taking it as holiday or as agreed unpaid leave. The practical issue for employees in this situation will be that, if many of their colleagues also want to participate in a strike, and also seek approval for the time off, the employer will have a difficult decision to make and may only sanction some employee requests, to ensure adequate staffing cover. An employee does not have a right to take a particular day as holiday, and there is no general right to unpaid leave. Some employees may also have used up all their holiday entitlement for the year, especially those who have a holiday year running to end December, and at a time when the summer holidays have just come to an end. What can employers do if they want to support the Global Climate Strike? Many employers will be supportive of raising awareness of the serious issue of climate change. Environmental policy is increasingly moving up the agenda for businesses. Intelligent Hand Dryers, a company based in Sheffield, England, announced recently that employees may receive disciplinary warnings and could ultimately be dismissed if they use disposable coffee cups with plastic linings, plastic water bottles and sandwich packets with plastic windows at work. If employers want to support the Global Climate Strike, they could organize an agreed walkout, to allow employees to participate in protests or other activities at a particular time, or they could organize an event with employees, which involves doing something to help the environment or raise awareness of the issues. An employer could also review or implement a new workplace environmental strategy which seeks to put in place some measures within the workplace to reduce the impact of the business' and employees’ behavior on the environment. If employers are implementing or changing policies, they must do so in accordance with the law which may in some cases require consultation with employees about any changes before they can be implemented. It will be a risk for employees to strike on September 20 or 27 without permission from their employers, but, if an employer is facing such a strike, working with employees in advance, to take action over climate change as opposed to threatening disciplinary action, may, in the longer term, be more beneficial both for the environment and wider staff morale.

#### Internal Action by workers solves emissions, green tech, lobbyists, and the largest causes of climate change

Sax 20 [Sarah Sax; A journalist based in Brooklyn, NY, who reports on climate change and environmental justice; 4-23-2020; "Employees Are Fighting For A New Cause At Work: The Climate"; HuffPost; https://www.huffpost.com/entry/employee-activism-climate-change\_n\_5ea04b1ac5b6a486d082480d; 10-26-2021] //Miller

At the end of February, thousands of cleaning workers in Minneapolis marched in what's believed to have been the first union-authorized climate strike in the United States. The protesters, many of them immigrants and people of color who have seen their communities harmed by everything from air pollution to drought, wanted their employers to take action on climate change. Employed by more than a dozen subcontractors, these workers clean corporate buildings that are home to major companies like Wells Fargo and United Health Group. Their demands ranged from a guarantee of more environmentally friendly cleaning products to funding for a "green technician janitorial training program," which could help them push for more substantial changes during their day-to-day operations rather than wait for top-down measures. Employee activists like those in Minneapolis are on the rise. And unlike the traditional union focus on better pay, benefits and working conditions, they're pushing for something even bigger ― for companies to align with their values when it comes to one of the world's biggest issues. Namely, climate change. As public concern about global warming has risen, companies had already come under pressure from investors, shareholders and consumers to adopt more ambitious climate-related targets for their operations and products. But now that pressure is also coming from within. A recent survey of 375 global executives found that 4 out of 5 companies expect an "unprecedented rise in workplace activism" over the next three to five years ― with sustainability and climate change an increasing concern. While strikes and walkouts may still be the most high-profile forms of employee protest, workers are also taking their efforts online and connecting with those in other departments to amplify their voices. In November, thousands of Google employees signed a letter circulated online demanding that the company take more aggressive action on climate change. Physical protests with signs and chanting workers are obviously not wise during the COVID-19 crisis ― and more immediate concerns like health and job security are likely taking priority ― but employees' climate demands have not disappeared. "I don't think [the coronavirus pandemic] will halt employee activism. Not being prepared for a major crisis like COVID-19 has demonstrated how ill-prepared we will be for extreme weather events due to climate change," said David Levine, co-founder and president of the American Sustainable Business Council. Climate activists and advocacy organizations hope this new wave of activism from inside companies, driven largely by millennials, could be the key to getting businesses to do more than just "green" their operations. It could force companies to support ― rather than oppose ― serious government action on climate change or else risk losing valuable employees. "We need companies to be really ambitious in what they're doing in their operations. And we need employees to push them to be more ambitious in that work," said Bill Weihl, a former Facebook and Google sustainability executive who now runs the nonprofit advocacy group ClimateVoice, which pushes companies to go "all in" on climate change issues. "But the thing that we really need them to step up and do," Weihl said, "is add their voice on the side of science-based climate policy everywhere." Corporations Speaking Out Advocates like Levine and Weihl argue that in the absence of U.S. leadership on the federal level, companies need to step to the front on climate change. In 2015, nations agreed to limit temperature rise this century to below 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit) under the Paris climate accord. Since then, the number of Fortune 500 companies pledging to reduce their carbon emissions has quadrupled, according to a 2019 report from the consultancy firm Natural Capital Partners ― with employee demands identified as a key driver behind much of this corporate action. Microsoft and Google parent company Alphabet, for instance, recently made climate pledges in part prompted by employees demanding more action. But according to Weihl, the **companies leading on climate** tend to **focus on** their **own operations**, while remaining almost entirely **silent on** the bigger public **policy changes that are needed**. There is a political risk in speaking out. **Without** public **policy changes**, however, "**we are not going to decarbonize** anywhere near fast enough," he said. And if other companies don't get involved, Weihl added, "that means the energy companies that are pushing in the wrong direction will continue to dominate the discussion." Over the next decade ― the timeframe that the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change says is crucial for avoiding catastrophic global warming ― corporate action will need to focus not only on operational measures like installing more solar panels but also on pushing for smart, science-based climate policy. Fred Kruger, president of the nonprofit Environmental Defense Fund, implored CEOs in an open letter last year to "unleash the most powerful tool they have to fight climate change: their political influence." Employee activism is critical to driving this shift, Weihl said. He contrasts it with consumer activism. "If a company has 10 million customers, you have to move a lot of people before the company really notices and cares," he said. But most companies have far fewer employees than that ― which means smaller numbers of workers speaking up can have a big impact. Throw in the need for companies to recruit and retain employees, and workers' voices become that much more powerful. Engaging With Employees Perhaps no company's employee activism has been more in the spotlight recently than Amazon's. Last September, along with several other corporations, Amazon made its "climate pledge," committing to net zero carbon by 2040 and 100% renewable energy by 2030, ahead of a massive planned employee walkout. Then in February, the online giant announced a $10 billion fund to fight climate change. While broadly supportive of CEO Jeff Bezos' pledge and the climate fund, employees continue to push Amazon to embrace climate action across its entire business, protesting its role in providing oil companies with the technology to find drillable oil faster and in funding climate change denial groups. The relationship between Amazon and its employees remains contentious, as criticism rises over its response to both climate change and working conditions during the pandemic. In April, the company reportedly fired two employees who had been outspoken about climate change. During a virtual webcast organized by Amazon Employees for Climate Justice on April 16 ― which the company reportedly tried to thwart ― the two urged their former co-workers to stage a virtual walkout to protest their firings and the treatment of warehouse workers amid the COVID-19 crisis. Some companies have been proactive in accommodating their employees ― such as Patagonia and Ben & Jerry's, which closed their shops for the Global Climate Strike last September ― but Amazon has done the opposite. It recently introduced a policy barring employees from publicly criticizing the company without prior approval. When asked about the rise in employee activism and the firing of the two workers, an Amazon spokesperson told HuffPost that "we support every employee's right to criticize their employer's working conditions, but that does not come with blanket immunity against any and all internal policies. "The price of ignoring or dismissing employee activism could be huge. According to a survey by law firm Herbert Smith Freehills, employee activism could cost organizations up to 25% of their global revenue each year due to the disruptive nature of strikes and reputational damage leading to lost business. "Today the purpose of a company has to align with climate change and employees are calling really strongly for that," said Farid Baddache, the CEO and co-founder of the sustainability consulting and impact investing firm Ksapa. The Future Workforce Figuring out how to navigate a world in which employees expect businesses to operate with a purpose beyond the bottom line may not be easy for companies, but it is critical because this new wave of activism is connected to the shifting demographics of the workforce. Millennials now make up over a third of the U.S. workforce, constituting the largest share of any generation. They are more likely than older generations to be employee activists, according to one survey by Weber Shandwick. And according to LinkedIn's 2018 Workplace Report, 86% of millennials would consider taking a pay cut to work for companies whose values aligned with their own. For Jake Elliott, 34, who specifically chose to work for Vermont solar power company SunCommon because the firm shared his values, climate change is "the number one most important thing." "When you look at global carbon emissions, the majority of carbon emissions are coming from businesses, so it is an obligation and requirement of business to address the climate crisis," he told HuffPost. Younger generations "don't want to commit to work for a company that is contributing to climate change," said Baddache, "or if they believe that the company is part of the problem rather than the solution." Corporate America is increasingly aware of this. "The talent Adobe wishes to recruit and retain expects us to set meaningful climate goals and work to meet them," Vince Digneo, sustainability strategist at Adobe has said previously. "Our employees want to see us take good action but not just among a flurry of other companies doing the same thing ― it has to have a meaningful impact." This sentiment is true not just among current employees but also future ones. A group of law students at Yale and Harvard, for example, are boycotting internships with Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison because it represents Exxon Mobil. They're accusing the law firm of enabling the destructive impact of the world's largest oil company in the climate crisis. "Companies need to hire people and they need to retain people," Weihl said. This will all become more difficult "if they are on the wrong side of an issue that many of their employees see as an existential threat to their future."

#### Striking is needed for active climate reform

Schaeffer 20 [Felipe Schaeffer Neves; political and environmental analyst. Felipe has worked for years with outdoor education focused on social projects for people in vulnerability situations. He expands its work from a holistic view of society, offering critical analyses, effectively correcting failures and fostering social and humanitarian awareness. Not to mention his ability to dialogue with the team, both personally and digitally. It was a pleasure to work with Felipe over the years; November 09, 2020; Climate Strikes: how effective is it to participate in them?; <https://lfca.earth/strikes/>] //Miller

This holistic approach to climate striking realizes how interconnected all social issues are and, as a form of nonviolent civil disobedience, is proving to be very effective in turning the spotlight to the climate crisis. Furthermore, striking, as a way of collective action, makes people feel empowered and more hopeful. This promotes awareness at the micro level and greater media attention at the macro level. In addition, it increases public pressure on elected officials and creates a fertile ground for discussing new strategies for halting global warming. A 2019 study published in the Journal of Environmental Psychology suggests **that striking can promote** the most important psychological factors **for fighting climate change**. This is **because** of the sense **of empowerment** that **collective action can create** on people. Whilst **you may not feel** like **your voice is being heard by carrying a sign alone** (though this is precisely what Greta Thunberg did), this very **action becomes much more powerful when carried out together with tens of thousands of people pressing for the same demands.** Striking implies collective action, which is all the more encouraging than isolated efforts, inasmuch as humans are social animals. The feeling of hopelessness and despair that inevitably emerges as we face the facts can be overpowered by a sense of community and solidarity. Obviously, this is not to dismiss individual environmental efforts, such as recycling, ethical consumerism, and veganism; these actions go hand in hand with striking. In fact, these two spheres – individualism and collectivism – are intertwined in the ever-evolving understanding of self and one’s place within the natural and social worlds. The socially constructed notion of individualism is simply not enough of a force to face the biggest crisis of our times. With this in mind, strikes are places where ideas emerge, disinformation is demystified and strategies can be discussed. It is the moment when people see their concerns being shared by many and their hopes being multiplied. A typical practice for displaying one’s active involvement in the strikes and the general climate movement is the use of hashtags on social media. It is a simple yet clever way to share with one’s circle of friends and family their concerns and participation, and to call attention to which actions are being planned. Some of the most popular hashtags circulating on social media are (in order of popularity): #climatestrike, #climatechange, #fridaysforfuture, #climate, #climatecrisis, #globalwarming, #gretathunberg, #climateaction, #savetheplanet and #climatejustice. The **uproar** caused **by the press is also a major contribution** brought about by the strikes. The more people participate, the louder the “buzz” and, consequently, the bigger the interest of the media in the cause. The dissemination of the ideals of the movement is important to raise awareness amongst the population, and having allies in the media is extremely important for this. Major news outlets, such as the Guardian in the UK and the New York Times in the US, regularly publish articles and op-eds about the climate strikes. For instance, during the last climate week of action, in September of this year, the Guardian reported extensively on the protests, covering in detail what was taking place around the globe, the numbers, their demands, and rationale. **Striking can have a great effect on policy-making**. That is, p**oliticians tend to listen to what is being demanded** from the **masses**, after all, **they are the electorate.** The **bigger the strike, the more of a chance of gaining space in political agendas**. Eventually, there will be an **election** right down the road, **which is why politicians take these actions seriously**. An example of this is **England**, where **campaigners managed to pressure their government into banning various single-use plastic items, like straws, stirrers, and cotton buds, earlier this year**. In Europe, the European Parliament passed a law banning disposable plastic, which will take effect next year, and in the US eight states have already banned it, with the prospect of more states following suit. Moreover, an increasing number of **countries** are **pledging to become carbon neutral** in the next few years, ranging from 2030 to 2050. This is much **owed to the efforts of climate activists**, who use collective action as their weapon for policy-change. As this recent [empirical research](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s42055-020-00035-0) concluded, climate activism indeed leads to a legislation change in favor of the environment. If you want to participate in climate strikes, the best way to go forward is to keep an eye out for organizations such as [Fridays For Future](https://fridaysforfuture.org/), [Global Climate Strike](https://globalclimatestrike.net/), [Extinction Rebellion](https://extinctionrebellion.de/), amongst others. These groups are in the vanguard of the new climate movement and they are global, having branches in many of the major world cities who meet regularly to debate strategies for action. They also organize and publish actions via social media groups, guiding participants on what to take, how to act, and what to do in the strikes. Their approaches differ slightly, with Fridays For Future being a more young-led movement whilst Extinction Rebellion amounting to a slightly older crowd. Both advocate non-violence and non-proprietary destruction in their strikes. The actions that occur in strikes are varied but, usually, performative. Some people may dress in flamboyant clothes, with costumes related to their cause, and hold signs with impact messages, dancing, singing, and interpreting altogether. This is not mandatory but is a good strategy used to call media and public attention to their movement. In a sense, the more attention is drawn to the strike the better. The location, route, and meeting place are also strategically important. Fridays for Future, for example, has an [interactive map](https://fridaysforfuture.org/action-map/map/) with the location of each strike around the world, which remains the same every Friday. On the other hand, Extinction Rebellion changes the location according to the [event's theme](https://extinctionrebellion.de/veranstaltungen/), making it possible to be in places such as public institutions, corporate headquarters, or tourist transit locations. Each of these actions is organized collectively and informed to the participants, so it is important to be informed before going on strike. There are, of course, other tools for manifesting discontent and building a movement. Signing and creating petitions is a great way to gather support for the climate cause, which is almost effortless. A petition should not replace striking however, but they can complement each other as they possess particular virtues. For instance, an online petition can go viral worldwide, gathering thousands of signatures (and even millions in some extreme cases) in support of the cause, which works brilliantly to raise awareness and build momentum for the next strike. It is also a great way to create a connection with people and educate them about the climate, as well as making the demands more clear and accessible to the public. A good example of this is a petition against oil drilling in the Arctic, which at the time of writing of this article had gathered over a million signatures and was still live, so you can [sign it](https://www.change.org/p/arctic-slope-regional-corporation-protect-polar-bears-no-oil-drilling-in-the-arctic-wildlife-refuge?signed=true). Another tool in the climate activist’s toolbox is the boycott of companies, political parties, and any institution judged to be unlawful, immoral, and/or environmentally-unfriendly. Boycotting has proven to be very effective; two examples: in 2018 The Body Shop had to declare itself animal cruelty-free after a massive boycott campaign, and in 2010 Nestlé was forced to commit to a zero deforestation policy in its palm oil supply chain after only eight weeks of an intense boycott campaign. Boycotts get the attention of big companies because they hit them where it hurts: their market share and reputation. The website [ethicalconsumer.org](https://www.ethicalconsumer.org/ethicalcampaigns/boycotts) provides a comprehensible list of corporations to be boycotted, the reasons for it, and who is calling for the boycott. Perhaps one of the biggest victories for the boycott movement was the end of Apartheid in South Africa. As an active movement throughout the 1960s, 70s, and 80s, it was instrumental in ending the Apartheid regime of racial segregation. In the case of South Africa, the boycott movement operated at first as a consumer and academic boycott of products and services. Then, governments under pressure felt inclined to apply economic sanctions, and in 1970 South Africa was even expelled from the Olympics. Though unrelated to climate change, this illustrates how boycotting can work effectively to achieve extremely ambitious goals. Just like politicians, private companies also tend to take stock of their consumers’ behavior. Thus, if a substantial amount of people boycott companies that are known to disregard the new normative climate concerns, chances are that this company will revise their modus operandi hastily. Boycotting and petitioning are excellent companions to striking, the former two as passive forms of collective actions, and the latter as an active way to engage in civil disobedience and make climate demands heard. The aforementioned climate strikes of 2019, with the huge number of people that were mobilized, illustrate how effective strikes really are. Whilst **the greatest victory for the climate movement is still to come, one that will set in motion a radical environmental reform**, we can look at the general societal turn towards sustainability and renewables as a sign of the progress that has been made in recent years. As a process that is fed back to itself, strikes are both advancing this turn and also a consequence of it. In the electoral arena, for instance, there is a clear indication that political parties have realized the importance of sustainability policies in their agendas. In the electoral arena, for instance, there is a clear indication that political parties have realized the importance of sustainability policies in their agendas. This can be illustrated by the electoral success of Greens parties in last year’s European Parliament elections. In Germany, for instance, the Greens took 20.5% of the national vote, almost doubling their 10.7% share from 2014. Perhaps more significant still, was the exceptionally high turnout in Germany – 61.4% –, demonstrating that people care about both politics and the climate. In the corporate sphere, many companies actively support the strikes. Some, like Ben & Jerry's, Patagonia, and Burton have closed their factories and all their online and physical stores, and encouraged their workers to participate in the protests. Here in Germany, 2400 companies have joined under the banner of "Entrepreneurs for Future". And even Swedish bus manufacturer Scania has dedicated Friday to employee training on sustainability, which may seem somewhat paradoxical to the critical reader since Scania’s industrial sector is very polluting in nature. Nonetheless, whether they honestly do it for the climate or to gain advertisement, the point is that they are doing it because people are doing it. In short, striking, as a form of peaceful civil disobedience, is an efficient way to protest and build a movement. It is something that everyone can participate in regularly and feel empowered by the scale and intensity of collective action. What makes striking the perfect vehicle for a mass movement, is the fact that it places collective action as the protagonist, as opposed to individual acts. Moreover, it is the perfect environment for the exchange of ideas and experiences. A powerful mechanism in the uphill struggle to transform our carbon-emitting society into a sustainable, egalitarian, and just one; we should all participate in climate strikes. The bigger the strike, the more powerful and transformative it is – and we do not have much time.

#### A Climate Right to Strike creates better working conditions for workers in climate tech and directly transition our economy away from fossil fuels

Raman et al. 21 [Anita Raman, Research and Policy Development Extension Associate; Avalon Hoek Spaans, Climate Labor Research and Policy; Hunter Moskowitz, Research Assistant at Cornell; Zach Cunningham, educator with the Worker Institute at Cornell University's ILR School; 3-22-2021; "Double Trouble: How the PRO Act Could Solve Two Crises at Once"; ILR School; https://www.ilr.cornell.edu/worker-institute/labor-leading-climate/how-pro-act-could-solve-two-crises-once; 11-2-2021] //Miller

We are in the midst of a global climate crisis. As long as humans burn fossil fuels, global temperatures will continue to increase at unsustainable levels, resulting in sea-level rise, raging wildfires, extreme weather events, and other climate catastrophes. At the same time, we are in the midst of an inequality crisis. One major driver of our growing inequities is a decades-long assault on workers’ rights to organize into unions and collectively address workplace concerns. It is incumbent on us to solve both of these crises. But, if you’ve read the news lately, you may view these as separate - even contradictory - goals. President Biden “is trying to square environmentalists’ demands to stop burning fossil fuels with labor leaders’ desire for union jobs linked to oil and gas,” the Washington Post declared this month. Hitting a similar theme, Politico recently wrote that Biden is “squeezed between promises to go green and bolster unions.” Can we really tackle climate change and empower workers? To us, the answer is a resounding “yes.” In fact, we believe this is a once-in-a-generation opportunity to build a sustainable economy and create a more equitable, just workplace. On March 9th, the U.S. House of Representatives passed the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act. If passed by the Senate and signed into law, the PRO Act would be the most significant labor law reform in decades. Ever since private-sector workers gained the legal right to organize a union (with some notable exceptions), employers and business-backed legislators have fought to weaken collective representation. The Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 weakened the right to strike and empowered employers to fight union drives. It also allowed states to pass so-called “right-to-work” laws, which let workers benefit from union representation without having to pay dues or fees. In the decades since, employers have gone on the offensive by waging anti-union campaigns, misclassifying workers as “independent contractors,” and successfully pushing right-to-work laws in 27 states. Violating workers’ rights is routine, and low-road employers slash pay and benefits by locating in states unfriendly to labor. As a result, private-sector union density has fallen from a mid-century high of over 30 percent to just 6.3 percent today, while income inequality has skyrocketed. The PRO Act would fundamentally alter this dynamic. It would overturn bans on solidarity boycotts and prevent employers from “permanently replacing” strikers. Many independent contractors would have the right to unionize, undermining management’s use of misclassification as a cost-saving tool. Employers would face stiffer penalties for impeding unionization, making it easier for workers to use their voices. Significantly, the PRO Act would outlaw right-to-work nationwide. In other words, it would be a shot in the arm to labor, possibly ushering in a new wave of union organizing. So what does this have to do with climate change? A lot, it turns out. Every state in the country faces increased climate risks moving into the future, and there has been a real movement towards climate mitigation and adaptation work in recent years. But the workers carrying out these projects face a patchwork of labor standards depending on where they live. And in many of the states with the most climate risks, workers also have the worst protections. Take North Carolina, a coastal state with several barrier islands. Rising sea levels could have devastating impacts on North Carolinians. Fortunately, the state’s solar industry employs over 6,000 workers and ranks third nationally in installations with over 7,000 MW. Yet, workers in this expanding industry do not have adequate rights or protections. Oxfam ranks North Carolina 47th overall in its “Best and Worst States to Work In America” index, citing its lack of paid sick leave and limits on collective bargaining, among other things. This is not surprising given the state is one of the least unionized in the country. Georgia provides another example. Georgia ranks among the top ten states in solar energy production and has strong potential for offshore wind. But Georgians will soon face more intense heat waves, sea-level rise, a loss of soil moisture, and an increased risk of drought, posing health and economic risks to the 14 percent of Georgia’s workforce who work in the production of goods. Georgia ranks as one of the worst places to work in America due to its weak wage policies, poor worker protections, and obstacles to union organizing. Unionization rates stand at less than 5 percent. Like any other work, green jobs aren’t inherently good jobs. Just 4 percent of workers in solar production and 6 percent of workers in wind belong to a union, while utility workers currently have a unionization rate of over 20 percent. Boosting these numbers presents a key challenge to workers’ rights advocates. Many states have crafted climate plans meant to decarbonize their economies. Some unions have successfully pushed for states and public utility commissions to attach labor standards requirements when the government procures renewable energy projects. We should encourage this, as it has led to real, tangible results in states such as New York and New Jersey. New Jersey, for example, has required prevailing wages on solar development since 2012 without slowing new solar installations. But in many states, barriers exist to attaching labor protections to renewable energy work. Much of the job growth potential in clean energy, such as the manufacturing of parts or maintenance services, exist in the supply chain, which some might argue (wrongly, in our opinion) is outside the state’s direct influence. For many of these occupations, employers routinely misclassify their workers as independent contractors or obscure the true nature of their employment to avoid paying benefits. So where should we look to improve working conditions in less labor-friendly states, as well as up and down the supply chain? The workers themselves. By stripping away some of the barriers to organizing, the PRO act would create the conditions necessary for workers to organize. This could help increase unionization in the renewable energy sector and beyond. Union representation can decrease workers’ exposure to on-the-job risks associated with hotter temperatures, air pollution, extreme weather, natural disasters, and biological hazards. It could also reduce the vulnerability of workers in industries dependent on fossil fuels and other natural resources. Union training and apprenticeship opportunities - along with union-negotiated “just transition” legislation - will enable workers to adjust and thrive in a changing environment. The COVID-19 pandemic illustrates how important union representation is during a crisis. Unionized workers had a seat at the table, allowing them to negotiate for paid leave and workplace safety measures that decreased their risk of contracting the virus. Climate change increases the risk of infectious diseases in many parts of the country, and access to good health care, breaks, and paid leave will give workers better footing to handle the next crisis. As advocates, we do not have to choose between fighting climate change and providing high-quality jobs. In fact, we can only create true climate resilience when we protect workers and allow them to organize. If the United States wants to truly mitigate and adapt to climate change, we must ensure that all climate jobs are high quality and protected by union contracts. The PRO Act offers the type of protection that will allow workers a more equal playing field to fight for dignified work, a better quality of life, and a sustainable future for all.

#### Warming causes Extinction

Kareiva 18, Peter, and Valerie Carranza. "Existential risk due to ecosystem collapse: Nature strikes back." Futures 102 (2018): 39-50. (Ph.D. in ecology and applied mathematics from Cornell University, director of the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at UCLA, Pritzker Distinguished Professor in Environment & Sustainability at UCLA)//Re-cut by Elmer

In summary, six of the nine proposed planetary boundaries (phosphorous, nitrogen, biodiversity, land use, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution) are unlikely to be associated with existential risks. They all correspond to a degraded environment, but in our assessment do not represent existential risks. However, the three remaining boundaries (**climate change**, global **freshwater** cycle, **and** ocean **acidification**) do **pose existential risks**. This is **because of** intrinsic **positive feedback loops**, substantial lag times between system change and experiencing the consequences of that change, and the fact these different boundaries interact with one another in ways that yield surprises. In addition, climate, freshwater, and ocean acidification are all **directly connected to** the provision of **food and water**, and **shortages** of food and water can **create conflict** and social unrest. Climate change has a long history of disrupting civilizations and sometimes precipitating the collapse of cultures or mass emigrations (McMichael, 2017). For example, the 12th century drought in the North American Southwest is held responsible for the collapse of the Anasazi pueblo culture. More recently, the infamous potato famine of 1846–1849 and the large migration of Irish to the U.S. can be traced to a combination of factors, one of which was climate. Specifically, 1846 was an unusually warm and moist year in Ireland, providing the climatic conditions favorable to the fungus that caused the potato blight. As is so often the case, poor government had a role as well—as the British government forbade the import of grains from outside Britain (imports that could have helped to redress the ravaged potato yields). Climate change intersects with freshwater resources because it is expected to exacerbate drought and water scarcity, as well as flooding. Climate change can even impair water quality because it is associated with heavy rains that overwhelm sewage treatment facilities, or because it results in higher concentrations of pollutants in groundwater as a result of enhanced evaporation and reduced groundwater recharge. **Ample clean water** is not a luxury—it **is essential for human survival**. Consequently, cities, regions and nations that lack clean freshwater are vulnerable to social disruption and disease. Finally, ocean acidification is linked to climate change because it is driven by CO2 emissions just as global warming is. With close to 20% of the world’s protein coming from oceans (FAO, 2016), the potential for severe impacts due to acidification is obvious. Less obvious, but perhaps more insidious, is the interaction between climate change and the loss of oyster and coral reefs due to acidification. Acidification is known to interfere with oyster reef building and coral reefs. Climate change also increases storm frequency and severity. Coral reefs and oyster reefs provide protection from storm surge because they reduce wave energy (Spalding et al., 2014). If these reefs are lost due to acidification at the same time as storms become more severe and sea level rises, coastal communities will be exposed to unprecedented storm surge—and may be ravaged by recurrent storms. A key feature of the risk associated with climate change is that mean annual temperature and mean annual rainfall are not the variables of interest. Rather it is extreme episodic events that place nations and entire regions of the world at risk. These extreme events are by definition “rare” (once every hundred years), and changes in their likelihood are challenging to detect because of their rarity, but are exactly the manifestations of climate change that we must get better at anticipating (Diffenbaugh et al., 2017). Society will have a hard time responding to shorter intervals between rare extreme events because in the lifespan of an individual human, a person might experience as few as two or three extreme events. How likely is it that you would notice a change in the interval between events that are separated by decades, especially given that the interval is not regular but varies stochastically? A concrete example of this dilemma can be found in the past and expected future changes in storm-related flooding of New York City. The highly disruptive flooding of New York City associated with Hurricane Sandy represented a flood height that occurred once every 500 years in the 18th century, and that occurs now once every 25 years, but is expected to occur once every 5 years by 2050 (Garner et al., 2017). This change in frequency of extreme floods has profound implications for the measures New York City should take to protect its infrastructure and its population, yet because of the stochastic nature of such events, this shift in flood frequency is an elevated risk that will go unnoticed by most people. 4. The combination of positive feedback loops and societal inertia is fertile ground for global environmental catastrophes **Humans** are remarkably ingenious, and **have adapted** to crises **throughout** their **history**. Our doom has been repeatedly predicted, only to be averted by innovation (Ridley, 2011). **However**, the many **stories** **of** human ingenuity **successfully** **addressing** **existential risks** such as global famine or extreme air pollution **represent** environmental c**hallenges that are** largely **linear**, have immediate consequences, **and operate without positive feedbacks**. For example, the fact that food is in short supply does not increase the rate at which humans consume food—thereby increasing the shortage. Similarly, massive air pollution episodes such as the London fog of 1952 that killed 12,000 people did not make future air pollution events more likely. In fact it was just the opposite—the London fog sent such a clear message that Britain quickly enacted pollution control measures (Stradling, 2016). Food shortages, air pollution, water pollution, etc. send immediate signals to society of harm, which then trigger a negative feedback of society seeking to reduce the harm. In contrast, today’s great environmental crisis of climate change may cause some harm but there are generally long time delays between rising CO2 concentrations and damage to humans. The consequence of these delays are an absence of urgency; thus although 70% of Americans believe global warming is happening, only 40% think it will harm them (http://climatecommunication.yale.edu/visualizations-data/ycom-us-2016/). Secondly, unlike past environmental challenges, **the Earth’s climate system is rife with positive feedback loops**. In particular, as CO2 increases and the climate warms, that **very warming can cause more CO2 release** which further increases global warming, and then more CO2, and so on. Table 2 summarizes the best documented positive feedback loops for the Earth’s climate system. These feedbacks can be neatly categorized into carbon cycle, biogeochemical, biogeophysical, cloud, ice-albedo, and water vapor feedbacks. As important as it is to understand these feedbacks individually, it is even more essential to study the interactive nature of these feedbacks. Modeling studies show that when interactions among feedback loops are included, uncertainty increases dramatically and there is a heightened potential for perturbations to be magnified (e.g., Cox, Betts, Jones, Spall, & Totterdell, 2000; Hajima, Tachiiri, Ito, & Kawamiya, 2014; Knutti & Rugenstein, 2015; Rosenfeld, Sherwood, Wood, & Donner, 2014). This produces a wide range of future scenarios. Positive feedbacks in the carbon cycle involves the enhancement of future carbon contributions to the atmosphere due to some initial increase in atmospheric CO2. This happens because as CO2 accumulates, it reduces the efficiency in which oceans and terrestrial ecosystems sequester carbon, which in return feeds back to exacerbate climate change (Friedlingstein et al., 2001). Warming can also increase the rate at which organic matter decays and carbon is released into the atmosphere, thereby causing more warming (Melillo et al., 2017). Increases in food shortages and lack of water is also of major concern when biogeophysical feedback mechanisms perpetuate drought conditions. The underlying mechanism here is that losses in vegetation increases the surface albedo, which suppresses rainfall, and thus enhances future vegetation loss and more suppression of rainfall—thereby initiating or prolonging a drought (Chamey, Stone, & Quirk, 1975). To top it off, overgrazing depletes the soil, leading to augmented vegetation loss (Anderies, Janssen, & Walker, 2002). Climate change often also increases the risk of forest fires, as a result of higher temperatures and persistent drought conditions. The expectation is that **forest fires will become more frequent** and severe with climate warming and drought (Scholze, Knorr, Arnell, & Prentice, 2006), a trend for which we have already seen evidence (Allen et al., 2010). Tragically, the increased severity and risk of Southern California wildfires recently predicted by climate scientists (Jin et al., 2015), was realized in December 2017, with the largest fire in the history of California (the “Thomas fire” that burned 282,000 acres, https://www.vox.com/2017/12/27/16822180/thomas-fire-california-largest-wildfire). This **catastrophic fire** embodies the sorts of positive feedbacks and interacting factors that **could catch humanity off-guard and produce a** true **apocalyptic event.** Record-breaking rains produced an extraordinary flush of new vegetation, that then dried out as record heat waves and dry conditions took hold, coupled with stronger than normal winds, and ignition. Of course the record-fire released CO2 into the atmosphere, thereby contributing to future warming. Out of all types of feedbacks, water vapor and the ice-albedo feedbacks are the most clearly understood mechanisms. Losses in reflective snow and ice cover drive up surface temperatures, leading to even more melting of snow and ice cover—this is known as the ice-albedo feedback (Curry, Schramm, & Ebert, 1995). As snow and ice continue to melt at a more rapid pace, millions of people may be displaced by flooding risks as a consequence of sea level rise near coastal communities (Biermann & Boas, 2010; Myers, 2002; Nicholls et al., 2011). The water vapor feedback operates when warmer atmospheric conditions strengthen the saturation vapor pressure, which creates a warming effect given water vapor’s strong greenhouse gas properties (Manabe & Wetherald, 1967). Global warming tends to increase cloud formation because warmer temperatures lead to more evaporation of water into the atmosphere, and warmer temperature also allows the atmosphere to hold more water. The key question is whether this increase in clouds associated with global warming will result in a positive feedback loop (more warming) or a negative feedback loop (less warming). For decades, scientists have sought to answer this question and understand the net role clouds play in future climate projections (Schneider et al., 2017). Clouds are complex because they both have a cooling (reflecting incoming solar radiation) and warming (absorbing incoming solar radiation) effect (Lashof, DeAngelo, Saleska, & Harte, 1997). The type of cloud, altitude, and optical properties combine to determine how these countervailing effects balance out. Although still under debate, it appears that in most circumstances the cloud feedback is likely positive (Boucher et al., 2013). For example, models and observations show that increasing greenhouse gas concentrations reduces the low-level cloud fraction in the Northeast Pacific at decadal time scales. This then has a positive feedback effect and enhances climate warming since less solar radiation is reflected by the atmosphere (Clement, Burgman, & Norris, 2009). The key lesson from the long list of potentially positive feedbacks and their interactions is that **runaway climate change,** and runaway perturbations have to be taken as a serious possibility. Table 2 is just a snapshot of the type of feedbacks that have been identified (see Supplementary material for a more thorough explanation of positive feedback loops). However, this list is not exhaustive and the possibility of undiscovered positive feedbacks **portends** even greater **existential risks**. The many environmental crises humankind has previously averted (famine, ozone depletion, London fog, water pollution, etc.) were averted because of political will based on solid scientific understanding. We cannot count on complete scientific understanding when it comes to positive feedback loops and climate change.

#### Climate Change makes war inevitable.

Dr. Michael T. Klare 20, Five Colleges Professor of Peace and World Security Studies at Hampshire College, Ph.D. from the Graduate School of the Union Institute, BA and MA from Columbia University, Member of the Board of Director at the Arms Control Association, Defense Correspondent for The Nation, “How Rising Temperatures Increase the Likelihood of Nuclear War”, The Nation, 1/13/2020, https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/nuclear-defense-climate-change/

Climbing world temperatures and rising sea levels will diminish the supply of food and water in many resource-deprived areas, increasing the risk of widespread starvation, social unrest, and human flight. Global corn production, for example, is projected to fall by as much as 14 percent in a 2°C warmer world, according to research cited in a 2018 special report by the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Food scarcity and crop failures risk pushing hundreds of millions of people into overcrowded cities, where the likelihood of pandemics, ethnic strife, and severe storm damage is bound to increase. All of this will impose an immense burden on human institutions. Some states may collapse or break up into a collection of warring chiefdoms—all fighting over sources of water and other vital resources.

A similar momentum is now evident in the emerging nuclear arms race, with all three major powers—China, Russia, and the United States—rushing to deploy a host of new munitions. This dangerous process commenced a decade ago, when Russian and Chinese leaders sought improvements to their nuclear arsenals and President Barack Obama, in order to secure Senate approval of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty of 2010, agreed to initial funding for the modernization of all three legs of America’s strategic triad, which encompasses submarines, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and bombers. (New START, which mandated significant reductions in US and Russian arsenals, will expire in February 2021 unless renewed by the two countries.) Although Obama initiated the modernization of the nuclear triad, the Trump administration has sought funds to proceed with their full-scale production, at an estimated initial installment of $500 billion over 10 years.

Even during the initial modernization program of the Obama era, Russian and Chinese leaders were sufficiently alarmed to hasten their own nuclear acquisitions. Both countries were already in the process of modernizing their stockpiles—Russia to replace Cold War–era systems that had become unreliable, China to provide its relatively small arsenal with enhanced capabilities. Trump’s decision to acquire a whole new suite of ICBMs, nuclear-armed submarines, and bombers has added momentum to these efforts. And with all three major powers upgrading their arsenals, the other nuclear-weapon states—led by India, Pakistan, and North Korea—have been expanding their stockpiles as well. Moreover, with Trump’s recent decision to abandon the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, all major powers are developing missile delivery systems for a regional nuclear war such as might erupt in Europe, South Asia, or the western Pacific.

#### It's the most probable scenario for Extinction – you can’t negotiate with the environment.

* Climate change is unique from all other existential risks: 1) probability is super high—it’s already happening and we’re quickly approaching the threshold. 2) we’re not doing anything about it, especially at the scale to which it is occurring versus other threats. 3) firm historical precedent.

Wagner and Weitzman 15 (Gernot Wagner, Ph.D. Student in Political Economy and Government, Harvard University & Martin Weitzman Professor of Economics at Harvard University, “How does climate stack up against other worst-case scenarios?”, Excerpt from “Climate Shock”)

What then, if anything, still distinguishes climate change from the others remaining: biotechnology, nanotechnology, nukes and pandemics? For one, the relatively high chance of eventual planetary catastrophe. In Climate Shock, we zero in on eventual average global warming of 6°C (11°F) as the final cutoff few would doubt represents a true planetary catastrophe. Higher temperatures are beyond anyone’s grasp. Yet our current path doesn’t exclude eventual average global warming above 6°C. In fact, our own analysis puts the likelihood at around 10 percent, and that’s for an indisputable global catastrophe. Climate change would trigger plenty of catastrophic events with temperatures rising by much less than 6°C. Many scientists would name 2°C (3.6°F) as the threshold, and we are well on our way to exceeding that, unless there is a major global course correction. Second, the gap between our current efforts and what’s needed on climate change is enormous. We are no experts on any of the other worst-case scenarios, but there at least it seems like much is already being done. Take nuclear terrorism. The United States alone spends many hundreds of billions of dollars each year on its military, intelligence and security services. That doesn’t stamp out the chance of terrorism. Some of the money spent may even be fueling it, and there are surely ways to approach the problem more strategically at times, but at least the overall mission is to protect the United States and its citizens. It would be hard to argue that U.S. climate policy today benefits from anything close to this type of effort. As for mitigating pandemics, more could surely be spent on research, monitoring and rapid response, but here too it seems like needed additional efforts would plausibly amount to a small fraction of national income. Third, climate change has firm historical precedence. There’s ample reason to believe that pumping carbon dioxide into the atmosphere is reliving the past — the distant past, but the past nonetheless. The planet has seen today’s carbon dioxide levels before: over 3 million years ago, with sea levels some 20 meters higher than today, and camels roaming the high Arctic. There are considerable uncertainties in all of this, but there’s little reason to believe that humanity can cheat basic physics and chemistry. Contrast the historical precedent of climate change with that of biotechnology, or rather the lack of it. The fear that bioengineered genes and genetically modified organisms will wreak havoc in the wild is a prime example. They may act like invasive species in some areas, but a global takeover seems unlikely, to say the least. Much like climate change, historical precedent can give us some guidance. But unlike climate change, that same historical precedent gives us quite a bit of comfort. Nature itself has tried for millions of years to create countless combinations of mutated DNA and genes. The process of natural selection all but guarantees that only a tiny fraction of the very fittest permutations has survived. Genetically modified crops grow bigger and stronger and are pesticideresistant. But they can’t outgrow natural selection entirely. None of that yet guarantees that scientists wouldn’t be able to develop permutations that could wreak havoc in the wild, but historical experience would tell us that the chance is indeed slim. In fact, the best scientists working on biotechnology seem to be much less concerned about the dangers of “Frankenfoods” and GMOs than the general public. The reverse holds true for climate change. The best climate scientists appear to be significantly more concerned about ultimate climate impacts than the majority of the general public and many policy makers. That alone should give us pause.

### 1AC: Plan

#### Plan text: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike against climate change. CX checks theory interps to avoid frivolous debates – otherwise I get an I meet.

#### The Status Quo prevents union involvement in Climate Strikes which is key to solving climate change – the right to strike is necessary for future solutions

Subasinghe and Vogt 19 [Ruwan Subasinghe, Legal Advisor to the International Transport Workers’ Federation (ITF); Jeff Vogt, director for the Solidarity Center’s Rule of Law department and past legal director of the ITUC; 9-5-2019; "Unions must join the Global Climate Strike to avert a climate catastrophe"; Equal Times; https://www.equaltimes.org/unions-must-join-the-global; 10-24-2021] //Miller

* AT Circumvention and Students Solve

Over the past twelve months, groups like the youth-led #FridaysforFuture movement and the civil disobedience network Extinction Rebellion have woken up the world to the climate and ecological emergency we are facing. Earlier this year, over a million students walked out of classes as part of two hugely successful global school strikes against inaction on the climate crisis. Now young people around the world are calling on workers to join them on 20 and 27 September for the third wave of global climate strikes. While some trade unions have been responding to the call with plans for lunch break actions and workplace climate assemblies, most are constrained by legal restrictions on the right to strike at the national level. Since taking unprotected action can lead to unions and their leaders being held liable for damages and individual members being disciplined or dismissed, defying legal requirements in pursuit of climate action may not be a viable option for many beleaguered unions across the globe. A strike is generally framed in national law as either a positive right or a freedom from liability which an employer would otherwise be able to assert in, for example, tort or contract. However, in many jurisdictions the right can only be exercised in the context of collective bargaining and/or a trade dispute. Unions operating in such jurisdictions will find it difficult to formally join the Global Climate Strike as the purpose of the action ostensibly falls outside the strict scope of collective bargaining or a trade dispute. While unions are increasingly bringing environmental issues to the bargaining table with demands for greening or just transition clauses, these efforts are still limited to workplace mitigation and adaptation strategies and do not cover wider commitments on climate change. In countries where strikes in furtherance of socio-economic aims are permitted, unions will nevertheless need to win the argument that climate change is a socio-economic issue and not just an environmental or a political one. Here we can, and should, rely on international law. Committee on Freedom of Association The International Labour Organization’s (ILO) tripartite Committee on Freedom of Association (CFA) has for nearly 70 years defined the scope of the right to freedom of association, including the right to strike. The CFA has consistently held that workers may engage in collective action, including protests and strikes, outside of the collective bargaining process and over matters beyond the traditional ambit of wages and conditions of work. So long as the strike is not ‘purely political’ in nature, such as an insurrection, the CFA has stated that, “organizations responsible for defending workers’ socio-economic and occupational interests should be able to use strike action to support their position in the search for solutions to problems posed by major social and economic policy trends which have a direct impact on their members and all workers in general, in particular as regards employment, social protection and standards of living.” In the past, the CFA has given its imprimatur to protests and strikes concerning a range of issues including trade agreements, labour law reform, pensions, tax policy, social protection and similar demands. While it has not yet had occasion to consider a climate strike, it should find such a strike to be protected. Indeed, there is no issue today that has a more direct, immediate and serious impact on the world of work than the climate emergency. Already, the ILO has explained that climate change, if not addressed, will have a serious impact on employment in all sectors and in all regions. These impacts include significant climate-driven migration for work, dangerous working conditions from extreme heat, job loss in rural areas due to crop failure and job loss in urban areas due to extreme weather events. Also, the actions we will need to take to mitigate climate change may be deeply disruptive, as the ILO Commission on the Future of Work has underscored. Conflict over how this is carried out and who benefits is certain to happen. Indeed, this is why Sustainable Development Goal 16 calls for broad social engagement in order to attain economic, social and environmental sustainability. The Global Climate Strike, for trade unions, would necessarily mean a call for immediate and significant reductions in emissions while respecting the need for a just transition to protect workers and their communities. The concept of a just transition of the workforce is firmly embedded in the legally binding Paris Agreement. Furthermore, in 2015 the ILO’s tripartite constituents unanimously endorsed guidelines for a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies. The promotion and realisation of fundamental principles and rights at work, which includes the principle of freedom of association, lies at the heart of the guidelines. It is evident that **without the right to strike workers will not** be able to **effectively demand investment in new green jobs**, training, income protection **and other necessary measures for a** fair and just **transition**. Strengthening the green-red alliance After the climate strike, we will urgently need to think about how to deepen policy coherence between the labour and environmental justice fields. While they have some different objectives, both share a common history of resistance to dominant economic and political structures which have subordinated the interests of individuals and communities. Indeed, a new field of ‘just transition’ law may be a way to bridge the fields of labour and environmental law and transform these into a coherent legal discourse. We would also propose as an important step the recognition of the right to strike in cases where an employer engages in activity which is demonstrably harmful to the environment. This is in a sense the extension of the long-standing principle that workers can remove themselves immediately from dangerous work without fear of retaliation. What can be more dangerous than activity that threatens our workplace, our communities and indeed life on Earth as we know it. With only 11 years left to avert climate catastrophe, trade unions must be given the means to help prevent irreversible damage from climate change. The right to strike is a human right protected under international law. Strikes have been, and can continue to be, a tool for major societal transformations, such as the democratisation of countries, from Poland to South Africa to Tunisia, and a just transition to a low carbon economy is just as significant. Without the industrial muscle of unions, we will not be able to effectively achieve the profound transformation of our economy, including the investment needed to create millions of new sustainable jobs. A determined labour movement can face up to the ultimate challenge of climate change.

#### I meet spec for what constitutes a legit climate strike

FOU 21 [Free Our Union, “A workers’ guide to climate strikes and the law,” 10-6-21, <https://freeourunions.org/2021/10/06/a-workers-guide-to-climate-strikes-and-the-law/>] //Miller

Examples might include:

air quality (see here)

being allocated work nearer home

better insulated buildings

bike shelters

carbon literacy training for staff

commitments to retraining, job security and just transition

free public transport passes, electric vehicle charging points, or shuttle bus to nearest station

free zero-carbon canteen

greener vehicles

hiring staff to work on decarbonisation

less travel for work. Facilities and training for online alternatives

on-site childcare or collection of children to reduce journeys

paid time for union reps to deal with environmental issues

policy on leaving work without loss of pay if temperatures are too high

shorter working week and/or working fewer days per week, flexible hours to reduce peak-time travel

support (e.g. paid time off, rehousing) for workers made homeless or unable to work by climate events (e.g. fires, floods, epidemics)

### 1AC – Framing

#### The standard is maximizing expected well-being, or hedonistic act utilitarianism.

#### 1] Neuroscience- pleasure and pain *are* intrinsic value and disvalue – everything else regresses.

Blum et al. 18 [Kenneth Blum, 1Department of Psychiatry, Boonshoft School of Medicine, Dayton VA Medical Center, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, USA 2Department of Psychiatry, McKnight Brain Institute, University of Florida College of Medicine, Gainesville, FL, USA 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA 5Department of Precision Medicine, Geneus Health LLC, San Antonio, TX, USA 6Department of Addiction Research & Therapy, Nupathways Inc., Innsbrook, MO, USA 7Department of Clinical Neurology, Path Foundation, New York, NY, USA 8Division of Neuroscience-Based Addiction Therapy, The Shores Treatment & Recovery Center, Port Saint Lucie, FL, USA 9Institute of Psychology, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary 10Division of Addiction Research, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC. North Kingston, RI, USA 11Victory Nutrition International, Lederach, PA., USA 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA, Marjorie Gondré-Lewis, 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA 13Departments of Anatomy and Psychiatry, Howard University College of Medicine, Washington, DC US, Bruce Steinberg, 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA, Igor Elman, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, David Baron, 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA, Edward J Modestino, 14Department of Psychology, Curry College, Milton, MA, USA, Rajendra D Badgaiyan, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, Mark S Gold 16Department of Psychiatry, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA, “Our evolved unique pleasure circuit makes humans different from apes: Reconsideration of data derived from animal studies”, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 28 February 2018, accessed: 19 August 2020, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6446569/>] R.S.

**Pleasure** is not only one of the three primary reward functions but it also **defines reward.** As homeostasis explains the functions of only a limited number of rewards, the principal reason why particular stimuli, objects, events, situations, and activities are rewarding may be due to pleasure. This applies first of all to sex and to the primary homeostatic rewards of food and liquid and extends to money, taste, beauty, social encounters and nonmaterial, internally set, and intrinsic rewards. Pleasure, as the primary effect of rewards, drives the prime reward functions of learning, approach behavior, and decision making and provides the **basis for hedonic theories** of reward function. We are attracted by most rewards and exert intense efforts to obtain them, just because they are enjoyable [10]. Pleasure is a passive reaction that derives from the experience or prediction of reward and may lead to a long-lasting state of happiness. The word happiness is difficult to define. In fact, just obtaining physical pleasure may not be enough. One key to happiness involves a network of good friends. However, it is not obvious how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to an ice cream cone, or to your team winning a sporting event. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure [14]. Pleasure as a hallmark of reward is sufficient for defining a reward, but it may not be necessary. A reward may generate positive learning and approach behavior simply because it contains substances that are essential for body function. When we are hungry, we may eat bad and unpleasant meals. A monkey who receives hundreds of small drops of water every morning in the laboratory is unlikely to feel a rush of pleasure every time it gets the 0.1 ml. Nevertheless, with these precautions in mind, we may define any stimulus, object, event, activity, or situation that has the potential to produce pleasure as a reward. In the context of reward deficiency or for disorders of addiction, homeostasis pursues pharmacological treatments: drugs to treat drug addiction, obesity, and other compulsive behaviors. The theory of allostasis suggests broader approaches - such as re-expanding the range of possible pleasures and providing opportunities to expend effort in their pursuit. [15]. It is noteworthy, the first animal studies eliciting approach behavior by electrical brain stimulation interpreted their findings as a discovery of the brain’s pleasure centers [16] which were later partly associated with midbrain dopamine neurons [17–19] despite the notorious difficulties of identifying emotions in animals. Evolutionary theories of pleasure: The love connection BO:D Charles Darwin and other biological scientists that have examined the biological evolution and its basic principles found various mechanisms that steer behavior and biological development. Besides their theory on natural selection, it was particularly the sexual selection process that gained significance in the latter context over the last century, especially when it comes to the question of what makes us “what we are,” i.e., human. However, the capacity to sexually select and evolve is not at all a human accomplishment alone or a sign of our uniqueness; yet, we humans, as it seems, are ingenious in fooling ourselves and others–when we are in love or desperately search for it. It is well established that modern biological theory conjectures that **organisms are** the **result of evolutionary competition.** In fact, Richard Dawkins stresses gene survival and propagation as the basic mechanism of life [20]. Only genes that lead to the fittest phenotype will make it. It is noteworthy that the phenotype is selected based on behavior that maximizes gene propagation. To do so, the phenotype must survive and generate offspring, and be better at it than its competitors. Thus, the ultimate, distal function of rewards is to increase evolutionary fitness by ensuring the survival of the organism and reproduction. It is agreed that learning, approach, economic decisions, and positive emotions are the proximal functions through which phenotypes obtain other necessary nutrients for survival, mating, and care for offspring. Behavioral reward functions have evolved to help individuals to survive and propagate their genes. Apparently, people need to live well and long enough to reproduce. Most would agree that homo-sapiens do so by ingesting the substances that make their bodies function properly. For this reason, foods and drinks are rewards. Additional rewards, including those used for economic exchanges, ensure sufficient palatable food and drink supply. Mating and gene propagation is supported by powerful sexual attraction. Additional properties, like body form, augment the chance to mate and nourish and defend offspring and are therefore also rewards. Care for offspring until they can reproduce themselves helps gene propagation and is rewarding; otherwise, many believe mating is useless. According to David E Comings, as any small edge will ultimately result in evolutionary advantage [21], additional reward mechanisms like novelty seeking and exploration widen the spectrum of available rewards and thus enhance the chance for survival, reproduction, and ultimate gene propagation. These functions may help us to obtain the benefits of distant rewards that are determined by our own interests and not immediately available in the environment. Thus the distal reward function in gene propagation and evolutionary fitness defines the proximal reward functions that we see in everyday behavior. That is why foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding. There have been theories linking pleasure as a required component of health benefits salutogenesis, (salugenesis). In essence, under these terms, pleasure is described as a state or feeling of happiness and satisfaction resulting from an experience that one enjoys. Regarding pleasure, it is a double-edged sword, on the one hand, it promotes positive feelings (like mindfulness) and even better cognition, possibly through the release of dopamine [22]. But on the other hand, pleasure simultaneously encourages addiction and other negative behaviors, i.e., motivational toxicity. It is a complex neurobiological phenomenon, relying on reward circuitry or limbic activity. It is important to realize that through the “Brain Reward Cascade” (BRC) endorphin and endogenous morphinergic mechanisms may play a role [23]. While natural rewards are essential for survival and appetitive motivation leading to beneficial biological behaviors like eating, sex, and reproduction, crucial social interactions seem to further facilitate the positive effects exerted by pleasurable experiences. Indeed, experimentation with addictive drugs is capable of directly acting on reward pathways and causing deterioration of these systems promoting hypodopaminergia [24]. Most would agree that pleasurable activities can stimulate personal growth and may help to induce healthy behavioral changes, including stress management [25]. The work of Esch and Stefano [26] concerning the link between compassion and love implicate the brain reward system, and pleasure induction suggests that social contact in general, i.e., love, attachment, and compassion, can be highly effective in stress reduction, survival, and overall health. Understanding the role of neurotransmission and pleasurable states both positive and negative have been adequately studied over many decades [26–37], but comparative anatomical and neurobiological function between animals and homo sapiens appear to be required and seem to be in an infancy stage. Finding happiness is different between apes and humans As stated earlier in this expert opinion one key to happiness involves a network of good friends [38]. However, it is not entirely clear exactly how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to a sugar rush, winning a sports event or even sky diving, all of which augment dopamine release at the reward brain site. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure. Remarkably, there are pathways for ordinary liking and pleasure, which are limited in scope as described above in this commentary. However, there are **many brain regions**, often termed hot and cold spots, that significantly **modulate** (increase or decrease) our **pleasure or** even produce **the opposite** of pleasure— that is disgust and fear [39]. One specific region of the nucleus accumbens is organized like a computer keyboard, with particular stimulus triggers in rows— producing an increase and decrease of pleasure and disgust. Moreover, the cortex has unique roles in the cognitive evaluation of our feelings of pleasure [40]. Importantly, the interplay of these multiple triggers and the higher brain centers in the prefrontal cortex are very intricate and are just being uncovered. Desire and reward centers It is surprising that many different sources of pleasure activate the same circuits between the mesocorticolimbic regions (Figure 1). Reward and desire are two aspects pleasure induction and have a very widespread, large circuit. Some part of this circuit distinguishes between desire and dread. The so-called pleasure circuitry called “REWARD” involves a well-known dopamine pathway in the mesolimbic system that can influence both pleasure and motivation. In simplest terms, the well-established mesolimbic system is a dopamine circuit for reward. It starts in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) of the midbrain and travels to the nucleus accumbens (Figure 2). It is the cornerstone target to all addictions. The VTA is encompassed with neurons using glutamate, GABA, and dopamine. The nucleus accumbens (NAc) is located within the ventral striatum and is divided into two sub-regions—the motor and limbic regions associated with its core and shell, respectively. The NAc has spiny neurons that receive dopamine from the VTA and glutamate (a dopamine driver) from the hippocampus, amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex. Subsequently, the NAc projects GABA signals to an area termed the ventral pallidum (VP). The region is a relay station in the limbic loop of the basal ganglia, critical for motivation, behavior, emotions and the “Feel Good” response. This defined system of the brain is involved in all addictions –substance, and non –substance related. In 1995, our laboratory coined the term “Reward Deficiency Syndrome” (RDS) to describe genetic and epigenetic induced hypodopaminergia in the “Brain Reward Cascade” that contribute to addiction and compulsive behaviors [3,6,41]. Furthermore, ordinary “liking” of something, or pure pleasure, is represented by small regions mainly in the limbic system (old reptilian part of the brain). These may be part of larger neural circuits. In Latin, hedus is the term for “sweet”; and in Greek, hodone is the term for “pleasure.” Thus, the word Hedonic is now referring to various subcomponents of pleasure: some associated with purely sensory and others with more complex emotions involving morals, aesthetics, and social interactions. The capacity to have pleasure is part of being healthy and may even extend life, especially if linked to optimism as a dopaminergic response [42]. Psychiatric illness often includes symptoms of an abnormal inability to experience pleasure, referred to as anhedonia. A negative feeling state is called dysphoria, which can consist of many emotions such as pain, depression, anxiety, fear, and disgust. Previously many scientists used animal research to uncover the complex mechanisms of pleasure, liking, motivation and even emotions like panic and fear, as discussed above [43]. However, as a significant amount of related research about the specific brain regions of pleasure/reward circuitry has been derived from invasive studies of animals, these cannot be directly compared with subjective states experienced by humans. In an attempt to resolve the controversy regarding the causal contributions of mesolimbic dopamine systems to reward, we have previously evaluated the three-main competing explanatory categories: “liking,” “learning,” and “wanting” [3]. That is, dopamine may mediate (a) liking: the hedonic impact of reward, (b) learning: learned predictions about rewarding effects, or (c) wanting: the pursuit of rewards by attributing incentive salience to reward-related stimuli [44]. We have evaluated these hypotheses, especially as they relate to the RDS, and we find that the incentive salience or “wanting” hypothesis of dopaminergic functioning is supported by a majority of the scientific evidence. Various neuroimaging studies have shown that anticipated behaviors such as sex and gaming, delicious foods and drugs of abuse all affect brain regions associated with reward networks, and may not be unidirectional. Drugs of abuse enhance dopamine signaling which sensitizes mesolimbic brain mechanisms that apparently evolved explicitly to attribute incentive salience to various rewards [45]. Addictive substances are voluntarily self-administered, and they enhance (directly or indirectly) dopaminergic synaptic function in the NAc. This activation of the brain reward networks (producing the ecstatic “high” that users seek). Although these circuits were initially thought to encode a set point of hedonic tone, it is now being considered to be far more complicated in function, also encoding attention, reward expectancy, disconfirmation of reward expectancy, and incentive motivation [46]. The argument about addiction as a disease may be confused with a predisposition to substance and nonsubstance rewards relative to the extreme effect of drugs of abuse on brain neurochemistry. The former sets up an individual to be at high risk through both genetic polymorphisms in reward genes as well as harmful epigenetic insult. Some Psychologists, even with all the data, still infer that addiction is not a disease [47]. Elevated stress levels, together with polymorphisms (genetic variations) of various dopaminergic genes and the genes related to other neurotransmitters (and their genetic variants), and may have an additive effect on vulnerability to various addictions [48]. In this regard, Vanyukov, et al. [48] suggested based on review that whereas the gateway hypothesis does not specify mechanistic connections between “stages,” and does not extend to the risks for addictions the concept of common liability to addictions may be more parsimonious. The latter theory is grounded in genetic theory and supported by data identifying common sources of variation in the risk for specific addictions (e.g., RDS). This commonality has identifiable neurobiological substrate and plausible evolutionary explanations. Over many years the controversy of dopamine involvement in especially “pleasure” has led to confusion concerning separating motivation from actual pleasure (wanting versus liking) [49]. We take the position that animal studies cannot provide real clinical information as described by self-reports in humans. As mentioned earlier and in the abstract, on November 23rd, 2017, evidence for our concerns was discovered [50] In essence, although nonhuman primate brains are similar to our own, the disparity between other primates and those of human cognitive abilities tells us that surface similarity is not the whole story. Sousa et al. [50] small case found various differentially expressed genes, to associate with pleasure related systems. Furthermore, the dopaminergic interneurons located in the human neocortex were absent from the neocortex of nonhuman African apes. Such differences in neuronal transcriptional programs may underlie a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders. In simpler terms, the system controls the production of dopamine, a chemical messenger that plays a significant role in pleasure and rewards. The senior author, Dr. Nenad Sestan from Yale, stated: “Humans have evolved a dopamine system that is different than the one in chimpanzees.” This may explain why the behavior of humans is so unique from that of non-human primates, even though our brains are so surprisingly similar, Sestan said: “It might also shed light on why people are vulnerable to mental disorders such as autism (possibly even addiction).” Remarkably, this research finding emerged from an extensive, multicenter collaboration to compare the brains across several species. These researchers examined 247 specimens of neural tissue from six humans, five chimpanzees, and five macaque monkeys. Moreover, these investigators analyzed which genes were turned on or off in 16 regions of the brain. While the differences among species were subtle, **there was** a **remarkable contrast in** the **neocortices**, specifically in an area of the brain that is much more developed in humans than in chimpanzees. In fact, these researchers found that a gene called tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) for the enzyme, responsible for the production of dopamine, was expressed in the neocortex of humans, but not chimpanzees. As discussed earlier, dopamine is best known for its essential role within the brain’s reward system; the very system that responds to everything from sex, to gambling, to food, and to addictive drugs. However, dopamine also assists in regulating emotional responses, memory, and movement. Notably, abnormal dopamine levels have been linked to disorders including Parkinson’s, schizophrenia and spectrum disorders such as autism and addiction or RDS. Nora Volkow, the director of NIDA, pointed out that one alluring possibility is that the neurotransmitter dopamine plays a substantial role in humans’ ability to pursue various rewards that are perhaps months or even years away in the future. This same idea has been suggested by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, a professor of biology and neurology at Stanford University. Dr. Sapolsky cited evidence that dopamine levels rise dramatically in humans when we anticipate potential rewards that are uncertain and even far off in our futures, such as retirement or even the possible alterlife. This may explain what often motivates people to work for things that have no apparent short-term benefit [51]. In similar work, Volkow and Bale [52] proposed a model in which dopamine can favor NOW processes through phasic signaling in reward circuits or LATER processes through tonic signaling in control circuits. Specifically, they suggest that through its modulation of the orbitofrontal cortex, which processes salience attribution, dopamine also enables shilting from NOW to LATER, while its modulation of the insula, which processes interoceptive information, influences the probability of selecting NOW versus LATER actions based on an individual’s physiological state. This hypothesis further supports the concept that disruptions along these circuits contribute to diverse pathologies, including obesity and addiction or RDS.

#### 2] Actor spec—governments must use util because they don’t have intentions and are constantly dealing with tradeoffs—outweighs since different agents have different obligations—takes out calc indicts since they are empirically denied.

#### 3] No intent-foresight distinction for states.

Enoch 07 Enoch, D [The Faculty of Law, The Hebrew Unviersity, Mount Scopus Campus, Jersusalem]. (2007). INTENDING, FORESEEING, AND THE STATE. Legal Theory, 13(02). doi:10.1017/s1352325207070048 https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/legal-theory/article/intending-foreseeing-and-the-state/76B18896B94D5490ED0512D8E8DC54B2

The general difficulty of the intending-foreseeing distinction here stemmed, you will recall, from the feeling that attempting to pick and choose among the foreseen consequences of one’s actions those one is more and those one is less responsible for looks more like the preparation of a defense than like a genuine attempt to determine what is to be done. Hiding behind the intending-foreseeing distinction seems like an attempt to evade responsibility, and so thinking about the distinction in terms of responsibility serves 39. Anderson & Pildes, supra note 38. I will use this text as my example of an expressive theory here. 40. See id. at 1554, 1564. 41. For a general critique, see Mathew D. Adler, Expressive Theories of Law: A Skeptical Overview, 148 U. PA. L. REV. 1363 (1999–2000). 42. As Adler repeatedly notes, the understanding of expression Anderson & Pildes work with is amazingly broad, so that “To express an attitude through action is to act on the reasons the attitude gives us”; Anderson & Pildes, supra note 38, at 1510. If this is so, it seems that expression drops out of the picture and everything done with it can be done directly in terms of reasons. 43. This may be true of what Anderson and Pildes have in mind when they say that “expressive norms regulate actions by regulating the acceptable justifications for doing them”; id. at 1511. http://journals.cambridge.org Downloaded: 03 Aug 2014 IP address: 134.153.184.170 Intending, Foreseeing, and the State 91 to reduce even further the plausibility of attributing to it intrinsic moral significance. This consideration—however weighty in general—seems to me very weighty when applied to state action and to the decisions of state officials. For perhaps it may be argued that individuals are not required to undertake a global perspective, one that equally takes into account all foreseen consequences of their actions. Perhaps, in other words, individuals are entitled to (roughly) settle for having a good will, and beyond that let chips fall where they may. But this is precisely what stateswomen and statesmen—and certainly states—are not entitled to settle for.44 In making policy decisions, it is precisely the global (or at least statewide, or nationwide, or something of this sort) perspective that must be undertaken. Perhaps, for instance, an individual doctor is entitled to give her patient a scarce drug without thinking about tomorrow’s patients (I say “perhaps” because I am genuinely not sure about this), but surely when a state committee tries to formulate rules for the allocation of scarce medical drugs and treatments, it cannot hide behind the intending-foreseeing distinction, arguing that if it allows45 the doctor to give the drug to today’s patient, the death of tomorrow’s patient is merely foreseen and not intended. When making a policy-decision, this is clearly unacceptable. Or think about it this way (I follow Daryl Levinson here):46 perhaps restrictions on the responsibility of individuals are justified because individuals are autonomous, because much of the value in their lives comes from personal pursuits and relationships that are possible only if their responsibility for what goes on in the (more impersonal) world is restricted. But none of this is true of states and governments. They have no special relationships and pursuits, no personal interests, no autonomous lives to lead in anything like the sense in which these ideas are plausible when applied to individuals persons. So there is no reason to restrict the responsibility of states in anything like the way the responsibility of individuals is arguably restricted.47 States and state officials have much more comprehensive responsibilities than individuals do. Hiding behind the intending-foreseeing distinction thus more clearly constitutes an evasion of responsibility in the case of the former. So the evading-responsibility worry has much more force against the intending-foreseeing distinction when applied to state action than elsewhere.

#### Impact calc – extinction outweighs

A] Reversibility- it forecloses the alternative because we can’t improve society if we are all dead

B] Structural violence- death causes suffering because people can’t get access to resources and basic necessities

C] Objectivity- body count is the most objective way to calculate impacts because comparing suffering is unethical

D] Intuitions – Their the basis of all ethical theories, and we know that intuitionally things like death are inherently bad, proves extinction ows.

### 1AC – UV

#### 1] 1AR theory A] we get it - otherwise neg can be infinitely abusive B] meta theory also precedes the evaluation of initial theory shells because it determines whether or not I could engage in theory in the first place C] its drop the debater - the 1AR is too short to be able to rectify abuse and adequately cover substance - you must be punished. This also applies to Ks - if I couldn't engage your criticism, we don't know if its true [D] No Neg RVIs - neg can dump on the shell for 6 minutes and make the 2AR impossible proliferating infinite abuse

#### 3] Permissibility and presumption affirm – a) statements are true until proven false, if I say my name you’d believe me, b) we’d have to question every strand of reasoning making knowledge impossible, c) we’d never prove obligations for neutral actions like eating which freezes action, d) negating requires a complete absence of obligations-<https://www.dictionary.com/browse/negate> e) if something isn’t false, it’s true, which means if the aff isn’t prohibited it’s obligatory.

#### 4] Calc indicts fail – a) ethics – it would indict everything since they use events to understand how their ethics have worked in the past and through the justification of premises, b) intuitions – if I was told going to the grocery store would kill 5 people, I wouldn’t do it regardless of if consequences are incoherent, c) internalism – asking why we value pain and pleasure is nonsensical cuz the answer is intrinsic since we just do, which means we still prefer hedonism despite shortcomings.