# NC

### 1

#### Interpretation: the affirmative must only defend that ‘a just governments ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike.’

#### Three violations

#### 1] Just governments respect liberties

Dorn 12 James A. Dorn, Cato Journal, "The Scope of Government in a Free Society", Fall 2012, https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/2012/12/v32n3-10.pdf

If laws are just, liberty and property are secure. The most certain test of justice is negative—that is, justice occurs when injustice (the violation of natural rights to life, liberty, and property) is prevented. The emphasis here is on what Hayek (1967) called “just rules of conduct,” not on the fairness of outcomes. No one has stated the negative concept of justice better than the 19th century French classical liberal Frederic Bastiat ([1850] 1964: 65): When law and force confine a man within the bounds of justice, they do not impose anything on him but a mere negation. They impose on him only the obligation to refrain from injuring others. They do not infringe on his personality, or his liberty or his property. They merely safeguard the personality, the liberty, and the property of others. They stand on the defensive; they defend the equal rights of all. They fulfill a mission whose harmlessness is evident, whose utility is palpable, and whose legitimacy is uncontested. In short, the purpose of a just government is not to do good with other people’s money, but to prevent injustice by protecting property and securing liberty.

#### Violation—the US and specifically courts are not just.

Nellis, Ph.D., 18, Report to the United Nations on Racial Disparities in the U.S. Criminal Justice System, https://www.sentencingproject.org/publications/un-report-on-racial-disparities/, Sentencing Project,

The United States criminal justice system is the largest in the world. At yearend 2015, over 6.7 million individuals1) were under some form of correctional control in the United States, including 2.2 million incarcerated in federal, state, or local prisons and jails.2) The U.S. is a world leader in its rate of incarceration, dwarfing the rate of nearly every other nation.3) Such broad statistics mask the racial disparity that pervades the U.S. criminal justice system, and for African Americans in particular. African Americans are more likely than white Americans to be arrested; once arrested, they are more likely to be convicted; and once convicted, and they are more likely to experience lengthy prison sentences. African-American adults are 5.9 times as likely to be incarcerated than whites and Hispanics are 3.1 times as likely.4) As of 2001, one of every three black boys born in that year could expect to go to prison in his lifetime, as could one of every six Latinos—compared to one of every seventeen white boys.5) Racial and ethnic disparities among women are less substantial than among men but remain prevalent.6) The source of such disparities is deeper and more systemic than explicit racial discrimination. The United States in effect operates two distinct criminal justice systems: one for wealthy people and another for poor people and people of color. The wealthy can access a vigorous adversary system replete with constitutional protections for defendants. Yet the experiences of poor and minority defendants within the criminal justice system often differ substantially from that model due to a number of factors, each of which contributes to the overrepresentation of such individuals in the system. As former Georgetown Law Professor David Cole states in his book No Equal Justice,

#### 2] Workers is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend a just government ought to recognize the unconditional right of a subset of workers to strike.

#### The upward entailment test and adverb test determine the genericity of a bare plural

Leslie and Lerner 16 [Sarah-Jane Leslie, Ph.D., Princeton, 2007. Dean of the Graduate School and Class of 1943 Professor of Philosophy. Served as the vice dean for faculty development in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty, director of the Program in Linguistics, and founding director of the Program in Cognitive Science at Princeton University. Adam Lerner, PhD Philosophy, Postgraduate Research Associate, Princeton 2018. From 2018, Assistant Professor/Faculty Fellow in the Center for Bioethics at New York University. Member of the [Princeton Social Neuroscience Lab](http://psnlab.princeton.edu/).] “Generic Generalizations.” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. April 24, 2016. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/> TG

1. Generics and Logical Form

In English, generics can be expressed using a variety of syntactic forms: bare plurals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), indefinite singulars (e.g., “a tiger is striped”), and definite singulars (“the tiger is striped”). However, none of these syntactic forms is dedicated to expressing generic claims; each can also be used to express existential and/or specific claims. Further, some generics express what appear to be generalizations over individuals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), while others appear to predicate properties directly of the kind (e.g., “dodos are extinct”). These facts and others give rise to a number of questions concerning the logical forms of generic statements.

1.1 Isolating the Generic Interpretation

Consider the following pairs of sentences:

(1)a.Tigers are striped.

b.Tigers are on the front lawn.

(2)a.A tiger is striped.

b.A tiger is on the front lawn.

(3)a.The tiger is striped.

b.The tiger is on the front lawn.

The sentence pairs above are prima facie syntactically parallel—both are subject-predicate sentences whose subjects consist of the same common noun coupled with the same, or no, article. However, the interpretation of first sentence of each pair is intuitively quite different from the interpretation of the second sentence in the pair. In the second sentences, we are talking about some particular tigers: a group of tigers in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), some individual tiger in ([2b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex2b)), and some unique salient or familiar tiger in ([3b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex3b))—a beloved pet, perhaps. In the first sentences, however, we are saying something general. There is/are no particular tiger or tigers that we are talking about.

The second sentences of the pairs receive what is called an existential interpretation. The hallmark of the existential interpretation of a sentence containing a bare plural or an indefinite singular is that it may be paraphrased with “some” with little or no change in meaning; hence the terminology “existential reading”. The application of the term “existential interpretation” is perhaps less appropriate when applied to the definite singular, but it is intended there to cover interpretation of the definite singular as referring to a unique contextually salient/familiar particular individual, not to a kind.

There are some tests that are helpful in distinguishing these two readings. For example, the existential interpretation is upward entailing, meaning that the statement will always remain true if we replace the subject term with a more inclusive term. Consider our examples above. In ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), we can replace “tiger” with “animal” salva veritate, but in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) we cannot. If “tigers are on the lawn” is true, then “animals are on the lawn” must be true. However, “tigers are striped” is true, yet “animals are striped” is false. ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) does not entail that animals are striped, but ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) entails that animals are on the front lawn (Lawler 1973; Laca 1990; Krifka et al. 1995).

Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification with minimal change of meaning (Krifka et al. 1995). For example, inserting “usually” in the sentences in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) (e.g., “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) dramatically alters the meaning of the sentence (e.g., “tigers are usually on the front lawn”). (For generics such as “mosquitoes carry malaria”, the adverb “sometimes” is perhaps better used than “usually” to mark off the generic reading.)

#### It applies to “workers” – 1] upward entailment test – “a just democracy ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike” doesn’t entail that” a just democracy ought to recognize the unconditional right of healthcare workers to strike” cuz it doesn’t prove teachers ought to have the right to strike

#### Standards:

#### 1] Precision – any other interp lets affs do away with random words in the res a] that means no solid neg ground b] The judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote on non-topical ground.

#### 2] Limits – they can defend any combination of governments and workers which explodes aff ground and prep skew that kills our ability to engage in a predictable advocacy.

#### 3] Scholarship – calling oppressive governments like US just and ignoring the HR violations normalizes and justifies racism which is an independent voter since it makes debate unsafe.

#### TVA – read the aff as a whole res aff, same advantage area

#### The voters are

#### 1] Fairness b/c a) it’ an intrinsic good b) it control the internal link to education c) debate is a game, if it’s unfair no-one will want to play.

#### 2] Education b/c a) portability, it’s useful for the real world b) constitutive purpose, this is an educational activity.

#### And it’s drop-the-debater, k2 deterring further abuse, and I can’t engage with the debate if they’re untopical.

#### No RVI on T, you don’t win for being topical or fair, and incentives being non-topical to bait T and win off RVI every rnd.

#### Competing interpretations, a) reasonability is bad it requires judge intervention and b) arguing about the norms is the only way to get to the best norms possible.

#### T before theory a] I only get 2 months to set norms they get 4 years b] any NC abuse was a necessary check against AC abuse.

### 2

#### Interp: If the affirmative defends anything other than “A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike” then they must provide a counter-solvency advocate for their specific advocacy in the 1AC.

#### Violation – they don’t

#### Prefer

#### 1. Limits – there are infinite things you could defend outside the exact text of the resolution – the only way to verify if it’s substantively fair is proof of counter-arguments. Nobody knows your aff better than you, so if you can’t find an answer, I can’t be expected to.

#### 2. Research – Forces the aff to go to the other side of the library and contest their own view points, as well as encouraging in depth-research about their own position. Key to education since we definitionally learn more about positions when we contest our own.

#### Same voters –

### 3

#### Raising debt ceiling passes now, but floor time is key

Sheffey 11/18 [Ayelet, staff reporter for Business Insider with a focus on Capitol Hill. “Mitch McConnell shrugs off Trump’s taunts and attempts to defuse the debt ceiling crisis” https://www.businessinsider.nl/mitch-mcconnell-shrugs-off-trumps-taunts-and-attempts-to-defuse-the-debt-ceiling-crisis/]

With less than a month left to raise the debt ceiling before the US ceases to be able to pay its bills, Mitch McConnell appears to be having a change of heart about helping Democrats out of this pickle.

This comes after Trump called McConnell a "Broken Old Crow" in a Wednesday statement for agreeing to a two-month extension of the debt-ceiling limit back in October.

"He could have won it all using the Debt Ceiling—they were ready to fold," Trump wrote. "Now the Democrats have a big victory and the wind at their back."

But that victory was short-lived. Congress now has until December 15 before the Treasury runs out of money to pay the country's bills. After some initial resistance to help again, McConnell met with Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer on Thursday for a brief meeting to discuss strategies to take on the debt limit before the deadline.

This is a notably different approach than the one from earlier this fall, when McConnell remained adamant it was Democrats' jobs to raise limit but consistently blocked every attempt by Democrats to do just that. He waited until the very last minute in October to step in and help. He vowed he would not step in again, but that story has changed.

"The best way to characterize it is we're going to be discussing the way forward," McConnell told Politico ahead of a meeting in Schumer's office.

McConnell's change of tune

On October 6, McConnell offered the 11 Republican votes needed to suspend the debt ceiling an additional two months, but at the time he made clear his help will not be available when Democrats need to confront the issue again in December. He said at the time that his help would "moot Democrats' excuses about the time crunch they created and give the unified Democratic government more than enough time to pass standalone debt limit legislation through reconciliation."

For months leading up to the suspension, though, Schumer and Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi said raising the debt limit should be a bipartisan task, and with Thursday's meeting, a showdown as seen in October may be avoided.

"We had a good discussion about several different issues that are all extant here as we move toward the end of the session and we agreed to keep talking and working together to try to get somewhere," McConnell told HuffPost following the meeting.

Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen earlier week said that after December 15, she is not confident the Treasury will have the resources to fund the government and stressed the need for the matter to be addressed in a bipartisan way.

#### Big ag is powerful, any attempt to take them down is politically perilous

Brock 21, assistant professor of American politics and public policy at Texas Woman's University (Clare, “Why is corporate lobbying on food skyrocketing?,” *Medium*, <https://medium.com/3streams/food-business-lobbying-and-political-polarization-bc812e93cf28>)

My latest research published in the journal, Interest Groups & Advocacy, suggests that political polarization is altering corporate lobbying in food and agriculture in very specific ways. As partisan polarization increases in this policy area, corporations are increasing their lobbying efforts in Congress. Why is this? Interest groups are working longer and harder to lobby members of Congress because that’s where the largest, loudest, most heated conflict occurs. As conflict increases, lobbying groups have to adjust their strategies accordingly. We often call this prolonged conflict in Congress and the resulting inaction “gridlock”, and in recent decades this has been particularly true. Congress is slow to move and the fights are fierce. Even within committee, legislation that once drew consensus now draws fire. And as partisanship increases, so does gridlock. For lobbyists and those who wish to influence the outcomes of legislation, this means that they must work harder and longer to see legislation through from start to finish. At the same time, gridlock and a prolonged process also means that there may be more opportunity for groups to influence policy content as lawmakers debate specific provisions and ideas to death (or life). This combination matters because polarization is likely to increase the competitive advantage that wealthy interest groups already enjoy. Lobbying is already dominated heavily by corporate interests. This is because lobbying is not cheap and is most easily undertaken as a collective activity. As gridlock prolongs the time between legislation being crafted and its passage, interest groups that would like to influence policy content must engage for increasingly long durations. Sustaining these efforts for year after year becomes both necessary and, for many, financially prohibitive. The wealthiest interest groups and corporations can sustain high levels of lobbying for much longer than more resource-poor groups. And this finding is especially important in a subsystem like food and agriculture, which affects our health and wellbeing on such a fundamental level. Current farm subsidies already reinforce disparities between farmers. In 2019, 54% of all payments went to the wealthiest 1/10th of farmers. As polarization further advantages wealthy interests who are able to sustain lobbying efforts, it is possible that such disparities will worsen. Farm policy impacts the cost of food, gas prices (ethanol is made from corn), food access, conservation policy, and more. This is not to say that wealthy interests and corporations are “buying” legislation. That has never been strictly true. Politicians are undoubtedly influenced by their ideologies, constituencies, and co-partisans. All this is simply to say that an increase in conflict within Congress prolongs the process in a way that exacerbates the advantages of wealthy interest groups. Polarization and gridlock don’t just frustrate Americans, they also have real consequences for policymaking and whose voice gets heard on the Hill.

#### Debt default is the easiest way to wreck the US economy—ruins the US dollar and financial reputation

Egan 9/8 [Matt Egan is an award-winning reporter at CNN, covering business, the economy and financial markets across CNN's television and digital platforms, "'Financial Armageddon.' What's at stake if the debt limit isn't raised", 9/8/21, <https://www.cnn.com/2021/09/08/business/debt-ceiling-default-explained/index.html>]

The easiest way to spark a financial crisis and wreck the US economy would be to allow the federal government to default on its debt. It would be an epic, unforced error — and millions of Americans would pay the price.

And yet that unlikely situation is once again being contemplated. If Congress doesn't raise the limit on federal borrowing the federal government will most likely run out of cash and extraordinary measures next month, Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen warned lawmakers on Wednesday.

In short, a default would be an economic cataclysm. Interest rates would spike, the stock market would crater, retirement accounts would take a beating, the value of the US dollar would erode and the financial reputation of the world's only superpower would be tarnished.

"It would be financial Armageddon," Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's Analytics, told CNN. "It's complete craziness to even contemplate the idea of not paying our debt on time."

But it's a crazy world.

Lawmakers in Washington are again playing chicken with America's creditworthiness. And the path to raising the debt ceiling is not clear.

Even though Congress has in the past raised the debt ceiling with a bipartisan vote, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell vowed in July that Republicans will not vote to raise the debt ceiling.

JPMorgan Chase (JPM) CEO Jamie Dimon urged lawmakers not to even think about going down this path again. During a hearing in May, Dimon said an actual default "could cause an immediate, literally cascading catastrophe of unbelievable proportions and damage America for 100 years."

'Irreparable damage'

In her letter to Congress, Yellen said history shows that waiting "until the last minute" to suspend or increase the debt limit "can cause serious harm" to business and consumer confidence, raise borrowing costs for taxpayers and hurt America's credit rating.

"A delay that calls into question the federal government's ability to meet all its obligations would likely cause irreparable damage to the U.S. economy and global financial markets," Yellen wrote.

A US default would undermine the bedrock of the modern global financial system.

"We pay our debt. That's what distinguishes the United States from almost every other country on the planet," Zandi of Moody's said.

Because of America's long track record of paying its debt, it's very cheap for Washington to borrow. But a default would force ratings companies to downgrade US debt and shatter that borrowing advantage. Markets plunged in 2011 when that debt ceiling standoff caused Standard & Poor's to downgrade America's credit rating.

Higher borrowing costs would make it much harder for Washington to borrow to pay for infrastructure, the climate crisis or to fight future recessions. And refinancing America's nearly $29 trillion mountain of existing debt would become that much more expensive. Interest expenses, which totaled $345 billion in fiscal 2020, would quickly rival what Washington spends on defense.

#### Extinction –

Joshua Zoffer 20, Investor at Cove Hill Partners, Fellow at New America, JD Candidate at Yale University Law School, AB from Harvard University, “To End Forever War, Keep the Dollar Globally Dominant”, The New Republic, 2/3/2020, https://newrepublic.com/article/156417/end-forever-war-keep-dollar-globally-dominant

In early 2016, Obama Treasury Secretary Jack Lew cautioned that the dollar’s dominance as a global currency rested, in part, on the U.S. government’s reluctance to fully weaponize it. If foreign markets and governments “feel that we will deploy sanctions without sufficient justification or for inappropriate reasons,” he warned, “we should not be surprised if they look for ways to avoid doing business in the United States or in U.S. dollars.” Lew’s case stemmed from the more fundamental view that the dollar’s international role is “a source of tremendous strength for our economy, a benefit for U.S. companies and a driver of U.S. global leadership”—in other words, a role worth keeping. This view is emblematic of American financial governance since the Second World War. U.S. economic analysts, especially at the Treasury, have jealously guarded the dollar’s role and the many benefits it offers: the ability to run large deficits at low cost and disproportionate influence over the structure of the global economy, among others. Yet in their recent article in The New Republic, David Adler and Daniel Bessner argue the U.S. should abandon these advantages. In their view, the dollar’s role has encouraged American militarism and should be relinquished to curb such behavior. Dollar hegemony is not without cost, but to renounce it would be a profound mistake. Adler and Bessner’s view neglects the sizable economic benefits the dollar’s role confers on the U.S., as well as its possible use as an antidote to military adventurism. It ignores the enormous good that can be done with deficit spending, much of which has gone to the American military but could instead fund progressive programs. And it elides the inability of the U.S. and its global trading partners to shift away from dollar dominance without creating worldwide financial distress. Adler and Bessner are right that the U.S. has misused its privilege, but Washington should not abandon it; rather, American leaders should seek to transform it. Generations of American policymakers have been right to protect the dollar’s key currency role for economic reasons. Most notably, dollar hegemony affords the U.S. the ability to run large and prolonged budget and balance-of-payments deficits. The dollar represents 62 percent of allocated foreign exchange reserves, is used to invoice and settle roughly half of world trade, and accounts for 42 percent of global payments. Because governments, banks, and businesses worldwide need lots of dollars, the world market always stands ready to absorb new U.S.-dollar-denominated debt without charging higher interest rates. Adler and Bessner correctly point out that the rest of the world considers the dollar’s role as the world’s reserve currency to be an “exorbitant privilege,” a term coined in the 1960s by then French Finance Minister Valéry Giscard D’Estaing. The ability to spend beyond its means has enabled the U.S. to fund its impressive military might, whether one views that power as the fountainhead of Pax Americana or the source of illegitimate military adventurism. But these economic benefits go beyond just deficits. The demand for dollars also pushes up the dollar’s value against other currencies, enhancing American purchasing power and offering consumers access to imports on the cheap. The dollar’s role also means American firms rarely need to do business in foreign currencies, reducing transaction costs and exchange-rate risks. More broadly, America’s central economic role gives it outsize influence at crucial moments. At the height of the financial crisis that began in 2008, the Federal Reserve was able to inject vital liquidity into the global financial system by selectively offering dollar swap lines to trusted foreign central banks. Dollar hegemony enabled the U.S. to act swiftly, effectively, and on its own terms. In addition, the dollar’s role offers a potent alternative to kinetic military action as a means of pursuing foreign policy objectives. The dollar’s broad use means access to dollar liquidity—which in turn requires access to the U.S. financial system—is essential for foreign governments and businesses. For foreign banks, especially, being cut off from dollar access is essentially a death sentence. That makes sanctions that do so a powerful tool in the international arena. In 2005, for example, the U.S. used the dollar to strike a devastating blow against North Korea without firing a single shot or even formally enacting sanctions. Using authority provided by Section 311 of the Patriot Act, the Department of the Treasury crippled Banco Delta Asia, a bank accused of facilitating illegal activity by the North Korean government, by merely threatening to cut off its access to the American financial system. Deposit outflows began within days; within weeks the bank was placed under government administration to avoid a full collapse. Pyongyang was hit hard, as other banks ceased their business with it to avoid meeting the same fate. Similarly, though the Trump administration has worked hard to undo it, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran to limit the development of nuclear weapons was made possible, in part, by painful dollar sanctions that brought Iran to the table. Far from being a proximate cause of military conflict, the dollar’s central global role has often been used to contain adversaries without military intervention. Still, skeptics are right to point out that the dollar’s role has indirectly funded American interventionism and that dollar sanctions have been overused, provoking the ire of American allies. But these facts suggest we should use our dollar power to forge a more progressive U.S. order, not abandon the advantage altogether. America’s exorbitant privilege need not fund warships and missiles: The same low-interest borrowing could be used to fund a new universal health care system, expand access to higher education, or pursue any number of large-scale social policy objectives, including financing global public goods that no other country or consortium of countries is prepared to fund, such as climate change mitigation.

### 4

#### CP: The United States federal government should:

#### In the event of increased food scarcity, refrain from transforming large-scale non-agricultural land into farmland

#### Invest $1 trillion in food scarcity research, focused on artificial production of food without damaging natural habitats

#### Implement the recommendations of the Tian evidence (their author)

#### Tian lists a suite of proposals to solve food security based on globally expanding access to genetically modified sustainable farming – that conclusively solves

**Tian et al 21**-- Tian, Zhixi [principal investigator, Institute of Genetics and Developmental Biology and former research geneticist at Purdue], et al. "Designing future crops: challenges and strategies for sustainable agriculture." The Plant Journal 105.5 (2021): 1165-1178. (AG DebateDrills)

With the rapid development of genome-editing tools in the past decade, the generation of genome-modified (GM) crops has again raised human health and environmental safety considerations (Friedrichs et al., 2019). Although there is broad scientific consensus that GM crops pose no greater risk to consumers than conventional agricultural products, the promotion of GM crops is heavily restricted in many countries, including European nations and China. Because of the precision of genetic changes introduced by CRISPR-Cas9 tools, it is suggested that genome-edited crops (GECs) should be subjected to product-based rather than technology-based regulation. In particular, GECs with gene knockouts or nucleotide variants that have been documented to exist in cultivars or closely related wild species have to be carefully evaluated. In 2016, a regulatory framework for GECs has been proposed (Huang et al., 2016). These regulations include minimization of the risk of the escape of GECs from laboratories and fields at the early stages of research and development, avoidance of the introduction of foreign DNA sequences and off-target DNA editing events, and precise documentation of DNA sequence changes at the target sites by whole genome sequencing. It is definitely necessary for scientists, policy-makers, regulators, and journalists to coordinate and discuss how to improve global food security using genome-editing tools, and at the same time alleviate public concerns related to GECs (Callaway, 2018)

### Underview

#### Presumption negates – infinite ways for something to be false but only one way for them to be true, and the aff has the burden of proof. Permissibility negates – if doing the aff is not obligatory then the squo is permissible. No 1ar theory, any response to the CI will be new in the 2ar, means neg loses every rnd, and 7-6 time skew after 1n.

# NR

#### No solvency—we already have enough food, but structural inequalities ensure crops go to feedlots and biofuels

Alternate News Media 12 (“We Already Grow Enough Food for 10 Billion People… and Still Can’t End Hunger”, 6/13/12, <http://alternatenewsmedia2012.wordpress.com/2012/06/13/we-already-grow-enough-food-for-10-billion-people-and-still-cant-end-hunger/>, Accessed 7/26/12, Chan)

Hunger is caused by poverty and inequality, not scarcity. For the past two decades the rate of global food production has increased faster than the rate of global population growth. The world already produces more than 1 ½ times enough food to feed everyone on the planet. That’s enough to feed 10 billion people, the population peak we expect by 2050. But the people making less than $2 a day—most of whom are resource-poor farmers cultivating unviably small plots of land—can’t afford to buy this food.¶ In reality, the bulk of industrially produced grain crops goes to biofuels and confined animal feedlots rather than food for the 1 billion hungry. The call to double food production by 2050 only applies if we [continue](http://alternatenewsmedia2012.wordpress.com/2012/06/13/we-already-grow-enough-food-for-10-billion-people-and-still-cant-end-hunger/) to prioritize the growing population of livestock and [automobiles](http://alternatenewsmedia2012.wordpress.com/2012/06/13/we-already-grow-enough-food-for-10-billion-people-and-still-cant-end-hunger/) over hungry people.

#### **Strikes cause food insecurity---empirics**

Lopes et al 19, Mariana Souza Lopes--Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Research Group on Nutrition Interventions, Belo Horizonte, MG, Brazil. Melissa Luciana de Araújo--Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Research Group on Urban Agriculture, Belo Horizonte, MG, Brazil. Aline Cristine Souza Lopes--Nutrition Department, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Research Group on Nutrition Interventions. PHN, (2019) <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/public-health-nutrition/article/national-general-truck-drivers-strike-and-food-security-in-a-brazilian-metropolis/90C14AC48923A17597DED720365E810B> brett

Food security exists when people have, at all times, a guaranteed and adequate food supply. Food security involves access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets individual dietary requirements and food preferences for a healthy life without restricting access to other fundamental needs( 1 ) and sovereignty( 2 ). Therefore, the risk of food insecurity is influenced by the availability, price, access and quality of the food supply to the consumer, especially in a crisis situation( 3 ). Studies that have explored the global food crisis and market instability indicate that there is an independent association between crisis situations and food security( 4 , 5 ). For example, a recent Brazilian study showed that there was a marked increase in the prevalence of food insecurity during the Brazilian economic crisis( 4 ). In Brazil, the Centrais de Abastecimento de Minas Gerais S.A. (CEASA-MINAS) distributes produce. The aims of the CEASA-MINAS are to: (i) improve the process of marketing and distribution of products; and (ii) connect producers and consumers in urban centres. The CEASA-MINAS is supported by mixed-capital (public and private) resources and operates under governmental supervision. Consequently, the CEASA-MINAS plays an important role in guaranteeing food security and the human right to food( 6 ). The state of Minas Gerais is the third-largest economy in Brazil and has one of the best transport networks in the country. The CEASA-MINAS has six units in this state and its headquarters is in the city of Contagem, in the metropolitan region of Belo Horizonte. The headquarters is the principal unit and is named CEASA-Minas Grande BH( 7 ). In 2018, the CEASA-Minas Grande BH traded about 2000 tonnes of food, which corresponded to 80 % of the total market in the state( 8 ). Therefore, this business unit is the subject of the present study. The supply of unprocessed or minimally processed foods\* in the CEASA-MINAS is self-supplied by the state of Minas Gerais. In spite of this, food is transported via long routes in the state due to its large territory (586 528 km2). The distribution network is more complex for fruit. The supply of fruit at the CEASA-Minas Grande BH has multiple origins and the fruits are carried by trucks over long distances. Some leafy vegetables are produced near the food supply centre( 10 ). In general, the food supply of the CEASA-Minas Grande BH covers a radius of 200 km, but there are items that originate from distances of up to 2000 km away( 11 ). The 1081 municipality suppliers of the CEASA-Minas Grande BH move, on average, 25 700 trucks per month via Brazilian roadways( 8 ). Consequently, a national general truck drivers’ strike may have important consequences for the economy and food supply chain of a country that is dependent on road networks. Such an event occurred on 21–30 May 2018. During this 10 d strike, Brazilians experienced an extreme event characterized by roadblocks and the unavailability of fuel, medicine, food, and the inputs for food production processes. The disruption of the supply of animal feed had a devastating impact: millions of chickens and pigs were slaughtered because producers had no food for them( 12 ). The drivers were on strike in order to make diesel oil tax-free and to obtain better working conditions( 13 ). Despite the drivers’ important claims, in a crisis situation, 200 km can be as long as 2000 km and the repercussions may result in negative impacts for food security. Given the importance of transport conditions for the food security of the Brazilian population, the present paper aimed to analyse the impact of the national general truck drivers’ strike on the availability, variety and price of unprocessed foods sold by a food supply centre in a Brazilian metropolis.

#### No impact to biod

* Permian-Triassic extinction proves resiliency
* No data on tipping points
* Ecosystems never outright collapse
* 600 models prove no ecosystem collapse

Hance 18 [Jeremy Hance, wildlife blogger for the Guardian and a journalist with Mongabay focusing on forests, indigenous people, climate change and more. He is also the author of Life is Good: Conservation in an Age of Mass Extinction. Could biodiversity destruction lead to a global tipping point? Jan 16, 2018. https://www.theguardian.com/environment/radical-conservation/2018/jan/16/biodiversity-extinction-tipping-point-planetary-boundary]

Just over 250 million years ago, the planet suffered what may be described as its greatest holocaust: ninety-six percent of marine genera (plural of genus) and seventy percent of land vertebrate vanished for good. Even insects suffered a mass extinction – the only time before or since. Entire classes of animals – like trilobites – went out like a match in the wind.

But what’s arguably most fascinating about this event – known as the Permian-Triassic extinction or more poetically, the Great Dying – is the fact that anything survived at all. Life, it seems, is so ridiculously adaptable that not only did thousands of species make it through whatever killed off nearly everything (no one knows for certain though theories abound) but, somehow, after millions of years life even recovered and went on to write new tales.

Even as the Permian-Triassic extinction event shows the fragility of life, it also proves its resilience in the long-term. The lessons of such mass extinctions – five to date and arguably a sixth happening as I write – inform science today. Given that extinction levels are currently 1,000 (some even say 10,000) times the background rate, researchers have long worried about our current destruction of biodiversity – and what that may mean for our future Earth and ourselves.

In 2009, a group of researchers identified nine global boundaries for the planet that if passed could theoretically push the Earth into an uninhabitable state for our species. These global boundaries include climate change, freshwater use, ocean acidification and, yes, biodiversity loss (among others). The group has since updated the terminology surrounding biodiversity, now calling it “biosphere integrity,” but that hasn’t spared it from critique.

A paper last year in Trends in Ecology & Evolution scathingly attacked the idea of any global biodiversity boundary.

“It makes no sense that there exists a tipping point of biodiversity loss beyond which the Earth will collapse,” said co-author and ecologist, José Montoya, with Paul Sabatier Univeristy in France. “There is no rationale for this.”

Montoya wrote the paper along with Ian Donohue, an ecologist at Trinity College in Ireland and Stuart Pimm, one of the world’s leading experts on extinctions, with Duke University in the US.

Montoya, Donohue and Pimm argue that there isn’t evidence of a point at which loss of species leads to ecosystem collapse, globally or even locally. If the planet didn’t collapse after the Permian-Triassic extinction event, it won’t collapse now – though our descendants may well curse us for the damage we’ve done.

Instead, according to the researchers, every loss of species counts. But the damage is gradual and incremental, not a sudden plunge. Ecosystems, according to them, slowly degrade but never fail outright.

“Of more than 600 experiments of biodiversity effects on various functions, none showed a collapse,” Montoya said. “In general, the loss of species has a detrimental effect on ecosystem functions...We progressively lose pollination services, water quality, plant biomass, and many other important functions as we lose species. But we never observe a critical level of biodiversity over which functions collapse.”

#### **Normal means is a constitutional amendment of existing labor law to remove exceptions – that draws tons of fire from moderate democrats**

TLA 21 [This Legal Alert provides an overview of a specific federal bill. It is not intended to be, and should not be construed as, legal advice for any particular fact situation. "A Resurrected PRO Act Could Pay Dividends For Big Labor This Time Around." https://www.fisherphillips.com/news-insights/a-resurrected-pro-act-could-pay-dividends-for-big-labor-this-time-around.html]

As we recently forecasted, the House of Representatives has reintroduced a bill designed to radically transform the labor relations landscape, substantially tilting the playing field towards organized labor. The “Protecting the Right to Organize Act of 2021,” or PRO Act, was introduced on February 4 after an earlier version of the same legislation failed to clear the Senate last year. However, now that both houses of Congress and the White House are controlled by the Democratic party, this proposal stands closer than ever to becoming law. What do employers – both unionized and non-unionized – need to know about this startling prospect, and what can you do to help prevent it from becoming reality?

The PRO Act: A Primer

If you think you’ve heard about this proposal before, you’re not experiencing déjà vu. The same bill was passed by the House a year ago this month. But at that time, it faced a hostile Senate controlled by the G.O.P. – which kept the proposal from reaching the floor for an up-or-down vote – and a president that would have vetoed the measure in the unlikely event it reached his desk. The winds of change have shifted, however, and we now have a Senate controlled by the Democrats by the slimmest of margins and an unabashedly pro-union president who campaigned on promises to deliver for organized labor.

So what could you be in store for if this law passes? Whether you currently operate in a unionized environment or have yet to encounter a labor union, be prepared to rethink just about everything you know about the regulatory framework governing your labor relations functions. The PRO Act would make it far easier for unions to organize your workforce, grant far more power to workers protesting working conditions, and shackle unionized businesses like never before, while undermining other longstanding employment models embedded with workplaces across the country.

Radical Shift In Union Organizing

If passed, the PRO Act would radically transform the process of union organizing, tilting the balance of power towards unions to a remarkable degree by altering seven critical steps in the organizing process.

Reinstalling “Quickie” Elections: In the absence of majority card support, the PRO Act would reinstate controversial rules substantially reducing the period of time between a petition for representation and the ensuing election is held, placing employers at a significant disadvantage when it comes to educating workers on the facts they may need to make an informed decision.

Cutting Employers Out Of The Process: The bill would deny employers standing to appear in administrative proceedings for purposes of challenging the petitioned-for bargaining unit or otherwise contesting the representation process. It would also give the petitioner an option to choose whether the election will be conducted electronically, by mail, or at an alternative location not controlled by the employer. If the union loses an election in which it possessed a majority of signed authorization cards, then the agency would be empowered to automatically issue a bargaining order.

Creating A National Gag Rule: Further hamstringing employers, the proposed law would for the first time prohibit all businesses from convening mandatory “captive audience” meetings for purposes of sharing facts on third party representation, effectively gagging them from utilizing their free speech rights in a group setting.

A Return To “Micro” Units: The PRO Act would effectively bar employers from challenging petitions for smaller, gerrymandered groupings of employees within departments or shifts that may be more sympathetic to union interests – representing a stark reversal of gains achieved by employers through the National Labor Relation Board’s (NLRB’s) 2017 decision in PCC Structurals, litigated by Fisher Phillips attorneys.

Expanding Pool Of Potential Union Members: The proposed bill would substantially narrow the statutory definition of “supervisor,” thereby expanding the base of workers who could organize into unions and engage in other “concerted” activities protected by the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). It would do so by requiring only that workers devote a majority of their worktime to performing supervisory duties in order to be considered a part of management, while eliminating other key “indicia” of supervisory status such as the responsibility to “assign” and “responsibly direct” other employees.

Permitting Workers To Use Company Equipment: The PRO Act would also restrict employer rights to control their own computers, equipment, and related electronic communications systems by establishing statutory employee rights to use them on premises for protected activities, absent compelling business considerations. Not only would employers be forced to allow workers to do so in union organizing campaigns, but they would also be limited in their ability to manage workplace dialogue via company-owned email, intranet, and other digital messaging platforms.

Compelling Disclosure Of Confidential Fee Information: Finally, the law would revive the moribund “persuader” rule, which attempted to require disclosure of confidential information associated with fees paid to legal counsel in connection with virtually all forms advice rendered in the context of an organizing campaign.

Shifting Power To Protesting Workers

The PRO Act would also take steps to further empower workers participating in workplace disputes – at the expense of their employers’ rights to manage the workplace.

Permitting Secondary Boycotts: Breaking from 85 years of established legal authority, the PRO Act would allow unions to extend economic pressure to ensnare companies that are not otherwise involved with them in a primary labor dispute. The law would eliminate the longstanding prohibition on secondary boycotts and allow unions to apply such pressure through protests, pickets and related activities.

Emboldening Protesting Workers: The proposed law would encourage intermittent and recognition strikes, such as the quickie strikes of the Fight for $15 Movement, by amending federal labor law to authorize strikes regardless of the duration, scope, frequency, or intermittence.

Constraining Unionized Employers

Further, the proposed law would restrict the rights of unionized employers when it comes to several critical activities.

Blocking Permanent Replacements: The PRO Act would prohibit employers from exercising their rights to permanently replace workers engaged in an economic strike. This right has long since been recognized as the employer’s counter-right to the union’s right to strike. Without it, strikers will always be entitled to reinstatement whenever the strike is over – regardless of whether they were replaced in the interim.

Prohibiting “Offensive” and Pre-Strike Lockouts: The bill would also prohibit employers from utilizing lockouts as an offensive economic weapon, or from doing so at all prior to a strike – thereby leaving intact only the prospect of a post-strike “defensive” lockout.

Prohibiting Anticipatory Withdrawal of Recognition: The bill would overturn a 2019 Board decision allowing employers to withdraw recognition in anticipation of contract expiration – compelling them instead to work through the agency’s formal decertification election process.

Forcing Union Contracts: The proposed law would force unionized employers to come to the table within 10 days of an initial union demand, and empower a tripartite arbitration board to impose collective bargaining agreements of up to two years in duration on all parties that fail to reach an agreement within the first 120 days of negotiations for an initial contract, depriving employers of a critical input into the terms and conditions governing their workplace against the backdrop of unreasonable union demands. The bill would also prohibit employers from implementing changes to working conditions upon reaching “impasse” in first contract bargaining – forcing them instead to maintain the “status quo” for the duration of such negotiations.

Shattering Commonplace Workplace Standards For All Employers

But the PRO Act wouldn’t just impact unionized workplaces. It would completely transform workplace law for unionized and non-union businesses alike by invalidating arrangements that have become commonplace over the last several decades.

Broadening Misclassification Law: The PRO Act would significantly expand the definition of “employee” to capture workers who are currently independent contractors, making it difficult for businesses to properly classify workers as such. In bringing California’s ABC test to the national stage, the bill would require businesses to prove (a) the individual is free from the employer’s control, (b) the service they perform is outside the usual course of the employer’s business, and (c) the individual is engaged in the same trade or business as called upon to perform. This would deny many individuals their choice and ability to work independently, threatening the expanding gig economy, and eliminating business flexibility to flex their size due to growth. The bill would also make it an independent violation to misclassify workers as independent contractors.

Expanding Joint Employment: The PRO Act would also codify the extremely broad joint employer standard previously established by the Obama NLRB by virtue of its decision in Browning Ferris Industries (“BFI”), exposing employers to liability for workplaces they don’t control and workers they don’t employ. Under this standard, courts and government agencies would be free to consider the exercise of control over employment terms that is either direct or indirect, and actual or potential, leading to a potential joint employer finding merely by establishing that a business has “reserved” such authority.

Prohibiting Arbitration Agreements: The PRO Act would ban pre-dispute arbitration agreements in all workplace settings, effectively overturning the Supreme Court’s landmark decision in Epic Systems upholding use of class waivers. Eliminating the ability of employers and employees to resolve disputes through arbitration would potentially overwhelm the court system by increasing needless and expensive lawsuits, including class action ligation.

Mandatory Posting Requirement: The bill reinstates prior proposed regulations compelling employers to post notices educating employees on their rights under the NLRA, and to notify all new hires of the information on that notice with penalties of $500 for every incident of technical non-compliance.

Expanding Legal Exposure: Finally, the bill would adopt never-before-seen penalties that would liquidate (double) the amount of damages (up to $100,000) for violations, in addition to providing for backpay, front pay and consequential damages. It would also create a new private right of legal action against employers directly in federal court, providing for recovery of back pay (without any reduction for interim earnings), front pay, consequential, liquidated, and punitive damages, and attorneys’ fees. Punishment at such levels could have a severe chilling effect on employers seeking to assert their free speech and other statutory rights when it comes to day-to-day workplace activities.

What's Next?

It’s worth noting that although it enjoys the support of the new administration, the bill faces a number of hurdles before it becomes law – chief of which is a filibuster that threatens to block any further progress on this legislation to the extent it remains in place through the current session of Congress. Even within the Democratic side of the aisle, the bill could generate opposition from some of its own moderate members. That being said, one of the chief impediments to its passage has already been removed, and the bill could receive a friendlier reception under the current political climate.