### Intro

#### I negate the resolution Resolved: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

### Framework

#### I value morality because the word ought in the resolution implies a moral obligation.

#### Thus, the value criterion must be maximizing well-being for everyone.

#### There are two main reasons for this:

#### Everyone does not like painful or emotionally harmful experiences, so naturally we should try to replace these things with good experiences.

#### Things like death and oppression are intuitively bad, and effect everyone, so we should try to prevent them.

#### In summary, if I can prove to you that strikes would have a bad impact on the world, then you should vote for the negative in today’s debate.

### C1 - Economy

#### Strikes disrupt supply chains. McHugh 91 [Cornell University][McHugh, Richard. "Productivity effects of strikes in struck and nonstruck industries." ILR Review 44.4 (1991): 722-732.]

It has been recognized that strikes may have important indirect costs-adverse effects on productivity in nonstruck indus- tries that do business with the industry that is struck. This study explicitly tests for the existence of such costs. The results indicate that strikes do have significant indirect productivity effects. Making use of information on the input and output structure of industries, the investigation has shown that labor productivity fell in those industries linked as purchasers or suppliers to struck industries from 1967 to 1981. In fact, the effects of strikes on productivity outside the struck industries were statistically more significant than the productivity effects within the struck in- dustries. How might we account for the finding that the indirect effects of strikes were so important? One possibility is that employ- ers in nonstruck firms affected by strikes, faced with reduced demand for their products or impaired ability to produce, chose to meet the "crisis," not by tempo- rarily laying off workers, which might have damaged labor-management rela- tions, but instead by holding onto workers until the strike in the linked industry was over or until a substitute supplier was found. It is this "hoarding" of labor that may have driven down short-run labor productivity. That these indirect costs were more significant (in a statistical sense) than the direct costs does not imply that the strikes were "costless" to the struck firms, or even less costly to them than to the linked nonstruck firms. At a minimum, since strikes were not costless to the nonstruck firms, they may have damaged the rela- tionship between the nonstruck firms and the struck firm. A struck firm, recognizing that the strike has imposed costs on its buyers, might attempt to guard against the recurrence of work actions that interfere with deliveries to nonstruck firms by increasing wage rates to improve worker loyalty and delivery reliability; alterna- tively, it may reduce the price of its goods in implicit "compensation" for these strike costs.

#### They hurt critical core industries that are necessary for economic growth

McElroy 19 John McElroy 10-25-2019 "Strikes Hurt Everybody" <https://www.wardsauto.com/ideaxchange/strikes-hurt-everybody> (MPA at McCombs school of Business)

This creates a **poisonous relationship** between the company and its workforce. Many GM hourly workers don’t identify as GM employees. They identify as UAW members. And they see the union as the source of their jobs, not the company. It’s an unhealthy dynamic that puts GM at a disadvantage to non-union automakers in the U.S. like Honda and Toyota, where workers take pride in the company they work for and the products they make. Attacking the company in the media also **drives away customers**. Who wants to buy a shiny new car from a company that’s accused of underpaying its workers and treating them unfairly? Data from the Center for Automotive Research (CAR) in Ann Arbor, MI, show that **GM loses market share during strikes and never gets it back**. GM lost two percentage points during the 1998 strike, which in today’s market would represent **a loss of 340,000 sales**. Because GM reports sales on a quarterly basis we’ll only find out at the end of December if it lost market share from this strike. UAW members say one of their greatest concerns is job security. But causing a company to lose market share is a sure-fire path to **more plant closings and layoffs**. Even so, unions are incredibly important for boosting wages and benefits for working-class people. GM’s UAW-represented workers earn considerably more than their non-union counterparts, about $26,000 more per worker, per year, in total compensation. Without a union they never would have achieved that. Strikes are a powerful weapon for unions. They usually are the only way they can get management to accede to their demands. If not for the power of collective bargaining and the threat of a strike, management would largely ignore union demands. If you took away that threat, management would pay its workers peanuts. Just ask the Mexican line workers who are paid $1.50 an hour to make $50,000 BMWs. But strikes don’t just hurt the people walking the picket lines or the company they’re striking against. They hurt **suppliers, car dealers and the communities located near the plants.** The Anderson Economic Group estimates that 75,000 workers at supplier companies were temporarily laid off because of the GM strike. Unlike UAW picketers, those supplier workers won’t get any strike pay or an $11,000 contract signing bonus. No, most of them lost close to a month’s worth of wages, which must be financially devastating for them. GM’s suppliers also lost a lot of money. So now they’re cutting budgets and delaying capital investments to make up for the lost revenue, which is a further drag on the economy. According to CAR, the communities and states where GM’s plants are located collectively lost a couple of hundred million dollars in payroll and tax revenue. Some economists warn that if the strike were prolonged it could knock the state of Michigan – home to GM and the UAW – **into a recession.** That prompted the governor of Michigan, Gretchen Whitmer, to call GM CEO Mary Barra and UAW leaders and urge them to settle as fast as possible. So, while the UAW managed to get a nice raise for its members, the strike left a path of destruction in its wake. That’s not fair to the innocent bystanders who will never regain what they lost. John McElroyI’m not sure how this will ever be resolved. I understand the need for collective bargaining and the threat of a strike. But there’s got to be a better way to get workers a raise without torching the countryside.

### C2 – Alternative Solutions

#### There are other ways to solve issues without stopping labor. Boesler et al. 21 [Matthew Boesler reporter Business Insider markets desk, host Benzinga radio, economics University of Michigan; Josh Eidelson workplace Bloomberg News and Bloomberg Businessweek, Washington Post, Reuters, and Slate, Society for Advancing Business Editing and Writing, the San Francisco Press Club, the Sidney Hillman Foundation, the Labor and Employment Relations Association, and the Northern California, Western Washington, and New York chapters of the Society of Professional Journalists, Salon reporter, MA political science Yale, union organizer; Benjamin Penn Sr. reporter, labor & employment @BLaw; Olivia Rockeman Reporter - Economics at Bloomberg News; Catarina Saraiva Federal Reserve/Labor Market Reporter; Paige Smith Associate Reporter Bloomberg Law][Boesler, Matthew, et al. “President Biden Offers Workers Reason to Hope for a Better Deal.” Bloomberg.com, Bloomberg, 22 Jan. 2021, www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-01-22/what-biden-can-do-to-help-workers-labor-unions-in-2021. ]

Labor unions and advocacy groups are pressing Democrats to leverage their control of the White House and Congress to enact policies that benefit workers, including facilitating the formation of unions and adopting a more expansive definition of what it is to be an employee. The Democrats’ tenuous control of the Senate may make it hard to pass some of the most progressive measures. President Biden may instead rewrite some rules, such as those that apply to federal contracting, by decree. And by continuing efforts to push the unemployment rate lower, the Federal Reserve may play an important supporting role in helping minorities and other less-advantaged groups reenter the job market. Federal minimum wage The $1.9 billion economic relief plan Biden unveiled on Jan. 14 calls for boosting the federal minimum wage to $15 an hour from the current $7.25. If successful, it would be the first increase enacted since 2007. More than half of U.S. states already have wage minimums above the federal floor. Still, Republicans and a few Democrats in Congress are sure to resist going to $15, arguing it will increase costs for businesses at a time when many are fighting to survive. Proponents say the increase would lower the poverty rate, which jumped by 2.4 percentage points from June to November as the effects of the first round of stimulus dissipated. Pay discrimination U.S. workers face persistent discrepancies in pay based on gender and race. Data gathered from employers by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission could help the Biden administration craft policies to close some of the gaps—a stated goal. One wrinkle is that the EEOC is controlled by a Republican majority through mid-2022. The Trump White House tried to halt collection of the pay data in 2017, saying it was overly burdensome for businesses, but was overruled by a federal judge. A report, which could help guide the agency in any future data-gathering effort, is expected by yearend. Contractors vs. employees In industries from construction to health care to the rapidly expanding app-based gig economy, workers have been squaring off with bosses over a hot-button issue: Are they employees who are protected under laws covering areas such as minimum wage and unionization, or are they independent contractors who aren’t? Under President Trump, the Department of Labor and the National Labor Relations Board worked to make it easier for companies to classify workers as contractors. Biden appointees could reverse that approach, but the administration will have to act quickly to prevent some of its predecessor’s 11th-hour changes from taking effect. Fairness in contracting In his campaign platform, Biden pledged to “ensure federal dollars do not flow to employers who engage in union-busting activities.” His administration will be weighing a range of possible actions to fulfill that promise, including an executive order requiring federal contractors to remain neutral to a union organizing drive. Companies bidding on new contracts may also face increased scrutiny as part of an effort to weed out those with a history of labor violations. Child care By forcing many day-care centers to close, the pandemic helped wipe out five years of gains in labor force participation for U.S. women. Biden’s stimulus plan calls for an additional $15 billion in funding for the state-administered Child Care and Development Block Grant program, which subsidizes child care for low-income families. In addition, it proposes a one-year expansion in child-care tax credits, with families eligible for as much as $4,000 for one child or $8,000 for two or more, depending on income. Also part of the Biden plan: paid family leave for those needing to care for a child or elderly parent. Maximum employment Achieving full employment has long been one of the Federal Reserve’s mandates, alongside battling inflation. Yet following a 20-month strategic review that wrapped up in August, the U.S. central bank will allow the economy to run hotter for longer in the interest of pulling more people—especially minorities—into the workforce faster.

### To pummer – extinction cannot outweigh in every single circumstance. You could say that driving to school causes extinction through some elaborate butterfly effect so instead prioritize probability rather than sheer mangiture

To democracy – 1st the impact is just a link into climate

## Climate Strikes

### 1NC – AT: Climate Policies

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But strikers must have the leverage to accomplish their goals

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

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

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

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

### 1NC – Blame Turn

#### Climate strikes cause governments to shift blame---that stalls effective climate action.

Evenson 19 [Darrick; Teachings lie in the broad area of environmental politics and governance. He is particularly focused on energy policy, both at domestic and international/global scales. Much of his research examines the public as a non-state actor in environmental and energy policy debates. He investigates public perceptions, preferences, and public actions taken in response to environmental issues and policy decisions; “Students’ climate strikes: **Right goals but wrong words**,” EURACTV; 5/7/19; <https://www.euractiv.com/section/energy-environment/opinion/students-climate-strikes-right-goals-but-wrong-words/>] Justin

Whilst I have great respect for Thunberg and her compatriots in the social movement, this message is problematic for several reasons.

Above all, science describes what is; it cannot directly indicate what should be. Science at most is a point of departure for the normative thought necessary to make decisions about climate policy. The science has been clear for some time that horrible things will happen due to climate change and that the effects of climate change pose huge risks to infrastructure, livelihoods, economies, and lives across the world (with the scientific predictions increasing in severity over time). Nevertheless, being more aware does not solve the problem of action. In contrast to Thunberg’s remarks about the need for more education, this is not a problem of knowledge, but one of values.

Highly developed nations can point to accelerating emissions growth in developing economies – a critique to imply developing nations need to undertake substantial mitigation. Those developing nations can invoke historical emissions in industrialised countries – an unparalleled legacy of pollution. We can pontificate over total carbon emissions, per capita emissions, rate of emissions increase, etc. Each accounting approach has implications for who is most responsible to act.

The dialectic between the ‘global north’ and ‘global south’ has been readily observable since at least the first major international environmental negotiation – the Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm (1972).

Listening to the science may affirm that something needs to be done on climate change mitigation, but it is far from clear that it makes leaders think they need to do more themselves (save those leaders who already thought this anyway). Listening to the science might just confirm that other actors are being irresponsible and not carrying their own weight in mitigation of climate-causing emissions.

### 1NC – Recognition Turn

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

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

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