#### Lack of Union Strikes decimates current quality of education
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Having weekends, summers and holidays off sounds like a dream job, but a public school teacher whose options are either a shortened pay season or a smaller paycheck may beg to differ. Low salaries are only one part of a larger set of problems that have led to teacher walkouts in West Virginia, Oklahoma, Kentucky and Arizona. State legislators are looking to cut costs wherever they can, but they’re looking in the wrong places — teacher and staff wages, and retirement funds. Teachers reasonably want state legislators to recognize the repercussions of a limited budget and understand that it is no longer just a teacher’s issue, but a community issue as well. The government claims there isn’t enough money to give raises and sustain the budget, yet as The New York Times said in an opinion article, West Virginia “senators, who receive hefty checks from gas and energy companies, could have funded education needs had they passed a modest tax increase on these companies.” It all comes down to a lack of money. Rather than tax these big companies, and possibly lose those “hefty checks,” senators in West Virginia cut school budgets and under pay hard-working teachers and staff. Budget cuts have led to four-day-a-week classes in some parts of rural Oklahoma, with art classes being cut and schools lacking of supplies like textbooks. Teachers have also had to become increasingly creative with how they teach students, often using their own money to buy basic classroom supplies, such as dry-erase markers, paper, pencils and erasers. They are even sending home checklists asking parents to donate supplies for the classroom like tissues and hand sanitizer. Originally meant to teach children the basics — reading, writing and arithmetic — teachers are now seen as counselors, listening to student concerns about everything from homework to troubles at home. They are referees, breaking up fights on the playground and in cafeterias. With the added threat of school shootings, some teachers are also taking on the role as security guards. It’s no wonder teachers are starting to crack beneath the unnecessary added pressure. The government seems to label children a high priority with programs ranging from nutrition to outdoor activities, but it doesn’t seem to realize that by not listening to voices of the teachers, it is neglecting the needs of the children. School is often a haven for children, particularly for those who rely on school-provided resources like lunches when they might otherwise have gone hungry. And parents who rely on weekdays when their children will have a relatively safe place to be. After a nine-day walkout, the teachers of West Virginia were successful in getting Gov. Jim Justice to sign legislation authorizing a contract agreement that includes a 5 percent pay raise for the 20,000 teachers and more than 10,000 support staff in the state. Teachers deserve appreciation for their unseen hours of extra work. To avoid further budget cuts, continued community support can result in more changes like the one in West Virginia. Continuous efforts from teachers ensure that, despite the budget cuts, students will still receive a good education. Though the budget cuts in education certainly shouldn’t have been so severe, with support from the community teachers voices can be heard and meaningful change made.

#### 1] Medical workers are hurt by an inability to strike.
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The coronavirus pandemic has revealed much about work in the United States: There have been countless examples of workers speaking out against unsafe work conditions and demanding personal protective equipment (PPE) to try and [stay healthy and safe on the job](https://www.huffpost.com/entry/mcdonalds-workers-strike-coronavirus_n_5ec57c58c5b622c412eb224e). We also have seen that [essential workers](https://www.epi.org/blog/who-are-essential-workers-a-comprehensive-look-at-their-wages-demographics-and-unionization-rates/) are often not paid commensurate with the critical nature of their work. Few U.S. workers have [access to paid sick time or paid leave](https://www.epi.org/blog/amid-covid-19-outbreak-the-workers-who-need-paid-sick-days-the-most-have-the-least/) of any kind. And, when workers have advocated for health and safety protections or wage increase, they have often been retaliated against, and even fired for doing so. As a result, [many workers have decided to strike](https://www.thenation.com/article/economy/coronavirus-workers-strikes-labor/) in an effort to have their voices heard.

fEven before the pandemic, data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) showed an upsurge in [major strike activity in 2018 and 2019](https://www.epi.org/publication/continued-surge-in-strike-activity/), marking a 35-year high for the number of workers involved in a major work stoppage over a two-year period. Further, 2019 recorded the greatest number of work stoppages involving *20,000 or more* workers since at least 1993, when the BLS started providing data that made it possible to track work stoppages by size. In fact, after decades of decline, strike activity surged in 2018, with 485,200 workers involved in major work stoppages—a nearly twenty-fold increase from 25,300 workers in 2017. The surge in strike activity continued in 2019, with 425,500 workers involved in major work stoppages. On average in 2018 and in 2019, 455,400 workers were involved in major work stoppages—the largest two-year average in 35 years.

What is the right to strike and who has it?

Most private-sector workers in the United States are guaranteed the right to strike under Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). Section 7 of the Act grants workers the right “to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.” This allows private-sector workers to engage in concerted activities such as strikes, regardless of whether the worker is in a union or covered by a collective bargaining contract. However, those in a union are better situated to engage in a long-term strike through strike funds. There is no federal law that gives public-sector workers the right to strike, but [a dozen states grant public-sector workers the right to strike](https://www.onlabor.org/overview-how-different-states-respond-to-public-sector-labor-unrest/).

In general, there are two types of strikes: economic strikes and unfair labor practice strikes. In an economic strike, workers withhold their labor as leverage when bargaining for better pay and working conditions. While workers in economic strikes retain their status as employees and cannot be discharged, their employer has the right to permanently replace them. In an unfair labor practice strike, workers withhold their labor to protest their employer engaging in activities that they regard as a violation of labor law. Workers in an unfair labor practice strike cannot legally be discharged or permanently replaced.

However, not all strikes are protected under the law. For example, it is currently unlawful for workers to be involved in “secondary” strikes, which are strikes aimed at an employer other than the primary employer (for example, when workers from one company strike in solidarity with another company’s workers). If a strike is deemed an “intermittent strike”—when workers strike on-and-off over a period of time—it is not protected as a lawful strike by the NLRA. In general, a strike is also unlawful if the collective bargaining agreement between a union and the employer is in effect and has a “no-strike, no-lockout” clause.

What data do we have on strikes?

Unfortunately, there are major data limitations around strikes. As a result, it is impossible to know the full extent of strike activity throughout the U.S. The main government source for strike data is the [Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) data on major work stoppages](https://www.bls.gov/wsp/home.htm). However, BLS data only include information on work stoppages involving 1,000 or more workers that last at least one full shift. Unfortunately, comprehensive data on work stoppages that involve fewer than 1,000 workers, or that last less than one full shift, are not readily available from BLS or other sources.

The BLS’s monthly data on work stoppages do not capture any strikes directly related to the coronavirus pandemic. However, it is evident essential workers are going on strike as seen in the recent [walkouts](https://www.vox.com/recode/2020/5/1/21244151/may-day-strike-amazon-instacart-target-success-turnout-fedex-protest-essential-workers-chris-smalls) organized by Amazon, Instacart, and Target workers as well as the [dozens of strikes organized by fast food and delivery workers](https://www.thecut.com/2020/05/whole-foods-amazon-mcdonalds-among-coronavirus-strikes.html). Consequently, there is a large gap in knowledge about the true extent of strikes that occur during the coronavirus pandemic and beyond.

Based on the very limited data available, the resurgence of strike activity in recent years has given over a million workers an active role in demanding improvements in their pay and working conditions. Essential workers during the coronavirus pandemic are continuing this trend by demanding better pay and safer working conditions from their employers. However, without comprehensive data, it’s impossible to understand the scope of how many workers are utilizing their fundamental right to strike. This knowledge gap makes it difficult for policymakers to adequately address the needs for workers in the United States, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics should be provided funding to gather comprehensive data on worker strikes. But even with the limited knowledge we have, it’s evident that strikes are an effective tool to improve the pay and working conditions of working people. Therefore, strengthening the right to strike for workers needs to be at the heart of labor law reform going forward.

#### 2] Non-unique – the Aff only changes government policy, NOT the worker’s mindset. Proves if their emboldened to strike against bad conditions the PIC doesn’t change that and can’t solve its impacts.

#### 3] Turn – Medical workers being unable to strike results in ressentiment that spills over to their work and mistreating patients to a worse degree.

## Advantage: Climate Change

#### Strikes get stuff done and help solve rising inequality, but recent pushback from major corporations means that we are losing ground. Only ensuring unconditional right to strike will solve
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The basic facts about inequality in the United States—that for most of the last 40 years, pay has stagnated for all but the highest paid workers and inequality has risen dramatically—are widely understood. What is less well-known is the role the decline of unionization has played in those trends. The share of workers covered by a collective bargaining agreement dropped from [27 percent to 11.6 percent between 1979 and 2019](https://www.epi.org/data/#?subject=unioncov), meaning the union coverage rate is now less than half where it was 40 years ago. Research shows that this de-unionization accounts for a sizable share of the growth in inequality over that period—[around 13–20 percent for women and 33–37 percent for men](https://www.epi.org/publication/labor-day-2019-collective-bargaining/). Applying these shares to annual earnings data reveals that working people are now losing on the order of $200 billion per year as a result of the erosion of union coverage over the last four decades—with that money being redistributed upward, to the rich. The good news is that restoring union coverage—and strengthening workers’ abilities to join together to improve their wages and working conditions in other ways—is therefore likely to put at least $200 billion per year into the pockets of working people. These changes could happen through organizing and policy reform. Policymakers have introduced legislation, the [Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act](https://www.epi.org/blog/the-pro-act-giving-workers-more-bargaining-power-on-the-job/), that would significantly reform current labor law. Building on the reforms in the PRO Act, the [Clean Slate for Worker Power Project](https://lwp.law.harvard.edu/clean-slate-project) proposes further transformation of labor law, with innovative ideas to create balance in our economy. How is it that de-unionization has played such a large role in wage stagnation for working people and the rise of inequality? When workers are able to join together, form a union and collectively bargain, their pay goes up. On average, a worker covered by a union contract earns [13.2 percent](https://www.epi.org/publication/how-todays-unions-help-working-people-giving-workers-the-power-to-improve-their-jobs-and-unrig-the-economy/) more than a peer with similar education, occupation and experience in a non-unionized workplace in the same sector. Furthermore, the benefits of collective bargaining extend well beyond union workers. Where unions are strong, they essentially set broader standards that non-union employers must match in order to attract and retain the workers they need and to avoid facing an organizing drive. The combination of the direct effect of unions on their members and this “spillover” effect to non-union workers means unions are crucial in fostering a vibrant middle class—and has also meant that as unionization has eroded, pay for working people has stagnated and inequality has skyrocketed. Unions also help shrink racial wage gaps. For example, black workers are more likely than white workers to be represented by a union, and black workers who are in unions get a larger boost to wages from being in a union than white workers do. This means that the decline of unionization has played a significant role in the [expansion of the black–white wage gap](https://www.epi.org/publication/black-white-wage-gaps-expand-with-rising-wage-inequality/#epi-toc-16). But isn’t the erosion of unionization because workers don’t want unions anymore? No—survey data show that in fact, a [higher](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0019793918806250) share of non-union workers say they would vote for a union in their workplace today than did 40 years ago. Isn’t the erosion of unionization due to the shifts in employment from manufacturing to service-producing industries? No again—changing industry composition [explains only a small share](https://www.brookings.edu/research/the-shift-in-private-sector-union-participation-explanations-and-effects/) of the erosion of union coverage. What has caused declining unionization? One key factor is fierce corporate opposition that has smothered workers’ freedom to form unions. Aggressive anti-union campaigns—once confined to the most anti-union employers—have become widespread. For example, it is now standard, when workers seek to organize, for their employers to hire union avoidance consultants to coordinate fierce anti-union campaigns. We estimate that employers spend nearly [$340 million per year](https://www.epi.org/publication/unlawful-employer-opposition-to-union-election-campaigns/) hiring union avoidance advisers to help them prevent employees from organizing. And though the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) makes it illegal for employers to intimidate, coerce or fire workers in retaliation for participating in union-organizing campaigns, the penalties are grossly insufficient to provide a meaningful disincentive for such behavior. This means employers often engage in illegal activities, such as threatening to close the worksite, cutting union activists’ hours or pay, or reporting workers to immigration enforcement authorities if employees unionize. In [at least 1 in 5](https://www.epi.org/publication/unlawful-employer-opposition-to-union-election-campaigns/) union elections, employers are charged with illegally firing workers involved in organizing. In the face of these attacks on union organizing, policymakers have egregiously failed to update labor laws to balance the system. Fundamental reform is necessary to build worker power and guarantee all workers the right to come together and have a real voice in their workplace. Restoring the right to representation on the job will likely put at least $200 billion in the pockets of working families each year, reducing income inequality and racial wage gaps, building a vibrant middle class and creating an economy that works for all, not just the privileged few.

#### And Inequality is intimately linked with Biodiversity loss-robust statistical analysis proves
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Human activity is causing high rates of biodiversity loss. Yet, surprisingly little is known about the extent to which socioeconomic factors exacerbate or ameliorate our impacts on biological diversity. One such factor, economic inequality, has been shown to affect public health, and has been linked to environmental problems in general. We tested how strongly economic inequality is related to biodiversity loss in particular. We found that among countries, and among US states, the number of species that are threatened or declining increases substantially with the Gini ratio of income inequality. At both levels of analysis, the connection between income inequality and biodiversity loss persists after controlling for biophysical conditions, human population size, and per capita GDP or income. Future research should explore potential mechanisms behind this equality-biodiversity relationship. Our results suggest that economic reforms would go hand in hand with, if not serving as a prerequisite for, effective conservation Human activities have dramatically increased the rates of species and population extinction [[1]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Vitousek1). This directly undermines the richness and diversity of life on Earth [[2]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Naess1), [[3]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Earth1), and indirectly threatens human welfare, e.g., through negative effects of species loss on ecosystem services [[4]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Millennium1), [[5]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Diaz1). The proximate causes of biodiversity loss are relatively well understood, with habitat destruction, climate change, biotic homogenization, resource extraction, and pollution the major factors [[6]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Wilcove1), [[7]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Sala1). However, the socioeconomic forces behind these biophysical drivers are poorly known [[8]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Carpenter1). While the sheer size of a country's economy predicts its overall environmental impact reasonably well [[9]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-York1), little is known about how the distribution of wealth or income within an economy affects the environment. Olson [[10]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Olson1) suggested that small groups with considerable inequality might favor the provision of a public good. The idea is that when the majority of the wealth is held by a few resource-users, it is in their interest to conserve regardless of what the poorer members of the group do. Some more recent theoretical analyses also support this perspective [[11]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Bergstrom1), [[12]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Itaya1). However, others suggest that inequality may hinder conservation [[13]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Boyce1), [[14]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-DaytonJohnson1), and empirical work has shown that inequality can thwart the collective action required for environmental protection [[15]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Baland1) and public health [[16]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Wilkinson1). Although these studies suggest a connection between inequality and environmental degradation, the sign and strength of the relationship with biodiversity remains unknown. We therefore used new high-quality data to test whether and how strongly inequality is linked to biodiversity loss. We examined two different spatial scales – entire countries, and states within the US – and used the Gini ratio of income inequality as our measure of economic inequality. This statistic, applied to households at the country scale and families at the state scale, can theoretically vary between 0 and 1. 0 would indicate that all of the households or families in a given society have exactly the same income, while 1 would mean that a single household or family earns all of the income, with no one else receiving any. Actual Gini ratios have ranged from 0.16 to 0.68 among different countries and years between 1960 and 1999 [[17]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Pitt1), and from 0.31 to 0.53 among different US states and years between 1969 and 1999 [[18]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-United1). Our measure of biodiversity loss in countries is the number of plant and vertebrate species known to be threatened in 2004 [[19]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-United2). We implicitly controlled for biophysical variables, such as area and climate, by including a variable that is highly correlated with them, namely the total number of plant and vertebrate species (again, in 2004). We explicitly controlled for two socioeconomic variables, human population size [[20]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Population1) and gross domestic product purchasing power parity (GDP PPP) per capita. GDP PPP is an adjusted version of the GDP, ensuring that each dollar “buys an equivalent amount of goods or services irrespective of the country.” [[21]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Development1) We also included the square of GDP PPP per capita in our analysis, to permit detection of the non-linear “environmental Kuznets” relationships that some have proposed for environmental impacts – first increasing, but then decreasing, with per capita GDP [[22]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Magnani1). Finally, we allowed for a time lag between socioeconomic causes and biological effects, rather than using contemporary data for all variables. We chose 1989 for our socioeconomic data, since that is the year for which Gini ratios are available for the largest number of countries: 61 [[17]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Pitt1). Missing information about variables other than inequality limited our final sample size to 45 countries. Together these countries cover 51% of the Earth's land surface excluding Antarctica, and currently contain 62% of the world population and generate 71% of the gross world product [[20]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Population1), [[21]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Development1). As an indicator of biodiversity loss within US states, we used the number of permanent resident bird species with statistically significant declines in abundance (P-value<0.10) over the period covered in the breeding bird survey, 1966–2005 [[23]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Sauer1). Permanent residents are presumably the species most affected by within-state socioeconomic conditions. We also controlled for the total number of permanent resident bird species in 2005, and human population size [[24]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-United3) and per capita income [[25]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-United4). Again allowing for a time lag between socioeconomic causes and biological effects, our state inequality and per capita income data are for 1969, and population data for 1970 – the years for which these socioeconomic statistics are available and that are closest to the start of the bird monitoring period in 1966. For five states, our sources lack information about one or more of the variables in our analysis. So our sample size at this scale is also 45, with these 45 states collectively extending over 91% of the US land surface, containing 97% of its human population, and accounting for 97% of its total income [[24]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-United3), [[25]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-United4). We used multiple regression to analyze the data described above. Analysis of residuals warranted the use of a power model at the country scale. This accords with previous studies finding power relationships between countries' biophysical and socioeconomic characteristics and their environmental impacts [[9]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-York1), [[26]](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone.0000444-Naidoo1). For US states, residual analysis warranted a linear model. See [Materials and methods](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#s4) for more detail. Among both countries and states, we found striking relationships between income inequality and biodiversity loss. As [Figure 1](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone-0000444-g001) shows, societies with more unequal distributions of income experience greater losses of biodiversity. After other variables have been taken into account, the country-level Gini ratio of household income inequality in 1989 has a highly significant power relationship with the number of threatened plant and vertebrate species in 2004 (P = 6.4×10−6). The estimated inequality exponent is 1.76, which means that a 1% increase in the Gini ratio is associated with an almost 2% rise in the number of threatened species. Inequality is even more significant (P = 1.1×10−6) after removing statistical outliers (Brazil, Jamaica, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, and New Zealand). Alternative models confirm this link between economic inequality and biodiversity loss (see [Table 1](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#pone-0000444-t001) and [Materials and methods](https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0000444#s4)).

#### Biodiversity loss is a massive risk for extinction due to climate change.
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PARIS, 6 May – Nature is declining globally at rates unprecedented in human history – and the rate of species extinctions is accelerating, with grave impacts on people around the world now likely, warns a landmark new report from the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), the summary of which was approved at the 7th session of the IPBES Plenary, meeting last week (29 April – 4 May) in Paris. “The overwhelming evidence of the IPBES Global Assessment, from a wide range of different fields of knowledge, presents an ominous picture,” said IPBES Chair, Sir Robert Watson. “The health of ecosystems on which we and all other species depend is deteriorating more rapidly than ever. We are eroding the very foundations of our economies, livelihoods, food security, health and quality of life worldwide.” “The Report also tells us that it is not too late to make a difference, but only if we start now at every level from local to global,” he said. “Through ‘transformative change’, nature can still be conserved, restored and used sustainably – this is also key to meeting most other global goals. By transformative change, we mean a fundamental, system-wide reorganization across technological, economic and social factors, including paradigms, goals and values.” “The member States of IPBES Plenary have now acknowledged that, by its very nature, transformative change can expect opposition from those with interests vested in the status quo, but also that such opposition can be overcome for the broader public good,” Watson said. The IPBES Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services is the most comprehensive ever completed. It is the first intergovernmental Report of its kind and builds on the landmark Millennium Ecosystem Assessment of 2005, introducing innovative ways of evaluating evidence. Compiled by 145 expert authors from 50 countries over the past three years, with inputs from another 310 contributing authors, the Report assesses changes over the past five decades, providing a comprehensive picture of the relationship between economic development pathways and their impacts on nature. It also offers a range of possible scenarios for the coming decades. Based on the systematic review of about 15,000 scientific and government sources, the Report also draws (for the first time ever at this scale) on indigenous and local knowledge, particularly addressing issues relevant to Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities. “Biodiversity and nature’s contributions to people are our common heritage and humanity’s most important life-supporting ‘safety net’. But our safety net is stretched almost to breaking point,” said Prof. Sandra Díaz (Argentina), who co-chaired the Assessment with Prof. Josef Settele (Germany) and Prof. Eduardo S. Brondízio (Brazil and USA). “The diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems, as well as many fundamental contributions we derive from nature, are declining fast, although we still have the means to ensure a sustainable future for people and the planet.”

#### Climate change causes extinction

Specktor 19 [Brandon writes about the science of everyday life for Live Science, and previously for Reader's Digest magazine, where he served as an editor for five years] 6-4-2019, "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims," livescience, <https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html> Justin

The current climate crisis, they say, is larger and more complex than any humans have ever dealt with before. General climate models — like the one that the [United Nations' Panel on Climate Change](https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/) (IPCC) used in 2018 to predict that a global temperature increase of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) could put hundreds of millions of people at risk — fail to account for the **sheer complexity of Earth's many interlinked geological processes**; as such, they fail to adequately predict the scale of the potential consequences. The truth, the authors wrote, is probably far worse than any models can fathom. How the world ends What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill many of the trees in the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.livescience.com/57266-amazon-river.html) (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the planet plunges into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions. "Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and **55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of** [**lethal heat conditions**](https://www.livescience.com/55129-how-heat-waves-kill-so-quickly.html), beyond the threshold of human survivability," the authors hypothesized. Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly **one-third of the world's land surface turns to desert**. Entire **ecosystems collapse**, beginning with the **planet's coral reefs**, the **rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets.** The world's tropics are hit hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than 1 billion people into refugees. This mass movement of refugees — coupled with [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to **stress the fabric of the world's largest nations**, including the United States. Armed conflicts over resources, perhaps culminating in **nuclear war, are likely**. The result, according to the new paper, is "outright chaos" and perhaps "the end of human global civilization as we know it."

## Advantage Democracy

#### Global democracy is collapsing now.

Freedom House 3/3 [Freedom House. Freedom House works to defend human rights and promote democratic change, with a focus on political rights and civil liberties. We act as a catalyst for freedom through a combination of analysis, advocacy, and action. Our analysis, focused on 13 central issues, is underpinned by our international program work. “New Report: The global decline in democracy has accelerated”. 3-3-2021. . https://freedomhouse.org/article/new-report-global-decline-democracy-has-accelerated.] SJ//VM

Washington - March 3, 2021 — Authoritarian actors grew bolder during 2020 as major democracies turned inward, contributing to the 15th consecutive year of decline in global freedom, according to [***Freedom in the World 2021***](https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2021/democracy-under-siege), the annual country-by-country assessment of political rights and civil liberties released today by Freedom House. The report found that the share of countries designated Not Free has reached its highest level since the deterioration of democracy began in 2006, and that countries with declines in political rights and civil liberties outnumbered those with gains by the largest margin recorded during the 15-year period. The report downgraded the freedom scores of 73 countries, representing 75 percent of the global population. Those affected include not just authoritarian states like China, Belarus, and Venezuela, but also troubled democracies like the United States and India. In one of the year’s most significant developments, India’s status changed from Free to Partly Free, meaning less than 20 percent of the world’s people now live in a Free country—the smallest proportion since 1995. Indians’ political rights and civil liberties have been eroding since Narendra Modi became prime minister in 2014. His Hindu nationalist government has presided over increased pressure on human rights organizations, rising intimidation of academics and journalists, and a spate of bigoted attacks—including lynchings—aimed at Muslims. The decline deepened following Modi’s reelection in 2019, and the government’s response to the coronavirus pandemic in 2020 featured further abuses of fundamental rights. The changes in India formed part of a broader shift in the international balance between democracy and authoritarianism, with authoritarians generally enjoying impunity for their abuses and seizing new opportunities to consolidate power or crush dissent. In many cases, promising democratic movements faced major setbacks as a result. In Belarus and Hong Kong, for example, massive prodemocracy protests met with brutal crackdowns by governments that largely disregarded international criticism. The Azerbaijani regime’s military offensive in Nagorno-Karabakh indirectly threatened recent democratic gains in Armenia, while the armed conflict in Ethiopia’s Tigray Region dashed hopes for the tentative political opening in that country since 2018. All four of these cases notably featured some degree of intervention by an autocratic neighbor: Moscow provided a backstop for the regime in Belarus, Beijing propelled the repression in Hong Kong, Turkey’s government aided its Azerbaijani counterpart, and Ethiopia’s leader called in support from Eritrea. The malign influence of the regime in China, the world’s most populous dictatorship, ranged far beyond Hong Kong in 2020. Beijing ramped up its global disinformation and censorship campaign to counter the fallout from its cover-up of the initial coronavirus outbreak, which severely hampered a rapid global response in the pandemic’s early days. Its efforts also featured increased meddling in the domestic political discourse of foreign democracies, as well as transnational extensions of rights abuses common in mainland China. The Chinese regime has gained clout in multilateral institutions such as the UN Human Rights Council, which the United States abandoned in 2018, as Beijing pushed a vision of so-called noninterference that allows abuses of democratic principles and human rights standards to go unpunished while the formation of autocratic alliances is promoted. “This year’s findings make it abundantly clear that we have not yet stemmed the authoritarian tide,” said Sarah Repucci, vice president of research and analysis at Freedom House. “Democratic governments will have to work in solidarity with one another, and with democracy advocates and human rights defenders in more repressive settings, if we are to reverse 15 years of accumulated declines and build a more free and peaceful world.” **A need for reform in the United States** While still considered Free, the United States experienced further democratic decline during the final year of the Trump presidency. The US score in [Freedom in the World](https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2021/democracy-under-siege) has dropped by 11 points over the past decade, and fell by three points in 2020 alone. The changes have moved the country out of a cohort that included other leading democracies, such as France and Germany, and brought it into the company of states with weaker democratic institutions, such as Romania and Panama. Several developments in 2020 contributed to the United States’ current score. The Trump administration undermined government transparency by dismissing inspectors general, punishing or firing whistleblowers, and attempting to control or manipulate information on COVID-19. The year also featured mass protests that, while mostly peaceful, were accompanied by high-profile cases of violence, police brutality, and deadly confrontations with counterprotesters or armed vigilantes. There was a significant increase in the number of journalists arrested and physically assaulted, most often as they covered demonstrations. Finally, the outgoing president’s shocking attempts to overturn his election loss—culminating in his incitement of rioters who stormed the Capitol as Congress met to confirm the results in January 2021—put electoral institutions under severe pressure. In addition, the crisis further damaged the United States’ credibility abroad and underscored the menace of political polarization and extremism in the country. ”January 6 should be a wake-up call for many Americans about the fragility of American democracy,” said Michael J. Abramowitz, president of Freedom House. “Authoritarian powers, especially China, are advancing their interests around the world, while democracies have been divided and consumed by internal problems. For freedom to prevail on a global scale, the United States and its partners must band together and work harder to strengthen democracy at home and abroad. President Biden has pledged to restore America’s international role as a leading supporter of democracy and human rights, but to rebuild its leadership credentials, the country must simultaneously address the weaknesses within its own political system.” “Americans should feel gratified that the courts and other important institutions held firm during the postelection crisis, and that the country escaped the worst possible outcomes,” said Abramowitz. “But the Biden administration, the new Congress, and American civil society must fortify US democracy by strengthening and expanding political rights and civil liberties for all. People everywhere benefit when the United States serves as a positive model, and the country itself reaps ample returns from a more democratic world.” **The effects of COVID-19** Government responses to the COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated the global democratic decline. Repressive regimes and populist leaders worked to reduce transparency, promote false or misleading information, and crack down on the sharing of unfavorable data or critical views. Many of those who voiced objections to their government’s handling of the pandemic faced harassment or criminal charges. Lockdowns were sometimes excessive, politicized, or brutally enforced by security agencies. And antidemocratic leaders worldwide used the pandemic as cover to weaken the political opposition and consolidate power. In fact, many of the year’s negative developments will likely have lasting effects, meaning the eventual end of the pandemic will not necessarily trigger an immediate revitalization of democracy. In Hungary, for example, the government of Prime Minister Viktor Orbán took on emergency powers during the health crisis and misused them to withdraw financial assistance from municipalities led by opposition parties. In Sri Lanka, President Gotabaya Rajapaksa dissolved Parliament in early March and, with new elections repeatedly delayed due to COVID-19, ruled without a legislature for several months. Later in the year, both Hungary and Sri Lanka passed constitutional amendments that further strengthened executive power. **The resilience of democracy** Despite the many losses for freedom recorded by [Freedom in the World](https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2021/democracy-under-siege) during 2020, people around the globe remained committed to fighting for their rights, and democracy continued to demonstrate its remarkable resilience. A number of countries held successful elections, independent courts provided checks on executive overreach, journalists in even the most repressive environments investigated government transgressions, and activists persisted in calling out undemocratic practices.

#### The plan solves:

#### 1] Civic engagement – strikes increase democratic participation which reinvigorates democracy.

McElwee 15 [Sean; Research Associate at Demos; “How Unions Boost Democratic Participation,” The American Prospect; 9/16/15; https://prospect.org/labor/unions-boost-democratic-participation/] Justin

Labor organizer Helen Marot once observed, "The labor unions are group efforts in the direction of democracy." What she meant is that more than simply vehicles for the economic interests of workers (which they certainly are), labor unions also foster civic participation for workers. And nowhere is this clearer than in voter turnout, which has suffered in recent years along with union membership. Indeed, new data from the Census Bureau and a new analysis of American National Election Studies data support the case that unions' declining influence has also deeply harmed democracy.

In 2014, voter turnout was abysmal, even for a midterm. Census data suggest that only 41.9 percent of the citizen population over 18 turned out to vote. However, as I note in my new Demos report Why Voting Matters, there are dispiriting gaps in turnout across class, race, and age. To examine how unions might affect policy, I performed a new analysis of both Census Bureau and American National Election Studies data. The data below, from the 2014 election, show the differences in voter turnout between union and non-union workers (the sample only includes individuals who were employed, and does not include self-employed workers). While only 39 percent of non-union workers voted in 2014, fully 52 percent of union workers did.

As part of ongoing research, James Feigenbaum, an economics PhD candidate at Harvard, ran a regression using American National Election Studies data suggesting that union members are about 4 percentage points more likely to vote and 3 points more likely to register (after controlling for demographic factors) and individuals living in a union household are 2.5 points more likely to vote and register. This is largely in line with the earlier estimates of Richard Freeman.

These numbers may appear modest, but in a close national election they could be enough to change the result.

Other research has found an even stronger turnout effect from unions. Daniel Stegmueller and Michael Becher find that after applying numerous demographic controls, union members are 10 points more likely to vote.

What's particularly important is that unions boost turnout among low- and middle-income individuals. In a 2006 study, political scientists Jan Leighley and Jonathan Nagler found that, "the decline in union membership since 1964 has affected the aggregate turnout of both low and middle-income individuals more than the aggregate turnout of high-income individuals." In 2014, the gap between unions and non-union workers shrunk at the highest rung of the income ladder. There was a 15-point gap among those earning less than $25,000 (40 percent turnout for union workers, and 25 percent turnout for non-union workers). Among those earning more than $100,000, the gap was far smaller (49 percent for non-union workers and 52 percent for union workers).

Individuals living in union households are also more progressive than those in non-union households. I examined 2012 ANES data and find that union households aren't largely different from non-union households on many issues regarding government spending, but they are more likely to have voted for Obama, identify as Democratic, and support a robust role for the government in reducing income inequality. When looking at union members specifically, the gaps become slightly larger.

More upscale union members are far more progressive than their non-union counterparts. Non-union households with an income above $60,000 oppose government intervention to reduce inequality by 11 points, with 32.2 percent in favor and 43.4 percent against. But richer union households support government intervention, with 42.5 percent in favor and 29.9 percent opposed. As Richard B. Freeman has pointed out, "union members are more likely to vote for a Democrat for the House or Presidency than demographically comparable nonunion voters." He similarly finds that "unionism moves members to the left of where they would be given their socioeconomic status," in line with the data I examined from 2012.

A 2013 study by Jasmine Kerrissey and Evan Schofer finds that union members are not only more likely to vote, but also more likely to belong to other associations, and to protest. They also find that these effects are strongest among people with lower levels of education, suggesting that unions may help mobilize the least politically active groups. A recent study of European countries finds union members vote more and identifies those aspects of union membership that contribute to the higher turnout.

The strongest factor is that workers who engage in democratic organizations in the workplace (via collective bargaining) are more likely to engage in democracy more broadly by, for instance, voting.

Other studies support the idea that civic participation creates a feedback loop that leads to higher voting rates. Another factor is that union members make more money, and higher income is correlated with voting behavior. Finally, union members are encouraged by peers and the union to engage in politics, which also contributes to higher levels of turnout.

It's not entirely surprising that politicians who savage unions often share a similar contempt for the right to vote. Democracy in the workplace leads to democracy more broadly throughout society. Workers with more democratic workplaces are more likely to democratically engage in in society. Further, when unions and progressives demonstrate that government can benefit them, Americans are more likely to want to participate in decision-making. For all these reasons, unions play a unique and indispensable role in the progressive project. As Larry Summers, certainly not a leftist, recently argued, "the weakness of unions leaves a broad swath of the middle class largely unrepresented in the political process."

#### Democratic backsliding causes extinction.

Kendall-Taylor 16 [Andrea; Deputy national intelligence officer for Russia and Eurasia at the National Intelligence Council, Senior associate in the Human Rights Initiative at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington; “How Democracy’s Decline Would Undermine the International Order,” CSIS; 7/15/16; <https://www.csis.org/analysis/how-democracy%E2%80%99s-decline-would-undermine-international-order>/] Justin

It is rare that policymakers, analysts, and academics agree. But there is an emerging consensus in the world of foreign policy: threats to the stability of the current international order are rising. The norms, values, laws, and institutions that have undergirded the international system and governed relationships between nations are being gradually dismantled. The most discussed sources of this pressure are [the ascent of China](http://nationalinterest.org/feature/how-china-sees-world-order-15846) and other non-Western countries, Russia’s assertive foreign policy, and the diffusion of power from traditional nation-states to nonstate actors, such as nongovernmental organizations, multinational corporations, and technology-empowered individuals. Largely missing from these discussions, however, is the [specter of widespread democratic decline](http://www.journalofdemocracy.org/article/facing-democratic-recession). Rising challenges to democratic governance across the globe are a major strain on the international system, but they receive [far less attention](http://www.iiss.org/en/publications/survival/sections/2016-5e13/survival--global-politics-and-strategy-april-may-2016-eb2d/58-2-03-boyle-6dbd) in discussions of the shifting world order.

In the 70 years since the end of World War II, the United States has fostered a global order dominated by states that are liberal, capitalist, and democratic. The United States has promoted the spread of democracy to strengthen global norms and rules that constitute the foundation of our current international system. However, despite the steady rise of democracy since the end of the Cold War, over the last 10 years we have seen dramatic reversals in respect for democratic principles across the globe. [A 2015 Freedom House report](https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/01152015_FIW_2015_final.pdf) stated that the “acceptance of democracy as the world’s dominant form of government—and of an international system built on democratic ideals—is under greater threat than at any point in the last 25 years.”

Although the number of democracies in the world is at an all-time high, there are a number of [key trends](file:///C:\Users\PMeylan\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\5V2CJVRN\160715_KendallTaylor_DemocracysDecline_Commentary.docx#http://www.journalofdemocracy.org/article/democracy-decline) that are working to undermine democracy. The rollback of democracy in a few influential states or even in a number of less consequential ones would almost certainly accelerate meaningful changes in today’s global order.

Democratic decline would weaken U.S. partnerships and erode an important foundation for U.S. cooperation abroad. [Research demonstrates](file:///C:\Users\PMeylan\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\5V2CJVRN\160715_KendallTaylor_DemocracysDecline_Commentary.docx#http://cmp.sagepub.com/content/18/1/49.abstract) that domestic politics are a key determinant of the international behavior of states. In particular, democracies are more likely to form alliances and cooperate more fully with other democracies than with autocracies. Similarly, authoritarian countries have established mechanisms for cooperation and sharing of “worst practices.” An increase in authoritarian countries, then, would provide a broader platform for coordination that could enable these countries to overcome their divergent histories, values, and interests—factors that are frequently cited as obstacles to the formation of a cohesive challenge to the U.S.-led international system.

Recent examples support the empirical data. Democratic backsliding in Hungary and the hardening of Egypt’s autocracy under Abdel Fattah el-Sisi have led to enhanced relations between these countries and Russia. Likewise, democratic decline in Bangladesh has led Sheikh Hasina Wazed and her ruling Awami League to seek closer relations with China and Russia, in part to mitigate Western pressure and bolster the regime’s domestic standing.

Although none of these burgeoning relationships has developed into a highly unified partnership, democratic backsliding in these countries has provided a basis for cooperation where it did not previously exist. And while the United States certainly finds common cause with authoritarian partners on specific issues, the depth and reliability of such cooperation is limited. Consequently, further democratic decline could seriously compromise the United States’ ability to form the kinds of deep partnerships that will be required to confront today’s increasingly complex challenges. Global issues such as climate change, migration, and violent extremism demand the coordination and cooperation that democratic backsliding would put in peril. Put simply, the United States is a less effective and influential actor if it loses its ability to rely on its partnerships with other democratic nations.

A slide toward authoritarianism could also challenge the current global order by diluting U.S. influence in critical international institutions, including the [United Nations](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/christopher-walker-authoritarian-regimes-are-changing-how-the-world-defines-democracy/2014/06/12/d1328e3a-f0ee-11e3-bf76-447a5df6411f_story.html) , the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Democratic decline would weaken Western efforts within these institutions to advance issues such as Internet freedom and the responsibility to protect. In the case of Internet governance, for example, Western democracies support an open, largely private, global Internet. Autocracies, in contrast, promote state control over the Internet, including laws and other mechanisms that facilitate their ability to censor and persecute dissidents. Already many autocracies, including Belarus, China, Iran, and Zimbabwe, have coalesced in the “Likeminded Group of Developing Countries” within the United Nations to advocate their interests.

Within the IMF and World Bank, autocracies—along with other developing nations—seek to water down conditionality or the reforms that lenders require in exchange for financial support. If successful, diminished conditionality would enfeeble an important incentive for governance reforms. In a more extreme scenario, the rising influence of autocracies could enable these countries to bypass the IMF and World Bank all together. For example, the Chinese-created Asian Infrastructure and Investment Bank and the BRICS Bank—which includes Russia, China, and an increasingly authoritarian South Africa—provide countries with the potential to bypass existing global financial institutions when it suits their interests. Authoritarian-led alternatives pose the risk that global economic governance will become [fragmented and less effective](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00396338.2016.1161899?journalCode=tsur20#.V2H3MRbXgdI).

Violence and instability would also likely increase if more democracies give way to autocracy. [International relations literature](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/1995-05-01/democratization-and-war) tells us that democracies are less likely to fight wars against other democracies, suggesting that interstate wars would rise as the number of democracies declines. Moreover, within countries that are already autocratic, additional movement away from democracy, or an “authoritarian hardening,” would increase global instability. Highly repressive autocracies are the most likely to experience state failure, as was the case in the Central African Republic, Libya, Somalia, Syria, and Yemen. In this way, democratic decline would significantly strain the international order because rising levels of instability would exceed the West’s ability to respond to the tremendous costs of peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance, and refugee flows.

Finally, widespread democratic decline would contribute to rising anti-U.S. sentiment that could fuel a global order that is increasingly antagonistic to the United States and its values. Most autocracies are highly suspicious of U.S. intentions and view the creation of an external enemy as an effective means for boosting their own public support. Russian president Vladimir Putin, Venezuelan president Nicolas Maduro, and Bolivian president Evo Morales regularly accuse the United States of fomenting instability and supporting regime change. This vilification of the United States is a convenient way of distracting their publics from regime shortcomings and fostering public support for strongman tactics.

Since 9/11, and particularly in the wake of the Arab Spring, Western enthusiasm for democracy support has waned. Rising levels of instability, including in Ukraine and the Middle East, fragile governance in Afghanistan and Iraq, and sustained threats from terrorist groups such as ISIL have increased Western focus on security and stability. U.S. preoccupation with intelligence sharing, basing and overflight rights, along with the perception that autocracy equates with stability, are trumping democracy and human rights considerations.

While rising levels of global instability explain part of Washington’s shift from an historical commitment to democracy, the nature of the policy process itself is a less appreciated factor. Policy discussions tend to occur on a country-by-country basis—leading to choices that weigh the costs and benefits of democracy support within the confines of a single country. From this perspective, the benefits of counterterrorism cooperation or access to natural resources are regularly judged to outweigh the perceived costs of supporting human rights. A serious problem arises, however, when this process is replicated across countries. The bilateral focus rarely incorporates the risks to the U.S.-led global order that arise from widespread democratic decline across multiple countries.

Many of the threats to the current global order, such as China’s rise or the diffusion of power, are driven by factors that the United States and West more generally have little leverage to influence or control. Democracy, however, is an area where Western actions can affect outcomes. Factoring in the risks that arise from a global democratic decline into policy discussions is a vital step to building a comprehensive approach to democracy support. Bringing this perspective to the table may not lead to dramatic shifts in foreign policy, but it would ensure that we are having the right conversation.

## Advocacy

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

#### Definition of unconditional right to strike:

NLRB 85 [National Labor Relations Board; “Legislative History of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947: Volume 1,” Jan 1985; <https://play.google.com/store/books/details?id=7o1tA__v4xwC&rdid=book-7o1tA__v4xwC&rdot=1>] Justin

\*\*Edited for gendered language

As for the so-called absolute or unconditional right to strike—there are no absolute rights that do not have their corresponding responsibilities. Under our American Anglo-Saxon system, each individual is entitled to the maximum of freedom, provided however (and this provision is of first importance), his [their] freedom has due regard for the rights and freedoms of others. The very safeguard of our freedoms is the recognition of this fundamental principle. I take issue very definitely with the suggestion that there is an absolute and unconditional right to concerted action (which after all is what the strike is) which endangers the health and welfare of our people in order to attain a selfish end.

#### We defend enforcement through the Illinois and Ohio models– an unconditional right is key, Malin 93 :

Martin H. Malin, [Martin H. Malin is co-director of the Institute for Law and the Workplace and teaches Labor Law, Employment Discrimination, Public Sector Employees, ADR in the Workplace, and Contracts. He received his B.A. from Michigan State University's James Madison College and his J.D. from George Washington University, where he was an editor of the law review and elected to the Order of the Coif. He joined the Chicago-Kent faculty in 1980 after serving as law clerk to United States District Judge Robert E. DeMascio in Detroit and on the faculty of Ohio State University.] 1993, University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform, “Public Employees' Right to Strike: Law and Experience” <https://repository.law.umich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1702&context=mjlr> //LHP AV recut SJEP

**The Illinois and Ohio approaches to enjoining lawful public employee strikes have much to commend** them. **First**, **both states confine injunctions to the very narrow group** of **strikes** **that** **pose a clear and present danger to public health and safety**.3 47 **Thus, they do not allow** **injunctive relief to significantly reduce the uncertainties of a strike's consequences and, accordingly, maintain maximum pressure on the parties to settle**. **Second**, **Ohio and Illinois place primary responsibility for determining** whether a clear and present **danger** exists **on the labor boards** and provide specific procedures for **resolving** post injunction bargaining impasses. 8 **Thus, they remove the primary decision** regarding whether to issue an injunction **from the potentially politically-charged atmosphere of the state trial courts**, thereby **removing many of the concerns that tempt judges in other jurisdictions to mediate the contract talks**. The judge's role is confined to a purely judicial function-reviewing the labor board's determination, issuing the injunction, and sending the parties to the next phase of the statutory procedures. CONCLUSION Public sector labor relations have come a long way since Franklin Delano Roosevelt maintained categorically that public employees were not entitled to the same rights that he signed into law for private sector workers. **States have experimented with a wide variety of approaches to resolving collective bargaining impasses. Experience shows that granting public employees the right to strike is an appropriate policy.** **Public** **employee** **strikes** **do not distort the democratic process** as once was feared. **Fact-finding coupled with** artificial strike **prohibitions** **do not provide a real alternative** to the right to strike. States which supposedly rely on fact-finding actually rely on the strike to motivate the parties to settle. **Interest arbitration** does provide a true strike substitute, but it **is a poor one**, **tending to stifle innovation and creative problem solving in negotiations**. Experiences in Illinois and Ohio show that **legalizing public employee strikes** does not cause an increase in strikes and **may encourage more realistic bargaining**. **Legislatures which recognize public employees' right to strike should subject them to only minimal regulation**. **Mandatory** **prestrike fact-finding**, currently imposed in several states, **carries with it the danger of stifling bargaining** in much the same way as interest arbitration, **while making those strikes which do occur more difficult to settle**. If fact-finding is not required, most strikes will settle quickly. Those **strikes that do not settle quickly usually should be allowed to run their courses. Liberal standards for strike injunctions cause more harm than good**. **They strain the judiciary and reduce the incentives to settle at the bargaining table.** **An injunction standard narrowly confined to strikes which endanger public health and safety, applied in the first instance by a labor relations board rather than a court, and coupled with specific poststrike impasse resolution procedures, relieves the strain on the judiciary and maximizes incentives to settle at the bargaining table**.

## Framing

#### Morality- extempt

#### The standard is maximizing expected well-being. Prefer it:

#### [1] Experience is epistemic – it is how we empirically ground our existence. Pain is universally bad and pleasure is universally good.

#### [2] Actor specificity: util is the best for governments, which is the actor in the rez – multiple warrants:

#### [a] Governments must aggregate since every policy benefits some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action.

#### [3] Util is a lexical pre-requisite to any other framework-threats to bodily security and life preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively utilize and act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis that inhibit the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose – so, util comes first and my offense outweighs theirs under their own framework.

#### [4] Extinction outweighs

Pummer 15 [Theron, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. “Moral Agreement on Saving the World” Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] AT

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But that is a huge mistake. Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don’t matter. Even John Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. We should also take into account moral uncertainty. What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

## Underview

#### 1] Aff gets 1AR theory since the neg can be infinitely abusive and I can’t check back. It’s drop the debater since the 1ar is too short to win both theory and substance. No RVI or 2NR paradigm issues since they’d dump on it for 6 minutes and my 3-minute 2AR is spread too thin. Competing interps since reasonability is arbitrary and bites judge intervention.