## 1

#### Interpretation: Debaters must post links to all previous constructive speech docs read at the tournament at least 30 minutes prior to the round on the 2021-2022 NDCA HSLD Wiki. To clarify, this means you must include all analytics, full text, underlining, and highlighting of all cards as read in round.

#### Violation – Screenshots prove they haven’t disclosed anything from this tournament, but I have.

A picture containing text, screenshot, indoor, computer

Description automatically generatedA computer screen capture

Description automatically generated with medium confidence

#### Standards –

#### 1] Debate resource inequities—you’ll say people will steal framework justifications or cards, but that’s good—it’s the only way to truly level the playing field for students such as novices in under-privileged programs.

Antonucci 5 [Michael (Debate coach for Georgetown; former coach for Lexington High School); “[eDebate] open source? resp to Morris”; December 8; http://www.ndtceda.com/pipermail/edebate/2005-December/064806.html //nick]

a. Open source systems are preferable to the various punishment proposals in circulation. It's better to share the wealth than limit production or participation. Various flavors of argument communism appeal to different people, but banning interesting or useful research(ers) seems like the most destructive solution possible. Indeed, open systems may be the only structural, rule-based answer to resource inequities. Every other proposal I've seen obviously fails at the level of enforcement. Revenue sharing (illegal), salary caps (unenforceable and possibly illegal) and personnel restrictions (circumvented faster than you can say 'information is fungible') don't work. This would - for better or worse. b. With the help of a middling competent archivist, an open source system would reduce entry barriers. This is especially true on the novice or JV level. Young teams could plausibly subsist entirely on a diet of scavenged arguments. A novice team might not wish to do so, but the option can't hurt. c. An open source system would fundamentally change the evidence economy without targetting anyone or putting anyone out of a job. It seems much smarter (and less bilious) to change the value of a professional card-cutter's work than send the KGB after specific counter-revolutionary teams.

#### 2] leads to higher quality engagement b/c I know exactly what the neg says which internal link turns the aff b/c it leads to net better discussion. This is especially true given that you did not disclose the offense of the NC—no way I can engage with it or contest it.

#### 3] Evidence ethics – open source is the only way to verify before round that cards aren’t miscut – full text doesn’t solve since you could have highlighted unethically. That’s a voter – maintaining ethical ev practices is key to being good academics and we should be able to verify you didn’t cheat

Voters – education - only terminal impact from debate – fairness – constitutive of the judge to decide the better debater

Drop the debater

1. Doesn’t make sense because you were abusive out of round.
2. Sets a precedent that debaters cant run unfair arguments because they will be scared to lose.

Competing interps

1. Reasonability causes a race to the bottom because debaters keep being barely reasonable, magnifying abuse.
2. Critical thinking –competing interps promotes in depth argumentation on theory which increases quality of clash.

No RVIs

1. RVIs center the debate on theory instead of substance because it’s the only place the round can be decided. Outweighs on time frame; we only get two months to talk about the topic and on research - where the majority of debate education occurs
2. RVIs discourage checking abuse because debaters will be afraid to lose on theory

## 2

#### Interpretation – The affirmative must defend all governments.

#### “A” is an indefinite article that modifies “government” in the res – this means that you have to prove the resolution true in a VACUUM, not in a particular instance

**CCC** (“Articles, Determiners, and Quantifiers”, <http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/determiners/determiners.htm#articles>, Capital Community College Foundation, a nonprofit 501 c-3 organization that supports scholarships, faculty development, and curriculum innovation) LHSLA JC/SJ

The three articles — a, an, the — are a kind of adjective. The is called the definite article because it usually precedes a specific or previously mentioned noun; a and an are called indefinite articles because they are used to refer to something in a less specific manner (an unspecified count noun). These words are also listed among the noun markers or determiners because they are almost invariably followed by a noun (or something else acting as a noun). caution CAUTION! Even after you learn all the principles behind the use of these articles, you will find an abundance of situations where choosing the correct article or choosing whether to use one or not will prove chancy. Icy highways are dangerous. The icy highways are dangerous. And both are correct. The is used with specific nouns. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something that is one of a kind: The moon circles the earth. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something in the abstract: The United States has encouraged the use of the private automobile as opposed to the use of public transit. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something named earlier in the text. (See below..) If you would like help with the distinction between count and non-count nouns, please refer to Count and Non-Count Nouns. We use a before singular count-nouns that begin with consonants (a cow, a barn, a sheep); we use an before singular count-nouns that begin with vowels or vowel-like sounds (an apple, an urban blight, an open door). Words that begin with an h sound often require an a (as in a horse, a history book, a hotel), but if an h-word begins with an actual vowel sound, use an an (as in an hour, an honor). We would say a useful device and a union matter because the u of those words actually sounds like yoo (as opposed, say, to the u of an ugly incident). The same is true of a European and a Euro (because of that consonantal "Yoo" sound). We would say a once-in-a-lifetime experience or a one-time hero because the words once and one begin with a w sound (as if they were spelled wuntz and won). Merriam-Webster's Dictionary says that we can use an before an h- word that begins with an unstressed syllable. Thus, we might say an hisTORical moment, but we would say a HIStory book. Many writers would call that an affectation and prefer that we say a historical, but apparently, this choice is a matter of personal taste. For help on using articles with abbreviations and acronyms (a or an FBI agent?), see the section on Abbreviations. First and subsequent reference: When we first refer to something in written text, we often use an indefinite article to modify it. A newspaper has an obligation to seek out and tell the truth. In a subsequent reference to this newspaper, however, we will use the definite article: There are situations, however, when the newspaper must determine whether the public's safety is jeopardized by knowing the truth. Another example: "I'd like a glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put the glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Exception: When a modifier appears between the article and the noun, the subsequent article will continue to be indefinite: "I'd like a big glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put a big glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Generic reference: We can refer to something in a generic way by using any of the three articles. We can do the same thing by omitting the article altogether. **A beagle** makes a great hunting dog and family companion. An airedale is sometimes a rather skittish animal. The golden retriever is a marvelous pet for children. Irish setters are not the highly intelligent animals they used to be. The difference between the generic indefinite pronoun and the normal indefinite pronoun is that the latter refers to any of that class ("I want to buy a beagle, and any old beagle will do.") whereas the former (see beagle sentence) **refers to all members of that class**.

#### “Governments” is a generic indefinite singular.

Leslie 12 Leslie, Sarah-Jane. “Generics.” In Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Language, edited by Gillian Russell and Delia Fara, 355–366. Routledge, 2012. <https://www.princeton.edu/~sjleslie/RoutledgeHandbookEntryGenerics.pdf> SM

GENERICS VS. EXISTENTIALS The interpretation of sentences containing bare plurals, indefinite singulars, or definite singulars can be either generic as in (1) respectively or existential/specific as in (2): (1) Tigers are striped A tiger is striped The tiger is striped. (2) Tigers are on the front lawn A tiger is on the front lawn The tiger is on the front lawn. The subjects in (1) are prima facie the same as in (2), yet their interpretations in (1) are intuitively quite different from those in (2). In (2) we are talking about some particular tigers, while in (1) we are saying something about tigers in general. There are some tests that are helpful in distinguishing these two readings. For example, the existential interpretation is upward entailing, meaning that the statement will always remain true if we replace the subject term with a more inclusive term. For example, if it is true that tigers are on the lawn, then it will also be true that animals are on the lawn. This is not so if the sentence is interpreted generically. For example, it is true that tigers are striped, but it does not follow that animals are striped (Lawler 1973 Laca 1990; Krifka et al 1995). Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification (in the sense of Lewis 1975) with minimal change of meaning (Krifka et al 1995). For example, inserting “usually” in the sentences in (1) (e.g. “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in (2) dramatically alters the meaning of the sentence (e.g. “tigers are usually on the front lawn). (For generics such as “mosquitoes carry malaria”, the adverb “sometimes” is perhaps better used than “usually”.)

#### Upward entailment – saying all leaderships should have unconditional right to strike is different from all governments

#### Violation- you specify Germany.

#### Standards–

#### Limits: specifying a democracy offers huge explosion in the topic since they get permutations of 76 governments, like US, Hong Kong, or Mauritius.

**That outweighs:**

1. **Iterative content mastery: debaters learn best from successive strategic iterations, so engaging in debates about the same core issues challenges students to innovate and adapt their arguments based on feedback from opponents and judges.**
2. **Prep: nuanced research requires a stasis point. A large caselist results in shallow debates and pushes argumentation to the fringes to find broad theses that disagree with everything. This prevents rigorous argument testing – anyone can skim a Wikipedia article, but the process of clash is unique to debate.**

#### TVA: affirm the entire resolution and have the \_\_\_\_\_ as an advantage – solves

## 3

#### German econ is bogged down by supply chain issues, but growth in 2022 likely

**Eddy 21** , [Melissa Eddy is a correspondent based in Berlin who covers German politics, social issues and culture for The New York Times. Her most recent work has delved into the challenges of integrating 1 million refugees, the spate of Islamist terror attacks and the legacy of a trove of Nazi-looted art. She has covered Germany’s green energy transformation and Chancellor Angela Merkel since she entered office in 2005. A Minnesota native fluent in German and French, she came to Germany as a Fulbright scholar in 1996. Before joining The International Herald Tribune, now the international edition of The New York Times, in 2015, she was a correspondent for The Associated Press in Frankfurt, Vienna and the Balkans. 11-5-2021, "Persistent shortages are stunting German economic growth.," No Publication, <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/11/05/world/europe/shortages-german-economic-growth.html>, Accessed 11/20/21]

Persistent shortages are dragging down the German economy, Europe’s largest, as companies struggle to fill orders because the necessary parts or raw materials are not arriving from abroad. Surveys and data released this week indicate that the ongoing [crunch in the supply chain](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/22/business/shortages-supply-chain.html) is the main factor slowing Germany’s manufacturing powerhouse, causing the government to scale back its forecast for economic growth for 2021. Many economists are now predicting that the situation won’t improve until well into 2022. Industrial production shrank by 1.1 percent in September compared with the previous month, according to [data](https://www.destatis.de/EN/Press/2021/11/PE21_508_421.html) released on Friday by the Federal Statistics Office. The drop was led by a fall in the production of mechanical, electrical and data processing equipment. More than 90 percent of all manufacturers in the automobile and electrical equipment industries said that their production had been hampered by a lack of supplies, according to a [survey](https://www.ifo.de/node/65972) released Wednesday by the Ifo Institute. Some economists are predicting the shortages could result in [a “bottleneck recession.”](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/05/business/germany-economy.html?searchResultPosition=1) And last month the German government cut its projection for economic growth for the year to 2.6 percent, down from a 3.5 percent estimate in April, citing supply chain issues and rising energy prices. “There will not be the final spurt we had hoped for,” said Peter Altmaier, the minister of economy in Chancellor Angela Merkel’s caretaker government. But the government predicted the economy would gain momentum in 2022, and lifted its estimate for next year’s growth to 4.1 percent from 3.6 percent, reflecting more shipments of microchips and raw materials. That projection reflects the expectation that a backlog of orders will be able to be filled in the coming months. Data released on Thursday showed industrial orders rebounding less than expected at an increase of 1.1 percent in September, after an unexpectedly large drop in August. Given the demand, some economists believe that with an increase in shipping predicted for the first part of next year, the German economy is positioned to improve, although it will not be immediate. “There is a potential for an upside,” said Carsten Brzeski, an economic analyst with ING Bank. “Only a small improvement in industrial production is required to see positive growth.” One of the biggest threats, however, remains the coronavirus pandemic. Germany finds itself facing a fourth wave of infections, with [a record](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/11/04/world/asia/diwali-india.html?searchResultPosition=1) number of new infections, 33,949, recorded in a 24-hour period on Thursday. That could prevent people from going out shopping or dining, endangering a projected increase in private consumption that has proved one of the bright spots in the German economy, and hitting the country just as the holiday period arrives, a high point for consumer spending.

#### Strikes hurt critical core industries that is 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.

#### Err Negative – over-estimate the effect on Strikes on the economy since traditional economic measures underestimate the damage.

Babb No Date Katrina Babb "Chapter 11: The Economic Impact of Unions" <http://isu.indstate.edu/conant/ecn351/ch11/chapter11.htm> (Professor of Economic at Indiana State)

Strikes ­ Simple statistics on strike activity suggest that strikes are relatively rare and the associated aggregate economic losses are relatively minimal. Table 11-3 provides data on major work stoppages, defined as those involving 1000 or more workers and lasting at least one full day or one work shift. But these data **can be misleading** **as a measure of the costliness of a strike.** On the one hand, employers in the struck industry may have anticipated the strike and worked their labor force overtime to accumulate inventories to supply customers during the strike period, so that the work lost data overstates the actual loss. On the other hand, the amount lost **can be understated** by the data if production in associated industries ( those that buy inputs from the struck industry or sell products to it) **is disrupted**. As a broad generalization, the adverse effects of a strike on nonstriking firms and customers are likely to be greater **when services are involved** and less when products are involved. Remember, that strikes are the result of the failure of both parties to the negotiation, so it is inaccurate to attribute all of the costs associated with a strike to labor alone.

#### Global war

Liu 18 (Qian Liu- Managing Director, Greater China, The Economist Group. Young Global Leader. 11/13/18 “The next economic crisis could cause a global conflict. Here's why” <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/the-next-economic-crisis-could-cause-a-global-conflict-heres-why> JO)

The response to the 2008 economic crisis has relied far too much on monetary stimulus, in the form of quantitative easing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates, and included far too little structural reform. This means that the next crisis could come soon – and pave the way for a large-scale military conflict. The next economic crisis is closer than you think. But what you should really worry about is what comes after: in the current social, political, and technological landscape, a prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising income inequality, could well escalate into a major global military conflict. The 2008-09 global financial crisis almost bankrupted governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the global economy back from the brink, using massive monetary stimulus, including quantitative easing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates. Image: UN But monetary stimulus is like an adrenaline shot to jump-start an arrested heart; it can revive the patient, but it does nothing to cure the disease. Treating a sick economy requires structural reforms, which can cover everything from financial and labor markets to tax systems, fertility patterns, and education policies. Policymakers have utterly failed to pursue such reforms, despite promising to do so. Instead, they have remained preoccupied with politics. From Italy to Germany, forming and sustaining governments now seems to take more time than actual governing. And Greece, for example, has relied on money from international creditors to keep its head (barely) above water, rather than genuinely reforming its pension system or improving its business environment. The lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented excess liquidity that central banks injected into their economies was not allocated to its most efficient uses. Instead, it raised global asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008. In the United States, housing prices are now 8% higher than they were at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, according to the property website Zillow. The price-to-earnings (CAPE) ratio, which measures whether stock-market prices are within a reasonable range, is now higher than it was both in 2008 and at the start of the Great Depression in 1929. As monetary tightening reveals the vulnerabilities in the real economy, the collapse of asset-price bubbles will trigger another economic crisis – one that could be even more severe than the last, because we have built up a tolerance to our strongest macroeconomic medications. A decade of regular adrenaline shots, in the form of ultra-low interest rates and unconventional monetary policies, has severely depleted their power to stabilize and stimulate the economy. If history is any guide, the consequences of this mistake could extend far beyond the economy. According to Harvard’s Benjamin Friedman, prolonged periods of economic distress have been characterized also by public antipathy toward minority groups or foreign countries – attitudes that can help to fuel unrest, terrorism, or even war. For example, during the Great Depression, US President Herbert Hoover signed the 1930 Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, intended to protect American workers and farmers from foreign competition. In the subsequent five years, global trade shrank by two-thirds. Within a decade, World War II had begun. To be sure, WWII, like World War I, was caused by a multitude of factors; there is no standard path to war. But there is reason to believe that high levels of inequality can play a significant role in stoking conflict. According to research by the economist Thomas Piketty, a spike in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Income inequality then declines for a while, before rising again, until a new peak – and a new disaster. Though causality has yet to be proven, given the limited number of data points, this correlation should not be taken lightly, especially with wealth and income inequality at historically high levels. Have you read? How to prevent World War 3 How countries have recovered from the financial crisis and other top economic stories of the week Four things not to do in an economic crisis This is all the more worrying in view of the numerous other factors stoking social unrest and diplomatic tension, including technological disruption, a record-breaking migration crisis, anxiety over globalization, political polarization, and rising nationalism. All are symptoms of failed policies that could turn out to be trigger points for a future crisis. Voters have good reason to be frustrated, but the emotionally appealing populists to whom they are increasingly giving their support are offering ill-advised solutions that will only make matters worse. For example, despite the world’s unprecedented interconnectedness, multilateralism is increasingly being eschewed, as countries – most notably, Donald Trump’s US – pursue unilateral, isolationist policies. Meanwhile, proxy wars are raging in Syria and Yemen. Against this background, we must take seriously the possibility that the next economic crisis could lead to a large-scale military confrontation. By the logic of the political scientist Samuel Huntington , considering such a scenario could help us avoid it, because it would force us to take action. In this case, the key will be for policymakers to pursue the structural reforms that they have long promised, while replacing finger-pointing and antagonism with a sensible and respectful global dialogue. The alternative may well be global conflagration.

## 4

#### CP Text: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of all workers except police to strike.

#### The inclusion of the police into the right to strike erases difference – the essence of a cop is to practice brutality and crackdowns strikes

Marcy ’15 [Sam, “The year of the pig: Should workers support police strikes?”, 01-08-2015, https://www.workers.org/2015/01/17782/]//pranav

Are strikes by the police to be regarded approximately the same way as strikes by ordinary workers? A reading of the treatment accorded to the New York police strike by the Daily World (the paper of the Communist Party which professes to be Marxist-Leninist) clearly conveys this impression. A column by George Morris, the Daily World’s labor analyst, waxes eloquent about the cops’ strike and says “it is in the spirit of rebellion we see everywhere today as in unions against the long entrenched bureaucracy.” He further says that the cops are “beginning to see themselves as in much the same position as other city employees and workers.” Finally, he admonishes his readers that “fire should not be blunderbussed against all on the police force.” You see, the way to look at it is that there are good cops and bad cops, just like there are good capitalists and bad ones. We must assume then, that there are good storm troopers and bad ones if we use the logic of George Morris. In this way, Morris substitutes bourgeois morality for Marxist analysis of class antagonisms and contradictions between class groupings. The cops’ strike is not an isolated phenomenon. There is one in progress right now in Milwaukee. Earlier there were strikes or stoppages in Detroit and Youngstown, Ohio. Strike preparations are underway in perhaps a dozen other cities throughout the country. It is therefore necessary and in the vital interests of the working class to restate the fundamental position of revolutionary Marxism on this crucial question. Should strikes of cops be treated on an equal level with workers’ strikes? Emphatically, no! A striking worker and a striking police officer may on the surface appear to have the same immediate aims — to get higher pay and better conditions for themselves. But this is to take an extremely narrow and superficial view of their apparently similar situations. The truth, however, is that there is objectively speaking not a shred of class identity between workers and the police. The fundamental interests of the workers are diametrically opposed to those of the police and are absolutely irreconcilable with them. Producers or parasites? A worker is, above all, a producer. The police officer is a parasite who lives off what the worker produces. No truer words could be said! All the material wealth which is now in the possession of the capitalist class was produced by the workers. When a worker goes out on strike she [or he] is merely trying to retrieve a portion of the wealth which her [or his] labor power produced. The worker gets back in the form of wages only a portion of what he [or she] produces. The rest is what the capitalist class retains in the form of profit (really the unpaid labor of the workers). The gross national income of the U.S. last year reached the astronomical sum of one trillion dollars. It was all produced by workers: Black, Brown, white, men and women and even children. The struggles of all the workers, insofar as their immediate demands are concerned, are merely to retrieve a larger portion of this wealth which they produced for the bosses and which the bosses keep for themselves. Contribute nothing to social wealth What have the cops contributed to the production of this unprecedented amount of wealth? Nothing at all. In fact, their principal function is to guard the wealth for the capitalists, protect their monopolist profits from the demands of the workers. Even as the New York cops were out on strike, their emergency crews were busily clubbing the heads of striking telephone workers. That’s the very essence of a cop: to crack the heads of strikers and practice the most inhuman brutality against the Black, Puerto Rican and Chicano/a communities. A cop is a mercenary hired by the capitalist class through their agent (the city government) to keep the mass of the workers and the oppressed in complete subjection. They utilize all the forces and violence at their disposal whenever the masses rise up in rebellion against the unendurable conditions imposed by the master class. The police are the most parasitic social grouping in society. When they work — if that’s what it can possibly be called — their labor is directed against the workers and oppressed. Graft, corruption, intimate collaboration with all sorts of underworld figures and enterprises such as gambling, narcotics and a thousand other shady businesses — that’s what cops are really engaged in. They are utterly inseparable from crime and corruption itself. One could not exist without the other. Both are nourished and supported by the nature of the capitalist system itself. To put the police on a par with the workers is to erase the difference between the persecutors and their victims.

Leyton doesn’t say anything that takes out the pic – it j warrants why opting-out is bad, but not RTS not applying to a specific industry.

## Case

### Framing

#### The Role of the ballot is to only evaluate the material consequences of the aff and neg world. Prefer:

#### A] fairness - Fairness—Arbitrary frameworks moot the 1NC and destroy our possibility of engaging with the affirmative on an equal playing field. Our scholarship is tied to the consequences of the plan, so it makes no sense to separate assumptions from implementation. Both debaters get the resolution at the same time.

#### B] Clash—Debate is not about the content of what we debate about but the process of iterative testing through specific points of contestation. There is no 1-1 correspondence between the arguments we read and our ideologies. This turns the Aff—no matter your political worldview, critical thinking skills through an unrestrained framework is necessary for any revolutionary strategy.

#### Existential threats outweigh:

#### [1] Moral uncertainty proves extinction outweighs – if you aren’t 100% sure their arg is true, keep future generations alive to figure things out

Bostrom 12 [Nick Bostrom, Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford. Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority. 2012. www.existential-risk.org/concept.html]

These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate.

Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving — and ideally improving — our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value. To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

### Top Level

#### No inherency – Germany already has a functionally unconditional right to strike – collective bargaining is allowed just not for specific jobs like public workers or religious groups – means the aff’s offense is marginal at best, only certain groups can benefit – aff needs to prove a substantial benefit to allowing individual strikes

#### No impact to the aff – independent of collective bargaining, people don’t have to the power to change company policy but only as a group which means there’s no marginal benefit to making it UNCONDITIONAL

### Wages

1] no shot aff solves for all of capitalism – tons of other things they can’t solve for

#### 2] Cap solves disease mutation

Jackson 16. Kerry, Pacific Research Institute; 12/19/16; Free Market Policies Needed To Incentivize Creation Of New Life-Saving Treatments; https://www.pacificresearch.org/article/free-market-policies-needed-to-incentivize-creation-of-new-life-saving-treatments/

“Our strongest antibiotics don’t work and patients are left with potentially untreatable infections,” Director Dr. Tom Frieden said when the CDC issued its warning. He asked doctors, hospitals and public health officials to “work together” to “stop these infections from spreading.” The 2014 Report to the President expressed a similar concern: “The evolution of antibiotic resistance is now occurring at an alarming rate and is outpacing the development of new countermeasures capable of thwarting infections in humans. This situation threatens patient care, economic growth, public health, agriculture, economic security and national security.” For those thinking this sort of thing shouldn’t be happening when medical science is more advanced than can almost be conceived, be assured that it is. And unless there are public policy interventions, it’s likely to get worse. “More and more microorganisms will continue to gain resistance to the current drug therapies because (antimicrobial resistance, or AMR) is basic evolution,” Wayne Winegarden writes in the Pacific Research Institute’s newly-released report “Incenting the Development of Antimicrobial Medicines to Address the Problem of Drug-Resistant Infections.” The International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers says the problem is caused by “a dearth of new antibiotic medicines.” At the same time that there’s been an increase in AMR, there has been “a sharp decline in the development of new antibiotic medicines.” The group reports that only two new classes of antibiotics have been discovered in the last three decades compared to 11 in the previous 50 years. The answers to many medical problems are still not within reach of researchers. But the hazards of AMR can be diminished. Winegarden suggests we begin with public health campaigns that encourage handwashing, which he calls a highly effective and low-cost way to reduce the spread of infection. He further recommends policy that would address the problem of antibiotic overuse and greater use of vaccines to cut the incidents of infection. But Winegarden’s primary concern is establishing the correct incentives for developing new antimicrobial medicines that would be effective against AMR microorganisms. He’s specifically referring to policies “based on a thorough understanding of the disincentives that are currently inhibiting their development.” “These disincentives are well-recognized,” he writes. “Despite the medical need, and despite the generally strong return on investment for many other drug classes, the return on investment for developing new antimicrobial medicines (particularly antibiotics) is too low.” Producing a new drug is a grinding and expensive endeavor. It can take 10 to 15 years to develop a single prescription drug that is introduced to the market, and a company can spend as much as $5.5 billion on research and development for each medication that is eventually approved and prescribed. Less than 2 percent of all projects launched to create new drugs succeed. This is not an environment in which pharmaceutical companies can get too amped up about pursuing new treatments. Yet new drug approvals increased over the last decade. Don’t look for a surge of antimicrobial drugs in that pipeline, though. Winegarden says that particular drug class is among several that “face unique impediments” that serve as disincentives for innovation. To overcome the steep hill that impedes the development of new AMR drugs, lawmakers must implement policies that unleash the incentives of the free market. Policymakers also should look at the 1983 federal Orphan Drug Act and its market-oriented reforms that increased the number of drugs developed to treat rare diseases. More than 400 have been introduced to the market since the law was enacted, compared to fewer than 10 in the 1970s. Put another way, government needs to remove its anchors from the process and let the market do what it does so well. In this case, that’s restoring patients’ health, enriching innovative companies that create jobs, and inspiring biotech start-ups such as the group of Stanford undergraduates that has been capitalized to develop new antibiotics. If the proper incentives are in place, the needed treatments will follow.

#### Pandemics end civilization – no burnout

Kerscher 14. Karl-Heinz, professor and management consultant “Space Education”, Wissenschaftliche Studie, 2014

The death toll for a pandemic is equal to the virulence, the deadliness of the pathogen or pathogens, multiplied by the number of people eventually infected. It has been hypothesized that there is an upper limit to the virulence of naturally evolved pathogens. This is because a pathogen that quickly kills its hosts might not have enough time to spread to new ones, while one that kills its hosts more slowly or not at all will allow carriers more time to spread the infection, and thus likely out-compete a more lethal species or strain. This simple model predicts that if virulence and transmission are not linked in any way, pathogens will evolve towards low virulence and rapid transmission. However, this assumption is not always valid and in more complex models, where the level of virulence and the rate of transmission are related, high levels of virulence can evolve. The level of virulence that is possible is instead limited by the existence of complex populations of hosts, with different susceptibilities to infection, or by some hosts being geographically isolated. The size of the host population and competition between different strains of pathogens can also alter virulence. There are numerous historical examples of pandemics that have had a devastating effect on a large number of people, which makes the possibility of global pandemic a realistic threat to human civilization.

#### 3] Cap solves warming

Hansen and Wethal 14 Arve Hansen is a Research Fellow in interdisciplinary development studies and geography at the Centre for Development and the Environment, University of Oslo, Norway. Ulrikke Wethal is a Research Fellow in development and economic geography at the Centre for Development and the Environment, University of Oslo, Norway. October 10, 2014, “Emerging Economies and Challenges to Sustainability: Theories, Strategies, Local Realities”, https://books.google.com/books?id=uxbEBAAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\_atb#v=onepage&q&f=false

As discussed in Chapter 3 by McNeill and Wilhite, the Kuznets curve has been used to describe the alleged relation between the environment and economic growth. The idea is that, as economies grow, growth will first lead to environmental degradation, but beyond a certain point, the fruits of this same growth can be used to prevent or ameliorate degradation. However, in advanced economies, most reduction in environmental degradation has taken place due to outsourcing of production rather than any innovative way of mitigating the challenges. In terms of achieving global sustainable development, the exportation of environmental problems through a relocalisation of production makes no positive contribution. While there has been increasing acknowledgement of the environmental crisis we are facing, radical action remains absent. So-called green-washing has been the main response to the call for sustainable development. This is not, we argue, necessarily because the idea of sustainable development is wrong, but mainly because countries are not willing to commit deeply to the required trans-formations. It is also because of the lack of visions that are both viable and appeal to large segments of societies. Economic growth enables job creation and increases living standards, and can allow governments to avoid the uncomfortable questions of more radical redistribution. Halting growth in a capitalist economy leads to recessions and unemployment. Even though it tends to hit the poorest hardest, the ramifications are felt across all groups in society. For a powerful political party (whether in a one-party system or a democracy) to preach no-growth or degrowth in this context is political suicide. Politics is the art of the possible (as von Bismarck famously said), and green-washing and technological fixes are much more palatable alternatives than the societal trans-formations required by deeper understandings of sustainability.

#### 4] Market failure wrong and capitalism creates *sustainable living conditions* – India and China prove

Smith 17. Noah Smith is a Bloomberg View columnist. He was an assistant professor of finance at Stony Brook University, and he blogs at Noahpinion [“Free-Market Failure Has Been Greatly Exaggerated,” 11-15-2017, *Bloomberg*, URL: https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2017-11-15/free-markets-improved-more-lives-than-anything-ever]//vikas

As someone who has done decades of pioneering work in the field of trade and growth, and who has been intimately involved in practical policy-making, Rodrik is as much of an expert on this topic as anyone . But although his criticisms are accurate, he overlooks much of the good that neoliberalism has done. Rodrik very wisely explains why it's so easy for economists to seem like shills for simplistic free-market policies. Confronted with a desire for quick fixes and easy explanations, many economists instinctively revert back to the toy models they learned in their introductory economics courses -- models where free-market competition solves almost any problem. As Rodrik notes, these models represent a common fable -- University of Connecticut law professor James Kwak calls it "economism" -- that ignores a million and one important features of real-world markets. **Government institutions**, for example, **matter a lot** -- from the corporatism of 20th century Japan to Germany's innovative unions**, there are many flavors of capitalism** that all seem to work fairly well. And without good institutions, capitalism can easily degenerate into inefficient monopoly, crash-prone financial excess, short-sighted environmental destruction, or a number of other undesirable conditions. But when it comes to the harms that neoliberalism has wrought, Rodrik cherry-picks quite a bit. He focuses on two countries -- Mexico and Chile. In the 1970s and 1980s, under dictator Augusto Pinochet, Chile took advice from a number of free-market economists, but the results were underwhelming. Since undertaking its own free-market reforms and signing the North American Free Trade Agreement, Mexico's economy has underperformed more interventionist countries like South Korea and China. These examples of neoliberal disappointment are real enough. It's no accident that both come from Latin America -- the region where neoliberal advice, in the form of a 10-point plan called the Washington Consensus, garnered the most publicity. The Washington Consensus has been the target of bitter criticism for years, and Rodrik himself has been one of its most prominent detractors. But Latin America is only one part of the world. Elsewhere, broadly neoliberal ideas have been much more of a success. Rodrik's essay should have taken these into consideration. Take China. **In the 1980s, after decades of economic and social disaster under Mao Zedong, China started experimenting with a market economy under** party leader **Deng Xiaoping**. The regime began to allow small businesses and granted limited land rights. **State**-owned **enterprises were partially privatized.** The country opened to foreign investment, and went from a state of isolation to the world's biggest trading economy. By 2005, China's market economy passed its state-run economy in size. What happened after China's market reforms is now well-known -- **the most dramatic explosion of economic growth in world history.** As Rodrik points out, state intervention still plays a prominent role in China's economy. But the shift from a rigid command-and-control economy to one that blended state and market approaches -- and the liberalization of trade -- was undoubtedly a neoliberal reform. Though Deng's changes were mostly done in an ad-hoc, common sense manner, he did invite famed neoliberal economist Milton Friedman to give him advice. A decade after China began its experiment, India followed suit. In 1991, after a sharp recession, **Prime Minister Narasimha Rao and Finance Minister Manmohan Singh scrapped a cumbersome system of business licensing, eased curbs on foreign investment, ended many state-sanctioned monopolies, lowered tariffs and** did a bunch of other neoliberal things. Although the results were not as dramatic as in China, **there was a** sustained **rise in economic growth**: It's almost impossible to overstate how important the growth explosions of India and China have been. So many people live in these two supergiant countries -- almost 40 percent of humanity, several times the total living in the developed world -- that together they determine the entire shape of human progress. During the last three decades, India and China have done more to reduce world poverty than any other force in history: Dry facts and figures shouldn't obscure the poignant human reality of this miracle. People who once bathed in dirty rivers, defecated outside and saw a quarter of their children die before age 5 are getting food, shelter and clean water. Hundreds of millions of **indigent farmers have moved on to better lives in cities.** Child mortality in India is down by almost five-sixths. It could reasonably be argued that nothing this good has ever happened before in human history. And **India and China's growth appears far from over.** So sure, the Washington Consensus didn't boost Latin America into the ranks of rich countries. And the neoliberal reforms in the former Soviet Union met with mixed success. But India and China account for more than three times as many people as all of those countries combined. Their sweeping reduction in extreme poverty alone makes neoliberalism a qualified success. Though the free-market approach unquestionably has its shortcomings, it would be wrong to label it "bad economics," as Rodrik does. The truth, as usual, is more complicated.

#### 5] Mobilization is impossible – self-hatred, love for the game, and lack of recognition of subjugation all disprove their thesis. Independently, neoliberal governments crack down on unions which kills aff solvency.

Han ’15 [Byung-Chul, “Why revolution is no longer possible”, 10-23-2015, https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/transformation/why-revolution-is-no-longer-possible/]//pranav

Accordingly, I tried to say why revolution is no longer possible today. Why is the neoliberal system of domination so stable? Why is there so little resistance to it? Why does the resistance that does occur so quickly come to naught? Why, despite the ever-expanding divide between rich and poor, is revolution no longer possible? To explain this state of affairs, we need a precise understanding of how power and domination function today. Anyone wishing to install a new system of rule must eliminate resistance. The same holds for the neoliberal order. Implementing a new system of dominion requires an instance of power that posits; often, this entails the use of force. However, power that posits a system is not identical to power that stabilizes a system internally. As is well known, Margaret Thatcher, the standard bearer of neoliberalism, treated unions as “internal enemies” and combated them violently. For all that, using force to establish the neoliberal agenda does not amount to system-preserving power. System-preserving power is not repressive, but seductive In disciplinary and industrial society, system-preserving power was repressive. Factory workers were brutally exploited by factory owners. Such violent exploitation of others’ labor entailed acts of protest and resistance. There, it was possible for a revolution to topple the standing relations of production. In that system of repression, both the oppressors and the oppressed were visible. There was a concrete opponent — a visible enemy —and one could offer resistance. The neoliberal system of domination has a wholly different structure. Now, system-preserving power no longer works through repression, but through seduction — that is, it leads us astray. It is no longer visible, as was the case under the regime of discipline. Now, there is no longer a concrete opponent, no enemy suppressing freedom that one might resist. Neoliberalism turns the oppressed worker into a free contractor, an entrepreneur of the self. Today, everyone is a self-exploiting worker in their own enterprise. Every individual is master and slave in one. This also means that class struggle has become an internal struggle with oneself. Today, anyone who fails to succeed blames themselves and feels ashamed. People see themselves, not society, as the problem. The subjugated subject is not even aware of its subjugation Any disciplinary power that expends effort to force human beings into a straitjacket of commandments and prohibitions proves inefficient. It is significantly more efficient to ensure that people subordinate themselves to domination on their own. The efficacy defining the system today stems from the fact that, instead of operating through prohibition and privation, it aims to please and fulfill. Instead of making people compliant, it endeavors to make them dependent. This logic of neoliberal efficiency also holds for surveillance. In the 1980s, to cite one example, there were vehement protests against the German national census. Even schoolchildren took to the streets. From today’s perspective, the information requested therein— profession, education levels, and distance from the workplace — seem almost laughable. At the time, people believed that they were facing the state as an instance of domination wresting data from citizens against their will. That time is long past. Today, people expose themselves willingly. Precisely this sense of freedom is what makes protest impossible. In contrast to the days of the census, hardly anyone protests against surveillance. Free self-disclosure and self-exposure follow the same logic of efficiency as free self-exploitation. What is there to protest against? Oneself? Conceptual artist Jenny Holzer has formulated the paradox of the present situation: “Protect me from what I want.” It is important to distinguish between power that posits and power that preserves. Today, power that maintains the system assumes a “smart” and friendly guise. In so doing, it makes itself invisible and unassailable. The subjugated subject does not even recognize that it has been subjugated. The subject thinks she is free. This mode of domination neutralizes resistance quite effectively. Domination that represses and attacks freedom is not stable. The neoliberal regime proves stable by immunizing itself against all resistance, because it makes use of freedom instead of repressing it. Suppressing freedom quickly provokes resistance; exploiting freedom does not. After the Asian financial crisis, South Korea stood paralyzed and shocked. The IMF intervened and extended credit. In return, the government had to assert its neoliberal agenda by force. This was repressive, positing power — the kind that often proves violent and differs from system-preserving power, which manages to pass itself off as freedom. According to Naomi Klein, the state of social shock following catastrophes such as the financial crisis in South Korea — or the current crisis in Greece — offers the chance to radically reprogram society by force. Today, there is hardly any resistance in South Korea. Quite the opposite: a vast consensus prevails — as well as depression and burnout. South Korea now has the world’s highest suicide rate. People enact violence on themselves instead of seeking to change society. Aggression directed outward, which would entail revolution, has yielded to aggression directed inward, against oneself. Today, no collaborative, networked multitude exists that might rise up in a global mass of protest and revolution. Instead, the prevailing mode of production is based on lonesome and isolated self-entrepreneurs, who are also estranged from themselves. Companies used to compete with each other. Within each enterprise, however, solidarity could occur. Today, everyone is competing against everyone else — and within the same enterprise, too. Even though such competition heightens productivity by leaps and bounds, it destroys solidarity and communal spirit. No revolutionary mass can arise from exhausted, depressive, and isolated individuals. Neoliberalism cannot be explained in Marxist terms. The famous “alienation” of labor does not even occur. Today, we dive eagerly into work — until we burn out. The first stage of burnout syndrome, after all, is euphoria. Burnout and revolution are mutually exclusive. Accordingly, it is mistaken to believe that the Multitude will cast off the parasitic Empire to inaugurate a communist society.

### Climate Strikes

Fisher & Nasrin is ab school children. Going on strikes – think greta Thunberg not workers - mans squo solves

#### Best science proves no warming impact.

Idso et al, PhDs, 18

(Craig, Geography@ArizonaState, David Legates, Climatology@Delaware, ProfClimatology@Deleware, Fred Singer, Physics@Princeton, ProfEnviroScience@Virginia, Climate Change Reconsidered II: Fossil Fuels, NIPCC, Ch.2, p. 108-109, Chapter Contributors: Joseph Bast, FormerPresident@HeartlandInstitute, Patrick Frank, PhD Chemistry@Stanford, Kenneth Haapala, MS Econ, President@Science+EnvironmentalPolicyProject, Jay Lehr, PhD Hyrdrology@Arizona, Patrick Moore, Co-Founder@Greenpeace, PhD Ecology@UniversityBrittishColumbia, Willie Soon, PhD AerospaceEngineering@USC, Chapter Reviewers: Charles Anderson, PhD Biology@Stanford, AssocProfBiolofy@PennState, Dennis Avery, DirectorFoodSecurity@Hudson, FormerUSDeptAg, Timothy Ball, PhD Climatology@QueenMary, FormerProfGeography@Winnipeg, David Bowen, PhD Geology@UCBoulder, ProfGeology@MontanaState, David Burton, MA CompSci@UTAustin, Mark Campbell, PhD Chemistry@JohnsHopkins, ProfChemistry@USNavalAcademy, David Deming, PhD PublicPolicy@Harvard, ProfPublicPolicy@Harvard, Rex Fleming, PhD AtmosphericScience@Michigan, Lee Gerhard, PhD Geology@Kansas, François Gervais, PhD Physics@UniversityNewOreleans, ProfPhysics@FrançoisRabelaisUniversity, Laurence Gould, ProfPhysics@UniversityHatford, PhD Physics@Temple, Kesten Green, PhD Managment@VictoriaManagmentSchool, Hermann Harde, PhD Engineering@UniversityOfKaiserslautern, Howard Hayden, PhD Physics@DenverUniversity, Ole Humlum, PhD GlacialGeomorphology@UniversityCopenhagen, ProfGeography@Oslo, Richard Keen, PhD Climatology@Colorado, ProfAtmosphericScience@Colorado, William Kininmonth, MSc@Colorado, FormerHead@AustralianBureauOfMeteorologyNationalClimateCenter, Anthony Lupo, PhD AtmosphericScience@Purdue, ProfAtmosphericScience@Missouri, Robert Murphy, PhD Chemistry@MIT, ProfPharmacology@Colorado, David Nebert, MD@UniversityOregon, ProfEnvironmentalHealth@Cincinati, Norman Page, PhD Geology@Illinois, Frederick Palmer, JD@Arizona, Gath Paltridge, PhD AtmosphericPhysics@UniversityMelbourne, ChiefResearchScientist@CSIRODivisionAtmosphericResearch, Jim Petch, PhD Geography@KingsCollegeLondon, Jan-Erik Solheim, MA PoliSci@Oslo, FormerExecDirectorUNEnvironmentProgram, Peter Stilbs, PhD Chemistry@RoyalInstituteTechnology, Roger Tattersol, BA History+PhilosophyOfScience@Leeds, Frank Tipler, PhD Physics@Maryland, ProfPhysics@Tulane, Ftitz Vahrenholt, PhD Chemistry@Munster, Art Viterito, PhD Climatology@Denver, ProfGeography@Maryland, Lance Wallace, PhD Physics@CUNY)

Methodology The Scientific Method is a series of requirements imposed on scientists to ensure the integrity of their work. The IPCC has not followed established rules that guide scientific research. Appealing to consensus may have a place in science, but not as a means of shutting down debate. Uncertainty in science is unavoidable but must be acknowledged. Many declaratory and predictive statements about the global climate are not warranted by science. Observations Surface air temperature is governed by energy flow from the Sun to Earth and from Earth back into space. Whatever diminishes or intensifies this energy flow can change air temperature. Levels of carbon dioxide and methane in the atmosphere are governed by processes of the carbon cycle. Exchange rates and other climatological processes are poorly understood. The geological record shows temperatures and CO2 levels in the atmosphere have not been stable, making untenable the IPCC’s assumption that they would be stable in the future in the absence of human emissions. Water vapor is the dominant greenhouse gas owing to its abundance in the atmosphere and the wide range of spectra in which it absorbs radiation. Carbon dioxide (CO2) absorbs energy only in a very narrow range of the longwave infrared spectrum. Controversies Reconstructions of average global surface temperature differ depending on the methodology used. The warming of the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries has not been shown to be beyond the bounds of natural variability. General circulation models (GCMs) are unable to accurately depict complex climate processes. They do not accurately hindcast or forecast the climate effects of human-related greenhouse gas emissions. Estimates of equilibrium climate sensitivity (the amount of warming that would occur following a doubling of atmospheric CO2 level) range widely. The IPCC’s estimate is higher than many recent estimates. Solar irradiance, magnetic fields, UV fluxes, and cosmic rays are poorly understood and may have greater influence on climate than general circulation models currently assume. Climate Impacts There is little evidence that the warming of the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries has caused a general increase in severe weather events. Meteorological science suggests a warmer world will see milder weather patterns. Arctic ice is losing mass, but melting commenced before there was a human impact on climate and is not unprecedented. Antarctica is either gaining ice mass or is unchanged. Best available data show sea-level rise is not accelerating. Local and regional sea levels continue to exhibit typical natural variability. The link between warming and drought is weak, and by some measures drought decreased over the twentieth century. Changes in the hydrosphere of this type are regionally highly variable and show a closer correlation with multidecadal climate rhythmicity than they do with global temperature. Plants have responded positively to rising temperatures and carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere, a trend that is likely to continue beyond the twenty-first century. Why Scientists Disagree Climate is an interdisciplinary subject requiring insights from many fields of study. Very few scholars have mastery of more than one or two of these disciplines. Fundamental uncertainties arise from insufficient observational evidence and disagreements over how to interpret data and how to set the parameters of models. Many scientists trust the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to objectively report the latest scientific findings on climate change, but it has failed to produce balanced reports and has allowed its findings to be misrepresented to the public. Climate scientists, like all humans, can have tunnel vision. Bias, even or especially if unconscious, can be especially pernicious when data are equivocal and allow multiple interpretations, as in climatology. Appeals to Consensus Surveys and abstract-counting exercises that are said to show a “scientific consensus” on the causes and consequences of climate change invariably ask the wrong questions or the wrong people. No survey data exist that support claims of consensus on important scientific questions. Some survey data, petitions, and peer-reviewed research show deep disagreement among scientists on issues that must be resolved before the man-made global warming hypothesis can be accepted. Some 31,000 scientists have signed a petition saying “there is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth’s atmosphere and disruption of the Earth’s climate.” Prominent climate scientists have said repeatedly that there is no consensus on the most important issues in climate science.

#### 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.