## 3

#### Interpretation: The affirmative debater must defend a legal policy action.

#### Violation: They defend the resolution as a general principle.

#### Recognize means approve of something as having legal authority.

Merriam Webster "Definition of RECOGNIZE," No Publication, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/recognize//ww> ap

to accept and approve of (something) as having legal or official authority

#### Resolved means to enact by law.

Words & Phrases ’64

(Words and Phrases; 1964; Permanent Edition)

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### Standards:

#### [1] Ground – their interp destroys engagement – we lose access to every DA that is reliant on implementation such as politics DAs, econ DAs, crime DAs, etc. Also kills K and CP ground since it’s not competitive and the aff gets to defend ideal conditions – that’s key to testing the aff. That’s a majority of the neg ground which either means the neg is pigeonholed into defending inequality is good or they don’t have to defend their advocacy against any well researched objections – that destroys advocacy skills – that’s a voter – there’s tons of screwed up things in the world we can’t fix without advocating for solutions.

#### [2] Precision – not defending the text of the resolution justifies the affirmative doing away with random words in the resolution which a] means they’re not within the topic which is a voter for jurisdiction since you can only vote affirmative on the resolution and this debate never should have happened, b] they’re unpredictable and impossible to engage in so we always lose

#### Drop the Debater –

#### [1] Sets a precedent so debaters don’t become abusive

#### [2] Drop the argument is the same thing since you drop the aff.

#### Voters:

#### [1] Fairness –

#### [a] constitutive to the judge to decide the better debater, only fairness is in your jurisdiction because it skews decision making.

#### [2] Education -

#### [a] The only portable impact of debate that we care about. Schools fund debate for education, killing educations means it kills debate.

#### CI:

#### [a] Reasonability causes a race to the bottom because debaters keep being barely reasonable, magnifying abuse.

#### [b] We debate about a specified briteline which collapses to an interp

#### No RVIs:

#### [A] Illogical for you to get offense for being fair, that is the 1ac’s burden

#### [B] Baiting – rvi’s incentive debaters to read abusive positions to win off theory

## 1

#### Reconciliation passes now - Biden PC is key to getting democratic skeptics on board, but it’s tentative

Cochrane & Weisman 11/05 [Emily Cochrane - correspondent based in Washington. She has covered Congress since late 2018, focusing on the annual debate over government funding and economic legislation, ranging from emergency pandemic relief to infrastructure, Jonathan Weisman - congressional correspondent, veteran Washington journalist and author of the novel “No. 4 Imperial Lane” and the nonfiction book “(((Semitism))): Being Jewish in America in the Age of Trump.” His career in journalism stretches back 30 years, “Live Updates: House Democrats Push Toward Votes on Biden’s Agenda”, 11-05-2021, https://www.nytimes.com/live/2021/11/05/us/biden-spending-infrastructure-bill]//pranav

At the White House, Mr. Biden called on lawmakers to pass the legislation. “I’m asking every House member, member of the House of Representatives, to vote yes on both these bills right now,” the president said. Spooked by Tuesday’s electoral drubbing, Democrats labored to overcome concerns among moderates about the cost and details of a rapidly evolving, $1.85 trillion social safety net and climate plan and push it through over unified Republican opposition. They also hoped to clear a Senate-passed $1 trillion bipartisan infrastructure bill — the largest investment in the nation’s aging public works in a decade — for Mr. Biden’s signature. Top Democratic officials said they were confident they could complete both measures by day’s end, but Speaker Nancy Pelosi of California and her team continued to haggle with holdouts. Several moderates were pushing for more information about the cost of the sprawling plan, including a nonpartisan analysis from the Congressional Budget Office, the official scorekeeper responsible for calculating the fiscal impact of the 2,135-page legislation. “I think everyone’s waiting for the C.B.O. to do their job,” said Representative Jared Golden, Democrat of Maine, speaking to reporters on Friday morning as he left Ms. Pelosi’s office, where White House officials were also meeting on next steps. But Representative Steny H. Hoyer of Maryland, the majority leader, said the cost estimate would not be ready by the end of the day, and a person familiar with the discussions said a score from the budget office was weeks away from completion. “We’re working on it,” Mr. Hoyer said. Ms. Pelosi spent much of the day on Thursday buttonholing lawmakers on the House floor to try to corral support for the social policy bill, which includes monthly payments to families with children, universal prekindergarten, a four-week paid family and medical leave program, health care subsidies and a broad array of climate change initiatives. Mr. Biden and members of his cabinet worked the phones to win over Democratic skeptics. With Republicans united in opposition, Democrats could afford to lose as few as three votes from their side. As Democrats labored to unite their members behind the bill, Republicans sought to wreak procedural havoc on the House floor, forcing a vote to adjourn the chamber that leaders held open for hours to buy time for their negotiations. While the Senate approved the $1 trillion infrastructure bill in August, the measure has stalled as progressives have repeatedly refused to supply their votes for it until there is agreement on the other bill.

#### Business lobbying backlash ensures Sinema flips – empirics prove she doesn’t like similar bills

Duda ’21 [Jeremy, Prior to joining the Arizona Mirror, he worked at the Arizona Capitol Times, where he spent eight years covering the Governor's Office and two years as editor of the Yellow Sheet Report, “Business groups urge Kelly, Sinema to oppose pro-union PRO Act”, 08-30-2021, https://www.azmirror.com/2021/08/30/business-groups-urge-kelly-sinema-to-oppose-pro-union-pro-act/]//pranav

Business groups publicly called on Democratic U.S. Sens. Mark Kelly and Kyrsten Sinema to oppose a sweeping piece of pro-organized labor legislation that would wipe out Arizona’s “right-to-work” law that prohibits mandatory union membership. At a press conference at the office of the Arizona chapter of the Associated General Contractors near the state Capitol on Monday, leaders of several business groups warned that the Protecting the Right to Organize Act — or PRO Act, as it’s more commonly known — would undermine Arizona’s recovery from the economic slump it faced last year due to the COVID-19 pandemic, undermine the “gig economy,” jeopardize secret ballots in union organization votes, give unions access to confidential employee information and strip Arizonans of their right not to join a union. The bill would allow unions to override right-to-work laws and collect union dues from non-members who still benefit from collective bargaining. It would also prohibit company-sponsored meetings to urge employees against unionizing, define most independent contractors as employees, protect employees who are attempting to unionize from being fired and allow unions to engage in secondary strikes in support of other striking workers, among other provisions. “We want to thank and tell Senator Sinema and Senator Kelly that we appreciate them for not signing on as co-sponsors to the PRO Act, because if they were to change their opinions, New York Sen. Chuck Schumer will put this up for a vote,” said Danny Seiden, president and CEO of the Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry. Kelly and Sinema are two of only three Senate Democrats, along with Virginia’s Mark Warner, who haven’t co-sponsored the bill or thrown their public support behind it. Kelly last month told the Huffington Post that he opposes the independent contractor provision, but that he supports the “overall goals” of the legislation. Sinema is widely known as a holdout on the Democratic side and hasn’t supported the PRO Act, but spokesman Pablo Sierra-Carmona indicated that she hasn’t made up her mind, and that she won’t do so unless and until it comes up for a vote in the Senate.

#### They lash out against Reconciliation – it includes similar provisions

FURCHTGOTT-ROTH 10/09 [Diana, former acting assistant secretary for economic policy at the U.S. Department of the Treasury, is adjunct professor of economics at George Washington University, “Democrats can't pass the PRO Act, so it's buried in the reconciliation bill”, 10-09-2021, https://thehill.com/opinion/white-house/575992-dems-cant-pass-the-pro-act-so-its-buried-in-the-reconciliation-bill]//pranav

Union membership has been declining for decades as workers find better uses than union dues for their hard-earned dollars. But union bosses and their supporters are trying to change the law to force hard-working Americans into unions. How? Through the Protecting the Right to Organize Act (PRO Act), a bill that would expand the power of union leaders at the expense of workers. After sailing through the House, the PRO Act now appears stalled in the Senate and Democrats are trying to slip some PRO Act provisions into a massive reconciliation bill. American workers are wise to turn down union membership. Union pension plans are in trouble. In 2020, the Labor Department listed 121 union plans in critical status, defined as less than 65 percent funded, and 61 in endangered status, with less than 80 percent funded. Unions desperately need new workers to join, because they pay contributions for many years without withdrawing money. Most recently, Amazon workers in Alabama resoundingly rejected efforts by the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store International Union to organize their plant, with more than 70 percent of workers voting against the union. The union’s plan was in critical status between 2015 and 2019, and the Labor Department informed the plan’s administrators that it had to be reorganized by reducing benefits and increasing contributions. Union leaders and their allies on Capitol Hill believe the way to increase membership after decades of decline is to pass elements of the PRO Act through reconciliation. Unlike the PRO Act, which needs 60 votes in the Senate to enable it to move to President Biden’s desk for signature, the reconciliation bill, which deals with taxes and spending, needs only a simple majority. So via a massive reconciliation bill, congressional Democrats are trying to move some labor union provisions of the PRO Act by arguing they are actually revenue raisers.

#### Reconciliation is k2 stopping existential climate change – warming is incremental and every change in temperature is vital

Higgins 8/16 [Trevor, Senior Director, Domestic Climate and Energy, “Budget Reconciliation Is the Key to Stopping Climate Change”, 08-16-2021, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2021/08/16/502681/budget-reconciliation-key-stopping-climate-change/]//pranav

The United States is suffering acutely from the chaotic changes in climate that scientists now directly attribute to the burning of fossil fuels and other human activity. The drought, fires, extreme heat, and floods that have already killed hundreds this summer across the continent and around the world are a tragedy—and a warning of worsening instability yet to come. However, this week, the Senate initiated an extraordinary legislative response that would set the world on a different path. Enacting the full scope of President Joe Biden’s Build Back Better agenda would put the American economy to work leading a global transition to clean energy and stabilizing the climate. A look at what’s coming next through the budget reconciliation process reveals a ray of hope that is easy to miss amid the fitful negotiations of recent months: At long last, Congress is on the verge of major legislation that would build a more equitable, just, and inclusive clean energy economy. This is our shot to stop climate change. Building a clean energy future must start now Until the global economy stops polluting the air and instead starts to draw down the emissions of years past, the world will continue to heat up, blundering past perilous tipping points that threaten irreversible and catastrophic consequences. Stemming the extent of warming at 1.5 degrees Celsius rather 2 degrees or worse will reduce the risk of crossing such tipping points or otherwise exceeding the adaptive capacity of human society. Every degree matters. Stabilizing global warming at 1.5 degrees Celsius starts with cutting annual greenhouse gas emissions in the United States to half of peak levels by 2030. This isn’t about temporary offsets or incremental gains in efficiency—it’s about the rapid adoption of scalable solutions that will work throughout the world to eliminate global net emissions by 2050 and sustain net-negative emissions thereafter. Building this better future will tackle climate change, deliver on environmental justice, and create good jobs. It will give us a shot to stop the planet from continuously warming. It will alleviate the concentrated burdens of fossil fuel pollution, which are concentrated in systemically disadvantaged, often majority Black and brown communities. It will empower American workers to compete in the global clean energy economy of the 21st century. There is no time to lose in the work of building a clean energy future.

## 2

#### CP Text: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike except for covid essential workers.

#### In the squo, the right to strike is banned by the ILO for essential workers.

Chima 13 Chima, Sylvester C. “Global Medicine: Is It Ethical or Morally Justifiable for Doctors and Other Healthcare Workers to Go on Strike?” *BMC Medical Ethics*, BioMed Central, 19 Dec. 2013, bmcmedethics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6939-14-S1-S5. SJEP

Despite the fundamental importance of the right to strike in collective bargaining and industrial relations, it has been recognised that derogations or restrictions to this right may be necessary to avoid abuse or usage of this right contrary to the needs of the community [[33](https://bmcmedethics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6939-14-S1-S5#ref-CR33)]. The concept of 'essential service' expresses the idea that certain activities are of such fundamental importance to the community, that their disruption may have particularly harmful consequences to the health, safety or welfare of members of the public [[51](https://bmcmedethics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6939-14-S1-S5#ref-CR51)]. Therefore one of the mechanisms by which governments or elected officials have used to manage the impact of strikes on certain professional groups has been to designate such groups as "essential workers". These employee groups are then statutorily prohibited from striking. In other words they are not allowed to withdraw their labour, regardless of the circumstances. The international labour organization (ILO) has provided a strict list of such "essential services", including the hospital sector, electricity services, water supply services, the telephone service, the police and the armed forces, the fire-fighting services, public or private prison services, the provision of food to pupils of school age and (more) the cleaning of schools and air traffic control. However, the ILO list is not exhaustive and a state can add other services to its national legislation if it these are deemed essential to its particular circumstances [[33](https://bmcmedethics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6939-14-S1-S5#ref-CR33)].

#### Recognizing essential workers’ right to strike would proliferate and expand current strikes occurring in small quantities due to covid on a large scale. This would lead to an overwhelming influx of essential worker strikes.

Abigail **Abrams**, 11-30-20**20**, "How COVID-19 Pushed Frontline Workers Into Collective Action," Time, https://time.com/5928528/frontline-workers-strikes-labor/

Cerue Cotton never expected to find herself on a picket line. As a forklift operator for Cash-Wa, a regional food distributor in Fargo, North Dakota, she enjoyed the physical challenges and responsibility of her job, and was used to working overnight hours. But this fall, everything changed. The coronavirus, which had seemed like a far-away problem last spring and summer, began spiking in her community in September. Cotton has a newborn baby and two older children at home, both of whom have asthma. She no longer felt safe going to work. Cash-Wa had for months failed to require masks in its warehouses, enforce social distancing rules or otherwise screen employees. The company’s only precautions were handing out cloth masks and placing two bottles of hand sanitizer in the break room. By late November, Cotton and her fellow workers—all deemed “essential,” under guidance from the federal government—had reached a breaking point: they banded together and refused to work for 24 hours. “I was super nervous because it was my very first time doing a strike,” Cotton says. Across the country, workers like Cotton, who have never gone on strike and did not consider themselves activists, have been moved to organize protests, sick-outs and strikes over COVID-19. Unions report a surge in workers taking action and an increased interest in organizing. Grocery stores, warehouses, hospitals, nursing homes, fast food restaurants, schools, and health clinics—unionized and not—all saw walkouts in 2020. While the National Labor Relations Board temporarily froze union representation elections last spring, and COVID-19 has continued to complicate some elections, unions of all types say the pandemic has fueled interest in their work. National unions across industries including health care, food service and retail say they are continuing to field more calls from from workers who want to join up and seeing thousands of current members eagerly volunteering to take action. Cerue Cotton, a forklift operator for Cash-Wa Distributing in Fargo, N.D., on Jan. 2. Nina Robinson for TIME The labor turmoil has followed the course of the pandemic. Last spring, Amazon warehouse workers, Whole Foods employees, and gig workers at Instacart and Shipt refused to work in protest of their companies’ lack of coronavirus safety precautions. In July, workers at the JBS beef plant in Greeley, Colo., one of the country’s largest meatpacking plants, walked out following a deadly COVID-19 outbreak, and in the fall, as the third wave of infections began overwhelming much of the American heartland, a coalition of five unions across six Midwestern hospitals joined forces to demand in a series of letters that the Catholic hospital chain Ascension Health improve staffing levels and infection control protocols. The complaints rise from an awkward reality: With certain exceptions, such as doctors and nurses, many of the workers deemed “essential” during the pandemic earn relatively low wages and lack (of) access to employer benefits, like paid sick leave (and) or compensation for working under hazardous conditions. While the shortage of personal protective equipment (PPE) eased at larger hospitals by the end of 2020, many essential workers who are not directly in the medical field are still struggling to consistently access masks or face shields. Meanwhile, many employers of these essential workers, including Walmart, Amazon, Kroger and Costco, have raked in record profits. The Brookings Institution found that 13 of the largest retail companies in the country earned a total of $16.7 billion more in 2020 than they did in 2019, while raising workers’ pay an average of just $1.11 per hour since the start of the pandemic. The federal government has, for the most part, declined to erect any safeguards for the workers it said should keep working during a pandemic. While Congress included paid sick leave in its first coronavirus relief package last spring, large loopholes left millions of essential workers ineligible. Lawmakers passed no federal hazard pay requirements. The Trump Administration’s National Labor Relations Board, the agency tasked with enforcing private sector labor laws, further rolled back and weakened worker protections, while the U.S. Department of Labor’s Occupational Safety and Health Administration has been criticized for its lax treatment of worker complaints during the pandemic.

#### Impacts:

#### 1] Destroys current responses to covid through a stoppage in distribution of covid vaccines

Fran **Kritz**, 1-20-20**21**, "Who Can Administer COVID-19 Vaccines?," Verywell Health, https://www.verywellhealth.com/who-can-administer-covid-19-vaccines-5094165

News footage these last few weeks has focused on healthcare workers getting the COVID-19 shot in the arm of their choice. But just who is doing the vaccinating? The answer is a variety of health professionals, some trained and deputized by states specifically for the current health emergency. “Don’t worry about who’s giv(e)ing you your shot anymore than you might have for any other vaccine,” John Sanders III, MD, MPH, chief of infectious diseases at Wake Forest Baptist Health in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, tells Verywell. “They have been trained and certified to give you the shot expertly.” Even before COVID-19, states determined which healthcare professionals could give vaccinations. Some allowed pharmacists and pharmacy technicians, and others did not. “But with COVID, it’s all hands on deck for vaccination,” Claire Hannan, MPH, the executive director of the Association of Immunization Managers, tells Verywell. Hannan says that because of the current COVID-19 public health emergency, “states can pass orders that allow providers who might not typically be vaccinators in a state to give the COVID-19 vaccine.” According to the American Public Health Association, professionals who will be able to administer the COVID-19 vaccine include: Nurses Nurse practitioners Doctors Students in health professions Physician assistants Pharmacy technicians Veterinarians (who routinely administer shots to animals) Dentists Medics EMTs Physicians say relying on these health professionals is exactly the right way to get the vaccines administered. “I’ve given exactly one vaccine in my career, so you wouldn’t want it from me,” Amesh Adalja, MD, senior scholar at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health Center for Health Security, tells Verywell. “People getting the vaccine should feel very confident in the professionals administering them who have been trained to give the shots.”

#### Puts us back to square one with widespread death and suffering

**Yale School of Medicine**, 7-2-20**21**, "How Equitable COVID-19 Vaccine Distribution Impacts Global Health," https://medicine.yale.edu/news-article/how-equitable-covid-19-vaccine-distribution-impacts-global-health/

SS: Thank you. So, I appreciate the gravity of the situation obviously, and the substantive offering and donation of vaccines that the Biden administration and the G7 now have offered, but clearly this is insufficient to meet the global demand and need. What are the consequences of not meeting that need? What does that mean for COVID-19 in our world right now? SO: The infection doesn't wait for the vaccination delivery schedule. It proceeds the way it wants to proceed, and the only thing we can do is vaccinate a high number of people to change the trajectory. So there are a few conceivable scenarios, one being that we will see flare-ups like India, where you have really, really high rates of infection and then mortality. And now there's a flare-up happening in Uganda and in East Africa. And so the outbreak burns through various populations. There are two consequences (of not following include). One is the likelihood of new variants emerging increases. Right now, our current vaccines are holding up against these newer variants including the Delta variant that initially was identified in India. If you increase the likelihood of more variants emerging, you will eventually have a chink in your armor, and that's concerning. So it’s in our shared interest to make sure that there's vaccinations in other countries. The other part is the mortality (with) in these places, which can be heartbreaking and substantial, while you’re on the path to becoming an endemic infection. There will still be enough people who are vulnerable for vaccination to be worthwhile into 2022, even if we don't do a good job. But during that period, some populations may enter an endemic phase rather than these exponential outbreak phases, but with a lot of tragedy. Kaveh Khoshnood: Also, (and) there is a lot of indirect consequence of COVID-19 as well, including a halt in routine vaccination of children for polio or measles in many countries. We've seen an increase in mental health issues, substance abuse, suicides, and interpersonal violence. So it is absolutely urgent to do all we can to bring this pandemic to a stop. SS: There's definitely data already that's been generated showing the impact of COVID and diverting resources to fight COVID on other sectors of the health system. Tuberculosis, HIV, and malaria have all been affected. Data have shown that we've regressed 10 years already in terms of TB control globally.

## Case

### Framing

#### [9] Extinction comes first under any framework.

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)

#### [2] Extinction affects the minority groups first, since the poor are the most vulnerable towards existensial threats.

### Contentions

#### Increased strikes sabotage the economy – they cause major disruptions and lower income for workers.

Grabianowski 6 [Ed; Author and freelance writer. He’s worked as a contributing writer for io9, HowStuffWorks, and Sweethome. His fiction has appeared in Black Static, Fear Project, and other publications and anthologies, including Fear After Fear; “How Strikes Work,” HSW; 3/24/06; https://money.howstuffworks.com/strike.htm]//SJWen

#### Labor strikes can cause major disruptions to industry, commerce and the lives of many people who aren't even connected to the strike itself. The Professional Air Traffic Controllers Association strike in 1981 resulted in the firing of thousands of air traffic controllers, and the New York City transit strike in late 2005 affected millions of people. The history of strikes and labor unions is a key chapter in the story of the Industrial Revolution. While the reasons behind strikes can be complex, they all boil down to two key elements: money and power. In this article, we'll find out how labor strikes have affected the balance of power between corporations and workers, what laws regulate strikes and learn about some important strikes in history. It's difficult to say when the first real labor strike occurred. The word "strike" was first used in the 1700s, and probably comes from to notion of dealing a blow to the employer [ref]. In 1786, a group of printers in Philadelphia requested a raise and the company rejected it. They stopped working in protest and eventually received their raise. Other professionals followed suit in the next few decades. Everyone in a city who practiced the same profession agreed to set prices and wages at the same rate. Members would shun anyone who diverged from the agreement, refusing to work in the same shop and forcing employers to fire them. By the 1800s, formal trade societies and guilds began to emerge. To have a strike today, you must have a union (though not necessarily an official union) -- an organization of workers that bargain collectively with an employer. Workers form unions because an individual worker is powerless compared to an employer, who can set low wages and long working hours as long as it adheres to labor laws. When workers combine to form a union, they collectively have enough power to negotiate with the employer. The main weapon the union has against the employer is the threat of a strike action. At its most basic level, a strike occurs when all the workers in the union stop coming to work. With no workers, the business shuts down. The employer stops making money, though it is still spending money on taxes, rent, electricity and maintenance. The longer the strike lasts, the more money the employer loses. Of course, the workers aren't getting paid either, so they're losing money as well. Some unions build up "war chests" -- funds to pay striking workers. But it isn't usually very much, and it's often not enough for a prolonged strike. Strikes help explain why unions are more powerful than individuals. Imagine if an employer refuses to give a raise to an individual worker. She then decides to stop coming to work in protest. The employer simply fires her for not coming to work. That one worker has no power to influence the employer. However, it can be very costly for an employ

#### Illegal strikes solve better and aff strikes become water downed and negotiated out by the state – TURNS CASE

Reddy 21 Reddy, Diana (Doctoral Researcher in the Jurisprudence and Social Policy Program at UC Berkeley) “" There Is No Such Thing as an Illegal Strike": Reconceptualizing the Strike in Law and Political Economy." Yale LJF 130 (2021): 421. <https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy>

In recent years, consistent with this vision, there has been a shift in the kinds of strikes workers and their organizations engage in—increasingly public-facing, engaged with the community, and capacious in their concerns.[178](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref178) They have transcended the ostensible apoliticism of their forebearers in two ways, less voluntaristic and less economistic. They are less voluntaristic in that they seek to engage and mobilize the broader community in support of labor’s goals, and those goals often include community, if not state, action. They are less economistic in that they draw through lines between workplace-based economic issues and other forms of exploitation and subjugation that have been constructed as “political.” These strikes do not necessarily look like what strikes looked like fifty years ago, and they often skirt—or at times, flatly defy—legal rules. Yet, they have often been successful. Since 2012, tens of thousands of workers in the Fight for $15 movement have engaged in discourse-changing, public law-building strikes. They do not shut down production, and their primary targets are not direct employers. For these reasons, they push the boundaries of exiting labor law.[179](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref179) Still, the risks appear to have been worth it. A 2018 report by the National Employment Law Center found that these strikes had helped twenty-two million low-wage workers win $68 billion in raises, a redistribution of wealth fourteen times greater than the value of the last federal minimum wage increase in 2007.[180](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref180) They have demonstrated the power of strikes to do more than challenge employer behavior. As Kate Andrias has argued: [T]he Fight for $15 . . . reject[s] the notion that unions’ primary role is to negotiate traditional private collective bargaining agreements, with the state playing a neutral mediating and enforcing role. Instead, the movements are seeking to bargain in the public arena: they are engaging in social bargaining with the state on behalf of all workers.”[181](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref181) In the so-called “red state” teacher strikes of 2018, more than a hundred thousand educators in West Virginia, Oklahoma, Arizona, and other states struck to challenge post-Great Recession austerity measures, which they argued hurt teachers and students, alike.[182](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref182) These strikes were illegal; yet, no penalties were imposed.[183](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref183) Rather, the strikes grew workers’ unions, won meaningful concessions from state governments, and built public support. As noted above, public-sector work stoppages are easier to conceive of as political, even under existing jurisprudential categories.[184](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref184) But these strikes were political in the broader sense as well. Educators worked with parents and students to cultivate support, and they explained how their struggles were connected to the needs of those communities.[185](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref185) Their power was not only in depriving schools of their labor power, but in making normative claims about the value of that labor to the community. Most recently, 2020 saw a flurry of work stoppages in support of the Black Lives Matter movement.[186](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref186) These ranged from Minneapolis bus drivers’ refusal to transport protesters to jail, to Service Employees International Union’s Strike for Black Lives, to the NBA players’ wildcat strike.[187](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref187) Some of these protests violated legal restrictions. The NBA players’ strike for instance, was inconsistent with a “no-strike” clause in their collective-bargaining agreement with the NBA.[188](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref188) And it remains an open question in each case whether workers sought goals that were sufficiently job-related as to constitute protected activity.[189](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref189) Whatever the conclusion under current law, however, striking workers demonstrated in fact the relationship between their workplaces and broader political concerns. The NBA players’ strike was resolved in part through an agreement that NBA arenas would be used as polling places and sites of civic engagement.[190](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref190) Workers withheld their labor in order to insist that private capital be used for public, democratic purposes. And in refusing to transport arrested protestors to jail, Minneapolis bus drivers made claims about their vision for public transport. Collectively, all of these strikes have prompted debates within the labor movement about what a strike is, and what its role should be. These strikes are so outside the bounds of institutionalized categories that public data sources do not always reflect them.[191](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref191) And there is, reportedly, a concern by some union leaders that these strikes do not look like the strikes of the mid-twentieth century. There has been a tendency to dismiss them.[192](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref192) In response, Bill Fletcher Jr., the AFL-CIO’s first Black Education Director, has argued, “People, who wouldn’t call them strikes, aren’t looking at history.”[193](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref193) Fletcher, Jr. analogizes these strikes to the tactics of the civil-rights movement.

er to fire every single worker when a union goes on strike (though it has happened).

#### Low wages inevitable and structural---labor monopsony, non-compete agreements and no unions

Smith 6-11-2018 – PhD, former assistant professor of finance at Stony Brook University (Noah, “Commentary: A job market this tight should deliver bigger raises,” *Chicago Tribune*, <http://www.chicagotribune.com/business/columnists/ct-biz-job-market-raises-20180611-story.html)//BB>

With the economy strong and unemployment low, why is wage growth so sluggish? Lots of economists and pundits are debating this vexing question. When the labor market gets tight, wages are supposed to rise faster. Instead, median wage growth is slower than it was back in 2016: The most benign explanation is that there's no mystery here -- total compensation, which includes both wages and benefits, may be accelerating: The first quarter of 2018 did see substantial compensation increases -- an annualized rate of almost 4 percent. But one quarter doesn't make a trend. In 2017, compensation growth was running at about 2.5 percent. That's lower than in the early 2000s, even though more prime-age Americans are at work now than then. Another benign explanation is that despite extremely low unemployment, the economy still isn't really at full employment yet. The Great Recession lasted so long that many workers simply gave up looking for jobs -- these people were classified not as unemployed, but as out of the labor force altogether. Some argue that when we take this shadow unemployment into account, the recovery -- and the associated wage growth -- are right on track. However, even in this picture, 2017 looks a bit weak. Also, using total compensation instead of wages might not be a good idea, because benefits might be increasing due to factors unrelated to the business cycle, such the rapid rise in health-care costs. If this is the case, then the disparity between now and the early 2000s increases -- wage growth in early 2018 has been equal to or lower than the trough of the early 2000s business cycle. There's also a possibility that some of the people who dropped out of the labor force during the Great Recession weren't really unemployed, but were just people who decided not to have formal jobs anymore by working under the table or in the black market. If that's true, then using prime-age employment overstates the unemployment rate, meaning that wage growth is even slower than it ought to be at this point in the cycle. So perhaps things aren't OK. It's possible that structural forces, unrelated to the business cycle, may be putting long-term downward pressure on wages. One such factor might be what economists call monopsony, or concentrated market power. Evidence is piling up that employers in the U.S. are able to hold down wages because it's hard for workers to find new jobs at higher pay in the area. If this power is greater now than in past years, it could be restraining wages, as Nobel economist Paul Krugman explains in an excellent blog post. Other structural factors -- increased use of noncompete agreements, and the continued decline of unions -- might be increasing employers' power to avoid raising pay. The idea that employer power is holding down wages is becoming more popular.