#### Counter interp: The affirmative debater may specify the United Kingdom if there is a solvency advocate grounded in the topic literature.

#### Core of the topic lit – countries like the US already allow for public sector strikes.

#### “a” means referring to a particular person or thing

Dictionary.com https://www.dictionary.com/browse/a

#### one (used before plural nouns that are preceded by a quantifier singular in form):

#### Err aff—they most likely misinterpreted bare plurals

Reiter and Frank ’10 (Nils Reiter and Anette Frank Department of Computational Linguistics Heidelberg University, Germany, July 2010. “Identifying Generic Noun Phrases” <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/5078/2fb22573c8b612743aade2d3e0b241f8ae0f.pdf>)

The above classification of generic expressions is well established in traditional formal semantics (cf. Krifka et al. (1995))2. As we argue in this paper, these distinctions are relevant for semantic processing in computational linguistics, especially for information extraction and ontology learning and population tasks. With appropriate semantic analysis of generic statements, we can not only formally capture and exploit generic knowledge, but also distinguish between information pertaining to individuals vs. classes. We will argue that the automatic identification of generic expressions should be cast as a machine learning problem instead of a rule-based approach, as there is (i) no transparent marking of genericity in English (as in most other European languages) and (ii) the phenomenon is highly context dependent. In this paper, we build on insights from formal semantics to establish a corpus-based machine learning approach for the automatic classification of generic expressions. In principle our approach is applicable to the detection of both generic NPs and generic sentences, and in fact it would be highly desirable and possibly advantageous to cover both types of genericity simultaneously. Our current work is confined to generic NPs, as there are no corpora available at present that contain annotations for genericity at the sentence level. The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 introduces generic expressions and motivates their relevance for knowledge acquisition and semantic processing tasks in computational linguistics. Section 3 reviews prior and related work. In section 4 we motivate the choice of feature sets for the automatic identification of generic NPs in context. Sections 5 and 6 present our experiments and results obtained for this task on the ACE-2 data set. Section 7 concludes. 2 Generic Expressions & their Relevance for Computational Linguistics 2.1 Interpretation of generic expressions Generic NPs There are two contrasting views on how to formally interpret generic NPs. According to the first one, a generic NP involves a special form of quantification. Quine (1960), for example, proposes a universally quantified reading for generic NPs. This view is confronted with the most important problem of all quantificationbased approaches, namely that the exact determination of the quantifier restriction (QR) is highly dependent on the context, as illustrated in (3)3. (3) a. Lions are mammals. QR: all lions b. Mammals give birth to live young. QR: less than half of all mammals 3Some of these examples are taken from Carlson (1977). c. Rats are bothersome to people. QR: few rats4 In view of this difficulty, several approaches restrict the quantification to only “relevant” (Declerck, 1991) or “normal” (Dahl, 1975) individuals. According to the second view, generic noun phrases denote kinds. Following Carlson (1977), a kind can be considered as an individual that has properties on its own. On this view, the generic NP cannot be analysed as a quantifier over individuals pertaining to the kind. For some predicates, this is clearly marked. (1.a), for instance, attributes a property to the kind lion that cannot be attributed to individual lions. Generic sentences are usually analysed using a special dyadic operator, as first proposed by Heim (1982). The dyadic operator relates two semantic constituents, the restrictor and the matrix: Q[x1, ..., xi]([x1, ..., xi] | {z } Restrictor ; 9y1, ..., yi[x1, .., xi, y1, ..., yi] | {z } Matrix ) By choosing GEN as a generic dyadic operator, it is possible to represent the two readings (a) and (b) of the characterising sentence (4) by variation in the specification of restrictor and matrix (Krifka et al., 1995). (4) Typhoons arise in this part of the pacific. (a) Typhoons in general have a common origin in this part of the pacific. (b) There arise typhoons in this part of the pacific. (a’) GEN[x; y](Typhoon(x);this-part-of-thepacific( y)^arise-in(x, y)) (b’) GEN[x; y](this-part-of-thepacific( x);Typhoon(y)^arise-in(y, x)) In order to cope with characterising sentences as in (2.a), we must allow the generic operator to quantify over situations or events, in this case, “normal” situations which were such that Erd˝os took amphetamines. 2.2 Relevance for computational linguistics Knowledge acquisition The automatic acquisition of formal knowledge for computational applications is a major endeavour in current research 4Most rats are not even noticed by people. 41 and could lead to big improvements of semanticsbased processing. Bos (2009), e.g., describes systems using automated deduction for language understanding tasks using formal knowledge. There are manually built formal ontologies such as SUMO (Niles and Pease, 2001) or Cyc (Lenat, 1995) and linguistic ontologies like Word- Net (Fellbaum, 1998) that capture linguistic and world knowledge to a certain extent. However, these resources either lack coverage or depth. Automatically constructed ontologies or taxonomies, on the other hand, are still of poor quality (Cimiano, 2006; Ponzetto and Strube, 2007). Attempts to automatically induce knowledge bases from text or encyclopaedic sources are currently not concerned with the distinction between generic and non-generic expressions, concentrating mainly on factual knowledge. However, rulelike knowledge can be found in textual sources in the form of generic expressions5. In view of the properties of generic expressions discussed above, this lack of attention bears two types of risks. The first concerns the distinction between classes and instances, regarding the attribution of properties. The second concerns modelling exceptions in both representation and inferencing. The distinction between classes and instances is a serious challenge even for the simplest methods in automatic ontology construction, e.g., Hearst (1992) patterns. The so-called IS-A patterns do not only identify subclasses, but also instances. Shakespeare, e.g., would be recognised as a hyponym of author in the same way as temple is recognised as a hyponym of civic building. Such a missing distinction between classes and instances is problematic. First, there are predicates that can only attribute properties to a kind (1.a). Second, even for properties that in principle can be attributed to individuals of the class, this is highly dependent on the selection of the quantifier’s restriction in context (3). In both cases, it holds that properties attributed to a class are not necessarily 5In the field of cognitive science, research on the acquisition of generic knowledge in humans has shown that adult speakers tend to use generic expressions very often when talking to children (Pappas and Gelman, 1998). We are not aware of any detailed assessment of the proportion of generic noun phrases in educational text genres or encyclopaedic resources like Wikipedia. Concerning generic sentences, Mathew and Katz (2009) report that 19.9% of the sentences in their annotated portion of the Penn Treebank are habitual (generic) and 80.1% episodic (non-generic). inherited by any or all instances pertaining to the class. Zirn et al. (2008) are the first to present fully automatic, heuristic methods to distinguish between classes and instances in the Wikipedia taxonomy derived by Ponzetto and Strube (2007). They report an accuracy of 81.6% and 84.5% for different classification schemes. However, apart from a plural feature, all heuristics are tailored to specific properties of the Wikipedia resource. Modelling exceptions is a cumbersome but necessary problem to be handled in ontology building, be it manually or by automatic means, and whether or not the genericity of knowledge is formalised explicitly. In artificial intelligence research, this area has been tackled for many years. Default reasoning (Reiter, 1980) is confronted with severe efficiency problems and therefore has not extended beyond experimental systems. However, the emerging paradigm of Answer Set Programming (ASP, Lifschitz (2008)) seems to be able to model exceptions efficiently. In ASP a given problem is cast as a logic program, and an answer set solver calculates all possible answer sets, where an answer set corresponds to a solution of the problem. Efficient answer set solvers have been proposed (Gelfond, 2007). Although ASP may provide us with very efficient reasoning systems, it is still necessary to distinguish and mark default rules explicitly (Lifschitz, 2002). Hence, the recognition of generic expressions is an important precondition for the adequate representation and processing of generic knowledge. 3 Prior Work Suh (2006) applied a rule-based approach to automatically identify generic noun phrases. Suh used patterns based on part of speech tags that identify bare plural noun phrases, reporting a precision of 28.9% for generic entities, measured against an annotated corpus, the ACE 2005 (Ferro et al., 2005). Neither recall nor f-measure are reported. To our knowledge, this is the single prior work on the task of identifying generic NPs.

#### Outweighs on common usage – one of the first results off Google which outweighs on accessibility for novices

Solves limits & precision – limits to basically one aff which means you’ll always know to prep for it

#### Standards—

#### 1] Clash—whole res creates stale debates with the same generics, destroys clash because there’s no new arguments. Specifying means the neg has to research more to have nuanced links to the aff—turns limits and outweighs on education because you have to learn more into the topic and have diversified clash

#### 2] PICs – Speccing is inevitable—if I run whole res, you can pic out of countries, mooting aff ground, which means I can’t leverage case, killing clash—outweighs bc if I spec, you get some ground through generic Ks, but the 1AR in your interp has no ground and is structural

#### AT: Limits—

#### [1] Functional limits check—inherency and solvency advocate means there is a predictable lit to cut from

#### [2] It’s inevitable – whole res creates hyperspecific negs that overburden 1AR prep—they could read a Mauritius DA on whole res

#### [3] No briteline on underlimiting, so presume aff off functional limits

#### AT: TVA—

#### [1] standards are DAs to the TVA

#### [2] Destroys clash—they can read generics to specific affs, which never contests the thesis of the aff and destroys scenario analysis

#### Extend the climate advantage – no “right to strike” means workers can no longer protest for climate policy action – collective action is key to pressure government officials. Strikes spill over to cause corporate policy change, Google and Amazon prove, setting an ethical standard and safer labor practices – that’s Ghaffary.

#### The plan solves, worker protests are key to taking climate action. UK reform gets modelled by other fossil fuel financers by taking leadership at UN Summits – that’s LaFortune.

#### US consumer confidence is declining which indicates incoming recession, that drags in the UK too. Consumer expectations are the best metric – field leader concludes aff

Ibbetson 10/18 [Ross, “America is ALREADY in a recession that could be as bad as 2008: Dartmouth College prof David Blanchflower warns that the real state of the economy has been skewed by Biden's huge unemployment payments”, 10-18-2021, [https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-10103413/US-recession-bad-2008-paper-warns.html]//pranav](https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-10103413/US-recession-bad-2008-paper-warns.html%5d//pranav)

* Brackets in original

Blanchflower and Bryson say that the indices are crucial to understanding the state of the economy because they provide real-time information about what is happening on the street. They argue that GDP growth figures are lagging behind by nearly a year and that unemployment numbers have been skewed by furlough schemes. 'The economic situation in 2021 is exceptional, however, since unprecedented direct government intervention in the labor market through furlough-type arrangements has enabled employment rates and unemployment rates to recover quickly from the huge downturn in 2020,' the study says. 'There are clear downward movements in consumer expectations in the last six months which, according to our rules of thumb regarding 10-point declines, would suggest the economy in the United States is entering recession now (Autumn 2021) - even though employment and wage growth figures suggest otherwise.' The authors predict that fears linked to Covid-19 have persisted and continue to dent economic growth, with workers afraid of contracting the disease either by commuting or at the workplace. 'Such concerns have been exacerbated by the appearance of the Delta variant of the virus,' the paper says. In conclusion, Blanchflower and Bryson say: 'There is a possibility of course, that these data are giving a false steer. However, missing the declines in these variables in 2007, as most policymakers and economists did, proved fatal. 'It is our hope such mistakes will not be repeated this time around. They missed it last time, hopefully they won't miss it this time. These qualitative data trends need to be taken seriously.' For months, the global economy has been expanding at break-neck speed after industries shutdown by the pandemic reopened. But while some restaurants and bars have been able to reap the rewards, more complex businesses are being hit by supply issues, with a shortage of semiconductors for cars and massive backlogs in the shipping industry. After the 2008 crash, there were an abundance of workers but not enough spending to get people back into work. The opposite has happened since the world reopened after the Covid lockdowns. Pent up savings, trillions of dollars in federal stimulus and rapidly rising wages mean that there is plenty of demand. But companies are struggling to recruit workers and source the raw materials needed to meet it. Dozens of ships are anchored at California ports waiting to unload products needed to fill shelves in American stores and car factories have been closed down over the global semiconductor shortage. Builders are having trouble ordering windows, appliances and other essential products to complete new homes. It is unclear when the supply woes will end and there are still concerns over the Delta variant. The economy also faces other far less predictable threats, including the impact of soaring inflation and the bursting of a colossal debt bubble in the Chinese real estate sector, with Evergrande struggling to pay off loans worth $300 billion. Speaking to the BBC on Monday, Blanchflower said: 'We've just had a big furlough scheme which has meant that much of the labor market data is really hard to understand. 'Traditionally what happens when the unemployment rate rises we go into a recession, wage growth falls. Well around the world it's risen. 'It just means this is really complicated, not least because the bottom part of the labor market has basically dropped out for a long time.' He said consumer confidence had 'basically collapsed' in the US. 'There is every evidence that the US is probably headed to recession and there is some evidence in the UK,' he said. 'It is just time when you should be steady as you go. There is nothing to stop you waiting, waiting to see what the [British] Chancellor does, waiting to see what happens when the furlough scheme comes off… 'This just doesn't look like something sensible, it looks like they are being pushed by some degree of public opinion.' On whether the UK was likely to follow America into recession, Blanchflower said: 'The US sneezes and the UK really does catch a cold. The answer is it potentially could … the danger would be in a few months with the spreading virus still and Delta still around that potential is it pushes the economy into recession.'

#### No link – workers strike when economies are resilient because of more bargaining power – they don’t destabilize econ

Noam Scheiber 19 [Noam Scheiber is a Chicago-based reporter who covers workers and the workplace. Before coming to the New York Times, he spent nearly 15 years at The New Republic magazine, where he covered economic policy and three presidential campaigns. In a Strong Economy, Why Are So Many Workers on Strike? (Published 2019). No Publication (10-19-2019) https://www.nytimes.com/2019/10/19/business/economy/workers-strike-economy.html]//anop

At first glance, it may seem like a paradox: Even as the economy rides a 10-year winning streak, tens of thousands of workers across the country, from General Motors employees to teachers in Chicago, are striking to win better wages and benefits. But, according to those on strike, the strong growth is precisely the point. Autoworkers, teachers and other workers accepted austerity when the economy was in a free fall, expecting to share in the gains once the recovery took hold. In recent years, however, many of those workers have come to believe that they fell for a sucker’s bet, as they watched their employers grow flush while their own incomes barely budged. Corporate profits are up by nearly 4 percent, about the same percentage as household income since their pre-recession peak. But corporate profits had already recovered by 2010, while it took the typical household another six years to regain its footing. Many Americans still find themselves struggling. The resulting frustration is partly behind the recent upturn in strikes. “That was the understanding — that if we gave up the concessions back in 2007 and 2009, that once G.M. got back on their feet, we would slowly get those things back,” said Tammy Daggy, who worked at the now-idled G.M. plant in Lordstown, Ohio, for nearly 25 years. But on many issues, “we never did.” To an extent, the pattern of strikes reflects a recurring feature of the labor market: Workers typically become bolder the longer an expansion continues, using the leverage they have when jobs are harder to fill to demand greater compensation. This was particularly true during the three decades after World War II, according to a survey of research by Jake Rosenfeld, a sociologist at Washington University in St. Louis. Overall strike activity has fallen sharply since the 1970s, as the ranks of unions have been depleted, dropping to about 10 percent of the work force from over 25 percent. Employers have also responded more aggressively — for example, by permanently replacing striking employees. Now, though, workers appear increasingly willing to walk off the job. Last year, the number of workers who participated in significant strikes soared to nearly 500,000, its highest point since the mid-1980s, while the total duration of such strikes reached a 15-year high. Image Striking hotel workers at a Marriott in San Francisco last year. Striking hotel workers at a Marriott in San Francisco last year.Credit...Ben Margot/Associated Press The backdrop for this trend is a rising gap between the money employers are making and the portion they’re sharing with workers. The share of the national income that workers receive fell in the early 2000s to its lowest level since World War II according to some measures, then collapsed further in 2009. It has yet to recover. That may be partly because the labor market is weaker than the picture painted by the official unemployment rate of 3.5 percent. That rate measures only the number of out-of-work Americans who say they are looking for jobs. It excludes Americans in their prime working years who are not actively looking for work but, given the opportunity, might choose to re-enter the work force. According to Neel Kashkari, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, the group who could quickly re-enter the work force is potentially large, and may help employers avoid bidding up wages to lure those who are currently employed. “We still don’t know how much shadow labor is out there,” Mr. Kashkari said in an interview on Thursday. But regardless of the strength of the labor market, in recent decades employers have amassed more power to hold wages down. “In the late 1990s, it seemed like maybe a hot economy was sufficient” to substantially raise workers’ incomes and narrow inequality, said Jason Furman, who led the White House Council of Economic Advisers during President Barack Obama’s second term. But a series of reports that Mr. Furman’s council released in 2016 documented changes that have allowed employers to pocket more of the gains from growth. Those changes include noncompete clauses in employment contracts and even outright collusion, in which companies explicitly agree not to hire workers away from one another or to offer identical wages. Employers argue that they need additional flexibility with their work force as they contend with global competition and technological changes. Business & Economy: Latest Updates Updated Nov. 5, 2021, 1:24 p.m. ET2 hours ago 2 hours ago The Bank of England adds green criteria to its corporate bond purchases. Biden sees strong jobs numbers as evidence economy is strengthening. Persistent shortages are stunting German economic growth. Scholars say there was an element of economic opportunism behind the strikes of the 1950s and ’60s, as unions exploited their bargaining power in tight labor markets. Image Teachers in Arizona, Chicago and elsewhere have walked out in recent years, demanding that local officials put more money into schools. Teachers in Arizona, Chicago and elsewhere have walked out in recent years, demanding that local officials put more money into schools.Credit...Ross D. Franklin/Associated Press But workers say today’s strikes are fueled by a deeper sense of unfairness and economic anxiety. This past week, for example, unions representing about 2,000 workers at copper mines and smelters in Arizona and Texas went on strike, saying their members had not received raises for a decade. “It’s about: ‘O.K., the government is not going to take care of us. Business is not going to take care of us. We’ve got to take care of ourselves,’” said D. Taylor, president of the hospitality workers union, UNITE HERE, which has had thousands of members strike in the past two years, including at Marriott International. “It’s been bubbling up for some time. Now it’s come up to the surface.” In the airline industry, workers who made numerous concessions amid a wave of post-9/11 corporate restructurings complain that they continue to struggle under austerity even as the airlines post outsize profits. “They got all these employees to agree to terms within the shadow of bankruptcy court, then they created these megamergers and are making billions,” said Sara Nelson, president of the Association of Flight Attendants. While airline workers, unlike most private-sector workers, must receive permission from the government before they can strike, they have repeatedly demonstrated their anger. Thousands of airline catering workers, many of whom make under $12 per hour, voted to strike this year, pending the assent of a federal mediation board. Airline mechanics, including at Southwest Airlines, have won raises after effectively gumming up the operations of their employers: The mechanics significantly increased the number of low-grade maintenance problems they identified, leading to widespread flight delays and cancellations. (The mechanics denied that this was their intention.) Teachers have expressed frustration that their districts were slow to reverse the spending cuts that followed the economic crisis a decade ago, even as state and local budgets have recovered. “When the recession hit, teachers kind of buckled down. We said: ‘We get it. Everybody has got to pull their weight,’” said Noah Karvelis, who helped organize last year’s teacher walkouts in Arizona that forced lawmakers to raise teacher salaries and partially restore education funding. “But 10 years later, the state’s economy is back, we’re doing really well, and still the cuts are there. It was a huge, huge thing for us.” Image A picket line on Thursday outside John Spry Community School in Chicago. A picket line on Thursday outside John Spry Community School in Chicago.Credit...Joshua Lott for The New York Times In Chicago, teachers who went on strike on Thursday are demanding that local officials devote more of a recent billion-dollar cash infusion from the state to raises. They point out that teaching assistants’ pay starts at around $30,000 a year but they are required by law to live in the high-cost city. And veteran teachers often leave the district during the several years in which they only receive cost-of-living increases. The teachers also want the district to hire more school nurses and librarians, who are in short supply across Chicago. “In Chicago, the citizenry during the austerity talks believed it,” said Michelle Gunderson, a first-grade teacher on the union’s bargaining committee, referring to the lean contract negotiated in 2016. “At that time, we had a Republican governor who wasn’t funding our schools. But now an infusion of money has come in that has not made it to the classroom.” The school district has noted that $700 million of that money went directly to teacher pensions, and that the rest kept the district solvent. The district has proposed raising salaries 16 percent over five years and substantially increasing the number of nurses. For its part, while G.M. has made $35 billion in profits in North America over the past three years, sales appear to be slowing in the United States and China. Domestic automakers also say they are under pressure from foreign rivals, which have lower labor costs in nonunion factories in the South, and to invest in developing electric vehicles. That is one reason G.M. sought to preserve a so-called two-tiered wage scale introduced amid the company’s struggles over a decade ago, in which workers hired after 2007 make up to 45 percent less than the $31 an hour that veteran workers currently earn. The company also relies on a cadre of temporary workers who earn even less. As part of the tentative deal the company reached with the United Automobile Workers, G.M. appears to have agreed to a path for temps to become permanent workers, and to alter its tiered wage scale. Workers will vote on the agreement over the next several days, and a result is expected on Friday. Some workers are skeptical that the union made sufficient progress on these questions, and on the extent to which G.M. can continue to shift production to Mexico, which has imperiled jobs in the United States. Selina Estrada, 32, who assembles doors at the G.M. plant in Spring Hill, Tenn., said she feared the company would prevent temporary workers from attaining permanent status by laying off those workers before they had achieved the required three years of “continuous service.” “They’ll keep turning them around and laying them off right before their three years,” she said. “It’s never going to happen.”

#### Turn – the plan spurs long term economic growth through boosting spending power and reduces income inequality. There’s minimal inflation – companies have relief strategies

Jacob Bogage 10/31 [Jacob Bogage writes about business and technology for The Washington Post, where he's worked since 2015. Workplace strikes are surging. Here’s why they won’t stop anytime soon. Washington Post (10-31-2021) https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2021/10/31/faq-striketober/]//anop

Economists are not entirely sure mostly because it’s unclear what it will take to placate workers. John Deere offered employees raises of 5 to 6 percent, but union officials said the proposed contract didn’t meet workers’ retirement and wage goals. Warrior Met, the Alabama coal mine, offered workers marginal annual raises in a new contract, but workers rejected the deal. If workers can extract better compensation and benefits, it could help tamp down rising income inequality, said William M. Rodgers III, director of the Institute for Economic Equity at the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. Even if strikes contribute to a near-term worker shortage that slows the economy’s pandemic recovery, middle- and working-class individuals and families could see more income and spending power, he said, that will be better for the economy in the long-term. A lot of those outcomes will depend on inflation, said Rodgers and Pollak, the ZipRecruiter economist. If more workers have more money, the other currency in circulation becomes less valuable. That could hurt consumers, who are already dealing with inflation. And businesses are dealing with inflationary problems, too. Labor costs more, so does moving products because of backed up supply chains. Even if businesses have to raise prices on consumers to make up for those expenses, Pollak said, the economic benefits of workers making better wages are greater than the cost to consumers of having to pay more for basic goods and services. But there are simple things businesses can do to stave off inflation, Pollak said. When wages rise high enough, they draw people back into the workforce: maybe someone comes out of retirement or a stay-at-home parent takes a part-time job. That increases the job applicant pool and brings down labor costs. Companies can innovate their operations, she said, and invest in programs or machinery that lessen their reliance on labor. They can also tweak their products or services to cut costs, Pollak said. For example, restaurant chain Wing Stop added chicken thighs to its menu to defray the rising cost of chicken wings. “Yes, you can have wage-growth-fueled inflation that kind of nullifies those real gains [in wages],” she said. “But inflation is a funny thing. And when you have a very competitive market, there are often ways to avoid those inflationary costs.”

### 1AC – Framework

#### Standard is maximizing expected well being

**Actor Spec— States must use util. Any other standard dooms the moral theory**

**Goodin 90.** Robert Goodin 90, [professor of philosophy at the Australian National University college of arts and social sciences], “The Utilitarian Response,” pgs 141-142 //RS

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more probable for them than private individuals. Before proceeding with the large argument, I must therefore say what it is that makes it so special about public officials and their situations that make it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism. Consider, first, the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, are relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices, but that is all. That is enough to allow public policy-makers to use the utilitarian calculus – assuming they want to use it at all – to choose general rules or conduct.

**Pleasure and pain are the starting point for moral reasoning—they’re our most baseline desires and the only things that explain the intrinsic value of objects or actions**

**Moen 16**, Ole Martin (PhD, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo). "An Argument for Hedonism." Journal of Value Inquiry 50.2 (2016): 267.

Let us start by observing, empirically, that **a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value** and disvalue **is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable**. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues. This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for **there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels**, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” **are** here **understood inclusively**, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative. 2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values. If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, **I might ask: “What for**?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. **The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good**. 3 As Aristotle observes: “**We never ask** [a man] **what** his **end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself**.”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that **if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad**. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that **pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value. Although pleasure and pain thus seem to be good candidates for intrinsic value and disvalue**, several objections have been raised against this suggestion: (1) that pleasure and pain have instrumental but not intrinsic value/disvalue; (2) that pleasure and pain gain their value/disvalue derivatively, in virtue of satisfying/frustrating our desires; (3) that there is a subset of pleasures that are not intrinsically valuable (so-called “evil pleasures”) and a subset of pains that are not intrinsically disvaluable (so-called “noble pains”), and (4) that pain asymbolia, masochism, and practices such as wiggling a loose tooth render it implausible that pain is intrinsically disvaluable. I shall argue that these objections fail. Though it is, of course, an open question whether other objections to P1 might be more successful, I shall assume that if (1)–(4) fail, we are justified in believing that P1 is true itself a paragon of freedom—there will always be some agents able to interfere substantially with one’s choices. The effective level of protection one enjoys, and hence one’s actual degree of freedom, will vary according to multiple factors: how powerful one is, how powerful individuals in one’s vicinity are, how frequent police patrols are, and so on. Now, we saw above that what makes a slave unfree on Pettit’s view is the fact that his master has the power to interfere arbitrarily with his choices; in other words, what makes the slave unfree is the power relation that obtains between his master and him. The difﬁculty is that, in light of the facts I just mentioned, there is no reason to think that this power relation will be unique. A similar relation could obtain between the master and someone other than the slave: absent perfect state control, the master may very well have enough power to interfere in the lives of countless individuals. Yet it would be wrong to infer that these individuals lack freedom in the way the slave does; if they lack anything, it seems to be security. A problematic power relation can also obtain between the slave and someone other than the master, since there may be citizens who are more powerful than the master and who can therefore interfere with the slave’s choices at their discretion. Once again, it would be wrong to infer that these individuals make the slave unfree in the same way that the master does. Something appears to be missing from Pettit’s view. If I live in a particularly nasty part of town, then it may turn out that, when all the relevant factors are taken into account, I am just as vulnerable to outside interference as are the slaves in the royal palace, yet it does not follow that our conditions are equivalent from the point of view of freedom. As a matter of fact, we may be equally vulnerable to outside interference, but as a matter of right, our standings could not be more different. I have legal recourse against anyone who interferes with my freedom; the recourse may not be very effective—presumably it is not, if my overall vulnerability to outside interference is comparable to that of a slave— but I still have full legal standing.68 By contrast, the slave lacks legal recourse against the interventions of one speciﬁc individual: his master. It is that fact, on a Kantian view—a fact about the legal relation in which a slave stands to his master—that sets slaves apart from freemen. The point may appear trivial, but it does get something right: whereas one cannot identify a power relation that obtains uniquely between a slave and his master, the legal relation between them is undeniably unique. A master’s right to interfere with respect to his slave does not extend to freemen, regardless of how vulnerable they might be as a matter of fact, and citizens other than the master do not have the right to order the slave around, regardless of how powerful they might be. This suggests that Kant is correct in thinking that the ideal of freedom is essentially linked to a person’s having full legal standing. More speciﬁcally, he is correct in holding that the importance of rights is not exhausted by their contribution to the level of protection that an individual enjoys, as it must be on an instrumental view like Pettit’s. Although it does matter that rights be enforced with reasonable effectiveness, the sheer fact that one has adequate legal rights is essential to one’s standing as a free citizen. In this respect, Kant stays faithful to the idea that freedom is primarily a matter of standing—a standing that the freeman has and that the slave lacks. Pettit himself frequently insists on the idea, but he fails to do it justice when he claims that freedom is simply a matter of being adequately (and reliably) shielded against the strength of others. As Kant recognizes, the standing of a free citizen is a more complex matter than that. One could perhaps worry that the idea of legal standing is something of a red herring here—that it must ultimately be reducible to a complex network of power relations and, hence, that the position I attribute to Kant differs only nominally from Pettit’s. That seems to me doubtful. Viewing legal standing as essential to freedom makes sense only if our conception of the former includes conceptions of what constitutes a fully adequate scheme of legal rights, appropriate legal recourse, justiﬁed punishment, and so on. Only if one believes that these notions all boil down to power relations will Kant’s position appear similar to Pettit’s. On any other view—and certainly that includes most views recently defended by philosophers—the notion of legal standing will outstrip the power relations that ground Pettit’s theory.

### 1AC – Advantage – Climate Change

#### Lack of a “*right to strike*” means the UK makes it near *impossible* for workers to climate strike.

Aspinall ’19 [Georgia, acting features editor at Grazia UK, formerly at The Debrief, “How Do You Strike For A Social Issue Without Getting In Trouble At Work?”, 09-02-2019, https://graziadaily.co.uk/life/in-the-news/how-to-strike-climate-crisis/]//pranav

But for many of us, striking for the climate crisis seems unthinkable. Not because it’s not a gravely important issue, but because we have no idea how to strike for a social issue. It’s complicated enough striking for industrial action (that is, when the majority of employees have a grievance with their employer) but to strike for something outside of that – many of us wouldn’t even know where to start without getting in trouble at work. Because, thanks to Margaret Thatcher, laws around strike action in the UK are extreme. According to Employment Law Watch, ‘there is no right to strike’ in the UK and calling one is ‘in principle unlawful as it amounts to inducing employees to breach their contracts of employment’. It is therefore described as a ‘privilege’, not a right. However, there are a bunch of rules strike action must follow to be legally immune. For industrial action, it must be about a trade dispute between the workers and employers, the result of a properly organised ballot and can only occur if the employer has been given detailed notice seven days prior. Typically, this means strikes are organised by trade unions that actually understand all of the rules that must be followed for a strike to be legal. But, non-union members have the same rights as union members as long as they take part in legal, official industrial action. Which is useful to know given that only 26% of UK employees are union members. This strike however, is not industrial action at all – it’s a social strike. So what rights do workers have to even take part? Well, none – which is unsurprising given that we don’t even have the legal right to strike against industrial action. What it does mean though, is that striking for climate change would involve taking some all-important holiday time. ‘Someone wanting to take part in the Climate Strike would have to request this as holiday, as it wouldn’t constitute a workplace dispute,’ says HR Advisor Kyle Taylor. ‘Otherwise, they would be classed as Absent Without Leave (AWOL)’ Going AWOL can be grounds for disciplinary action, however it is at the discretion of your employer how serious they take the incident. For example, you may simply not be paid for the day’s work or it could go on your record – it’s not typically grounds for dismissal.

**Collective action incentivizes policy change, but status quo sustains science as usual which embraces climate skep.**

**Green ’19** [Matthew, Reuters Journalist, “Scientists endorse mass civil disobedience to force climate action”, 10-12-2019, Reuters, https://www.reuters.com/article/us-climate-change-scientists/scientists-endorse-mass-civil-disobedience-to-force-climate-action-idUSKBN1WS01K]//pranav

In a joint declaration, **climate scientists, physicists, biologists, engineers and others from at least 20 countries broke with the caution traditionally associated with academia to side with peaceful protesters** courting arrest from Amsterdam to Melbourne.

**Wearing white laboratory coats to symbolize their research credentials, a group of about 20 of the signatories gathered on Saturday to read out the text outside London’s century-old Science Museum in the city’s upmarket Kensington district**.

“**We believe that the continued governmental inaction over the climate and ecological crisis now justifies peaceful and non-violent protest and direct action**, even if this goes beyond the bounds of the current law,” said Emily Grossman, a science broadcaster with a PhD in molecular biology. She read the declaration on behalf of the group.

“**We therefore support those who are rising up peacefully against governments around the world that are failing to act proportionately to the scale of the crisis**,” she said.

The declaration was coordinated by a group of scientists who support Extinction Rebellion, a civil disobedience campaign that formed in Britain a year ago and has since sparked offshoots in dozens of countries.

**The group launched a fresh wave of international actions on Monday, aiming to get governments to address an ecological crisis caused by climate change and accelerating extinctions of plant and animal species**.

**A total of 1,307 volunteers had since been arrested at various protests in London by 2030 GMT on Saturday, Extinction Rebellion said. A further 1,463 volunteers have been arrested in the past week in another 20 cities**, including Brussels, Amsterdam, New York, Sydney and Toronto, according to the group’s tally. More protests in this latest wave are due in the coming days.

While many scientists have shunned overt political debate, fearing that being perceived as activists might undermine their claims to objectivity, the 395 academics who had signed the declaration by 1100 GMT on Sunday chose to defy convention.

“**The urgency of the crisis is now so great that many scientists feel, as humans, that we now have a moral duty to take radical action**,” Grossman told Reuters.

**Other signatories included several scientists who contributed to the U.N.-backed Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC),** which has produced a series of reports underscoring the urgency of dramatic cuts in carbon emissions.

“**We can’t allow the role of scientists to be to just write papers and publish them in obscure journals and hope somehow that somebody out there will pay attention**,” Julia Steinberger, an ecological economist at the University of Leeds and a lead IPCC author, told Reuters.

“**We need to be rethinking the role of the scientist and engage with how social change happens at a massive and urgent scale,”** she said. “**We can’t allow science as usual.”**

**Climate strikes spill over and cause corporate policy change – empirically proven in tech – that bypasses politicians & avoids legal disputes.**

**Ghaffary ’19** [Shirin Ghaffary, 9-20-2019, "Here’s why the Amazon climate walkout is a big deal," Vox, https://www.vox.com/recode/2019/9/20/20874497/amazon-climate-change-walkout-google-microsoft-strike-tech-activism]//pranav

On Friday, over 1,500 Amazon workers plan to walk out of work to protest their company’s environmental impact. It will be the first time in Amazon’s 25-year history that its corporate employees have participated in a walkout demonstration. **Employees are calling on Amazon to reduce its carbon footprint as part of a larger**, youth-led global **climate strike that has planned hundreds of events around the world**. **Even ahead of their walkout, protesters have already seen results.** On Thursday morning, Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos announced in Washington, DC, **that the company is making a pact to follow the Paris climate agreement — a cross-country pledge for nations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions — and it is also pledging to be carbon neutral by 2040.** But Amazon employees who plan to walk out of work say it’s not enough. Organizers told Recode they want to see Amazon set a more aggressive plan for the company to reduce its carbon emissions to zero; they want it to stop selling its cloud services to the oil and gas industry; and they want it to stop donating to politicians who deny climate change’s existence. (**Bezos said he would “take a hard look” at whether donations are going toward climate-change deniers** but made no promises.) Amazon declined to comment directly on the strike. “I would love to be in a meeting where one of the criteria or goals around the design that I’m proposing is, ‘How much carbon does this remove from our footprint?’” Weston Fribley, a software engineer at Amazon and one of the organizers of Amazon Employees for Climate Justice, the group organizing the walkout, told Recode. “Our work is interesting and challenging, and it’s tough to see the company not prioritizing things that are so important.” **Employees from several other major tech companies have joined Amazon’s lead, calling on their companies to change business practices to reduce climate change**. So far, 700 **Google** employees have pledged to walk out, along with others at several other major tech companies including **Microsoft, Facebook, and Twitter**. **(Google announced a day ahead of the walkout that it’s making a major investment in wind and solar energy.)** These employees’ **coordinated involvement is a sign of how far the growing tech labor movement has come since rank-and-file workers began organizing over the past several years**. In 2019, as public and political scrutiny of their companies increases, **these employees have mobilized to pressure their companies on political issues ranging from selling AI tech military use, providing products to oppressive governments, and discrimination and harassment in the workplace**. Several leaders of the Amazon protest say they were inspired by last year’s Google walkout in which 20,000 employees left work to protest the company’s payout of high-powered executives accused of sexually harassing employees. The walkout was a historic moment for tech activism and the largest-ever company protest by workers in the industry. **It’s remarkable that employees at Amazon, known for a grueling work culture in which employees put on a unified public front and are sworn to secrecy, are now leading a protest in their sector.** “**The tech climate strike is proof that tech workers across the industry are becoming more confident in our power to shape the future,”** the organizing group Tech Workers Coalition (TWC) said in a statement to Recode. TWC helped coordinate employees at major companies who planned to join Amazon workers in participating in the strike. “This is a historic milestone for our industry and shows that we will only continue getting stronger until tech treats everyone equitably.” **The walkout is indeed a sign of a growing, cross-industry movement by employees to move the needle on their employer’s business practices on social and political issues**. A few months ago, employees at e-commerce home decor giant Wayfair walked out of work to demand their employer stop providing beds to children in US immigration detention facilities. Similarly, employees at the advertising firm Ogilvy protested their company’s contract with US Border Patrol, prompting the CEO to hold a lengthy meeting addressing concerns to a room full of angry employees. (Neither Ogilvy nor Wayfair have said they will cancel their contracts.) And at Amazon, workers have also formed a “We Won’t Build It” organizing group to protest the company’s Amazon Web Services contracts with companies like Palantir, which provide a technological infrastructure that helps US immigration agencies enforce deportation policies. **At a time when many of these workers are feeling doubtful about politicians’ ability to pass laws enforcing changes they want to see, they’re increasingly calling on their employers to set the ethical standard**. “**It goes beyond climate change**,” one Amazon employee who plans to walk out and who requested anonymity told Recode. “It demonstrates that, ‘Hey, you guys can organize on something together that you feel strongly about that maybe your managers don’t like but that you think is the right thing to do.’

**Warming causes extinction & turns every impact – no adaptation & each degree is worse**

**Krosofsky ’21** [Andrew, Green Matters Journalist, “How Global Warming May Eventually Lead to Global Extinction”, Green Matters, 03-11-2021, https://www.greenmatters.com/p/will-global-warming-cause-extinction]//pranav

Eventually, yes. **Global warming will invariably result in the mass extinction of millions of different species,** humankind included. In fact, **the Center for Biological Diversity says that global warming is currently the greatest threat to life on this planet**. **Global warming causes a number of detrimental effects on the environment that many species won’t be able to handle long-term**. Extreme weather patterns are shifting climates across the globe, eliminating habitats and altering the landscape. **As a result, food and fresh water sources are being drastically reduced**. Then, of course, **there are the rising global temperatures themselves, which many species are physically unable to contend with**. Formerly frozen arctic and antarctic regions are melting, increasing sea levels and temperatures. Eventually, **these effects will create a perfect storm of extinction conditions**. The melting glaciers of the arctic and the searing, **unmanageable heat indexes being seen along the Equator are just the tip of the iceberg, so to speak.** **The species that live in these climate zones have already been affected by the changes caused by global warming.** Take polar bears for example, whose habitats and food sources have been so greatly diminished that they have been forced to range further and further south. **Increased carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere and oceans have already led to ocean acidification**. **This has caused many species of crustaceans to either adapt or perish and has led to the mass bleaching of more than 50 percent of Australia’s Great Barrier Reef**, according to National Geographic. According to the Center for Biological Diversity, the current trajectory of global warming predicts that more than 30 percent of Earth’s plant and animal species will face extinction by 2050. By the end of the century, that number could be as high as 70 percent. We won’t try and sugarcoat things, humanity’s own prospects aren’t looking that great either. According to The Conversation, **our species has just under a decade left to get our CO₂ emissions under control. If we don’t cut those emissions by half before 2030, temperatures will rise to potentially catastrophic levels. It may only seem like a degree or so, but the worldwide ramifications are immense.** The human species is resilient. We will survive for a while longer, even if these grim global warming predictions come to pass, **but it will mean less food, less water, and increased hardship across the world — especially in low-income areas and developing countries. This increase will also mean more pandemics, devastating storms, and uncontrollable wildfires**.

### 1AC – Advantage - Democracy

#### UK democracy is declining right now – Johnson’s levelling up agenda is a disguise for masking dissent

Macfarlane 5/12 [Laurie is a Research Associate at IIPP. Prior to this Laurie was a Senior Economist at the New Economics Foundation. Open Democracy “The UK government is using ‘levelling up’ to hide a crackdown on political dissent” <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/oureconomy/the-uk-government-is-using-levelling-up-to-hide-a-crackdown-on-political-dissent/> ] //aaditg

What about Boris Johnson? For many, the answer is obvious: Brexit. But when it comes to domestic policy, the prime minister has yet to leave his mark on the country. After a year spent fighting the COVID-19 pandemic, the closest thing his government has to a flagship policy is the much-trumpeted “levelling-up” agenda. Officially the aim is to tackle the UK’s stark regional inequalities and “rebalance opportunities” across the country. Unofficially it’s about cementing Conservative support in traditional Labour strongholds in northern England and the Midlands. But while the broad objectives may sound sensible, in recent weeks frustration with the policy has been growing. Some have denounced the agenda for being vague and ill-defined, while others have accused the flagship Levelling Up Fund and Towns Fund of being convenient conduits for pork barrel politics. In an attempt to fend off critics and put the agenda back on track, the government promised that this week’s Queen’s Speech would be “jam-packed with measures to 'level up' the UK”. So how did it measure up to this promise? The Queen’s Speech included a total of 28 new bills covering a broad range of issues, from healthcare and criminal justice to online safety and professional qualifications. Bizarrely, almost every area of policy is presented as contributing to the levelling-up agenda in some way ­– from the launch of a new anti-smoking strategy to the recruitment of more police officers. But simply repeating a term over and over again doesn’t make it more convincing. In reality, precious little of the government’s legislative agenda will have any bearing on regional inequalities. Where legislative proposals are relevant, the solutions presented are far from convincing. Precious little of the government’s legislative agenda will have any bearing on regional inequalities A new Skills and Post-16 Education Bill will introduce a Lifelong Loan Entitlement, which will expand the student loan system to cover four years of education at any time in life. While the prime minister said the scheme will be "rocket fuel" for the levelling-up agenda, it’s unclear how burdening struggling families – many of whom are already drowning in debt – with even more loans will help to narrow the UK’s economic divides. A new Planning Bill will allegedly create a “simpler, faster and more modern planning system” that will promote homeownership and tackle the housing crisis. But by undermining local authorities and handing over more power to private developers, many housing experts believe the government’s reforms will make the housing crisis worse, not better. The government will also deliver on its commitment to establish eight freeports, which we are told will “drive regeneration by bringing investment, trade and jobs”. However, experts say there is little evidence that freeports create additional jobs or boost economic growth, while others have warned they could lead to increased tax evasion and money laundering. Meanwhile, legislation that would genuinely help to level up the country, such the long-awaited bills on workers’ rights and private renting reform, both of which were first promised in 2019, have once again been neglected or kicked into the long grass. So despite the government’s best efforts to convince us otherwise, ‘levelling up’ remains a slogan without substance. But if the government’s legislative programme isn’t going to level up the country, what is it going to deliver? The answer is: something else entirely. In the UK’s political system, a government can continue winning elections by suppressing critics and rigging democracy in its favour Under the proposed Electoral Integrity Bill, it will no longer be possible to simply walk into a polling station, give your name and address, and cast a vote. Instead voters will be forced to show photographic ID at polling stations. While the government claims the measure is being introduced to “protect the integrity of elections”, critics say the move is a naked attempt at voter suppression. In 2015 it was estimated that 3.5 million UK citizens do not have access to photo ID, while 11 million don’t own a passport or a driver’s licence. Unsurprisingly, those voters are disproportionately poor, disadvantaged and non-white. Groups including the Electoral Reform Society, the Runnymede Trust and the Traveller Movement have warned that requiring voter ID could cause widespread disenfranchisement among minority communities (who, as it happens, tend not to vote Conservative). This isn’t the only attack on democracy. After Labour dominated last week’s mayoral elections, the home secretary, Priti Patel, unveiled plans to change the electoral system. The reform involves switching all future English mayoral elections from the existing supplementary vote system – in which the public ranks their two favourite candidates – to the first-past-the-post system used in elections to the House of Commons. Political analysts say the move will make it easier for Conservatives to win future elections. It’s not just elections that are in the government’s sights. The proposed Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts bill has been described by the human rights organisation Liberty as “an assault on basic civil liberties”. As well as dramatically curtailing the right to protest against government policies, the bill creates new stop-and-search powers and criminalises trespass – measures that could licence state harassment, ramp up racial profiling and threaten the way of life of Gypsy and Traveller communities. Academics have also expressed concern about the proposed Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Bill, which will enable speakers who are ‘no-platformed’ to sue universities for compensation. While the government claims the bill will “strengthen academic freedom and free speech in universities in England”, critics say it’s an attempt to impose a right-wing agenda on university campuses. So while the government claims its main focus is levelling up, its legislative agenda suggests the priority is something rather different: cracking down on political dissent. After years spent dealing with Brexit and COVID-19, Johnson’s domestic priorities are finally becoming clear: reward those who vote Conservative, and suppress those who don’t. Is this really a sustainable strategy? In most democracies, where coalitions and consensus building are the norm, the answer would be ‘no’. But in the UK’s winner-takes-all political system, it’s perfectly possible for a government to continue winning elections by suppressing critics and rigging the rules of democracy in its favour. Can it be stopped? That depends on whether progressives are up to the task of defending our democracy and civil liberties from a creeping new authoritarianism.

#### Strikes are the internal link to uphold democracy – empirics prove

Pope 18 [ Before joining Rutgers in 1986, James Gray Pope worked in a shipyard and represented labor unions at the Boston law firm of Segal, Roitman & Coleman. He has a doctorate in politics from Princeton and specializes in constitutional law, constitutional theory, and labor law. “Labor’s right to strike is essential” Sept 2018 <https://www.psc-cuny.org/clarion/september-2018/labor%E2%80%99s-right-strike-essential>] //aaditg

What provoked Cuomo and de Blasio to close ranks and launch a simultaneous attack on workers’ rights? Gubernatorial candidate Cynthia Nixon had the audacity to include in her platform a plank endorsing public workers’ right to strike. No wonder Cuomo and de Blasio struck back: Like Bernie Sanders, Nixon threatened the grip of Wall Street-backed politicians on what was once the party of working people. The right to strike should be a no-brainer for any self-respecting candidate who claims to care about working people. It isn’t some transitory policy fix; it’s a fundamental human right, recognized in international law. Without the right to strike, workers have no effective recourse against unhealthy conditions, inadequate wages, or employer tyranny. Before the American labor movement began its long decline, unions made the right to strike a litmus test for supporting candidates. Labor leaders held that anti-strike laws imposed “involuntary servitude” in violation of the Thirteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. Corporate interests ridiculed this claim, arguing that the Amendment guaranteed only the individual right to quit and go elsewhere. But workers and unions held their ground. “The simple fact is that the right of individual workers to quit their jobs has meaning only when they may quit in concert, so that in their quitting or in their threat to quit they have a real bargaining strength,” Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) General Counsel Lee Pressman explained. “It is thus hypocritical to suggest that a prohibition on the right to strike is not in practical effect a prohibition on the right to quit individually.” Labor leaders quoted the Supreme Court’s statement that the Amendment was intended “to make labor free, by prohibiting that control by which the personal service of one man is disposed of or coerced for another’s benefit which is the essence of involuntary servitude.” Although they never convinced the Supreme Court that this principle covered the right to strike, Congress did embrace the core of their claim when it protected the right to strike in two historic statutes, the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932 and the Wagner National Labor Relations Act of 1935. The “individual unorganized worker,” explained Congress, “is helpless to exercise actual liberty of contract and to protect his freedom of labor.” A DEMOCRATIC NEED The recent teacher strikes underscore another, equally vital function of the strike: political democracy. It is no accident that strikers often serve as midwives of democracy. Examples include Poland in the 1970s, where shipyard strikers brought down the dictatorship, and South Africa in the 1970s and 1980s, where strikers were central to the defeat of apartheid. Even in relatively democratic countries like the United States, workers often find it necessary to withhold their labor in order to offset the disproportionate power of wealthy interests and racial elites. During the 1930s, for example, it took mass strikes to overcome judicial resistance to progressive economic regulation. Today, workers confront a political system that has been warped by voter suppression, gerrymandering and the judicial protection of corporate political expenditures as “freedom of speech.” With corporate lackeys holding a majority of seats on the Supreme Court, workers may soon need strikes to clear the way for progressive legislation just as they did in the 1930s. But if the right to strike is a no-brainer, then how did Cuomo and de Blasio justify attacking it? “The premise of the Taylor Law,” said Cuomo, “is you would have chaos if certain services were not provided,” namely police, firefighters and prison guards. If that’s the premise, then why not endorse Nixon’s proposal as to teachers and most public workers, and propose exceptions for truly essential services? That’s the approach of international law, and that’s what Nixon clarified she supports. But Cuomo couldn’t explain why teachers and other non-essential personnel should be denied this basic human right. As for de Blasio, he claimed that the Taylor Law accomplishes “an important public purpose” and that “there are lots of ways for workers’ rights to be acknowledged and their voices to be heard.” What public purpose? Forcing workers to accept inadequate wages and unsafe conditions? What ways to be heard? Groveling to politicians for a raise in exchange for votes? The ban forces once-proud unions to serve as cogs in the political machines of Wall Street politicians. No sooner did Nixon endorse the right to strike than two prominent union leaders rushed to provide cover for Cuomo. Danny Donohue, president of the Civil Service Employees Association, called her “incredibly naive” and charged that “clearly, she does not have the experience needed to be governor of New York.” Evidently Cuomo, who was elected governor on a program of attacking unions and followed through with cuts to public workers’ pensions and wages, does have the requisite experience. John Samuelsen of the Transport Workers Union, which represents more than 40,000 New York City transit workers, also lashed out, saying, “I believe that she will cut and run when we shut the subway down…. As soon as her hipster Williamsburg supporters can’t take public transit to non-union Wegmans to buy their kale chips, she will call in the National Guard and the Pinkertons.”

#### Climate strikes are a form of environmental, civil *mobilization* that creates the emergence of a democratic impetus *legitimizing* democracy and reform

Szolucha 20 [ Anna Szolucha works at Department of Social Sciences, Faculty of Arts, Design and Social Sciences, Northumbria University, Newcastle, UK Sage Pub “Why is everyone talking about climate change ... again?” Feb 19, 2020 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0791603520908188> ] // aaditg

And yet, as U Thant’s quote would seem to confirm, there is a justified feeling that we have been here before; we have already made those arguments; we have appealed to global solidarity and cried out for urgent action to tackle global warming and stop causing irreparable damage to the Earth’s ecosystems. However, at least from a European perspective, there is also a sense that things are changing. The recent popular mobilisations in the form of climate strikes, various national movements and, importantly, community-based campaigns have raised the profile of climate action and brought it to the fore of national and international debate in a way that we have not seen for years. Importantly, this seems to be the case in both the core as well as on the periphery of Europe where the environment has suddenly become a topic of electoral debates. So how do we make sense of the current moment in, what seems to be, a very long march toward tackling climate change? What is the same? What is different? How to define success and failure? And what has climate change to do with democracy? A view from the fracking front I remember that I first heard of fracking1 when I lived in Ireland, about nine years ago. I did not think for a moment that I would end up living in the vicinity of fracking pads in England, conducting ethnographic research about the impacts of gas developments on local communities. I think that it is important that I say where my observations are coming from because climate change looks a little bit differently from the perspective of a rural Lancashire or North Yorkshire 2 Irish Journal of Sociology 0(0) community split by their views on shale gas than from the perspective of capitalbased social movement organisations or policy makers. What I found early on, when I came to live in the communities facing the prospect of fracking, was the profound sense of democratic and social injustice that was fuelled by the distrust toward the authorities, police and the gas industry (Szolucha, 2016, 2018). Regardless of their individual views on hydraulic fracturing, local residents felt alienated from the conditions of their physical environments as well as from their rights as democratic subjects. This experience stemmed from their interactions with one another as well as with the industry and various state agencies that were tasked with safeguarding the environment and people’s health. The distrust settled in the communities quite quickly, at least partially prompted by the increasing corporatisation of the state and the hollowing out of its democratic function. Although fracking can have an impact on all local residents, it is important to note that the majority of gas developments that I have researched have taken place in areas that are overall traditionally Conservative-voting, predominantly white and middle-class. These characteristics can influence the way in which people make sense of decisions and actions that affect their lives, but I think that the popular democratic and anti-authoritarian tone of the claims made by community-based campaigns does not derive simply from their sociological characteristics but is also symptomatic of the current moment in the global struggle to tackle climate change. In outlining the similarities and differences between the current and past waves of social protest around environmental issues, I want to highlight the role that popular democratic demands play in mobilising for climate action – why are they important and why are they the only thing that really moves things forward? Have we really been here before? Yes, which means that, hopefully, we will have learnt something. And we did. In the 1970s and 1980s, environmentalism won much wider public support and, in the US, where it became overtly political and radical, it facilitated the creation of the Earth Day – a now-annual and global event that promotes environmental protection. It was initially modelled on anti-war teach-ins, but their antiestablishment orientation soon gave way to environmental management which conceived of problems as technical and scientific rather than social, democratic or transformative (Gottlieb, 1995). The echoes of this approach can still be heard today in the way in which climate science is often elevated to the status of the “truth” that alone should be sufficient to mobilise populations and political leaders to take decisive and rapid action on climate change. Forty and 50 years ago, the heightened environmental awareness led to the emergence of professional organisations in which experts dealt with specific problems, often applying a conservationist lens. This relatively unthreatening form of activism helped introduce some legislative and administrative changes such as the National Environmental Protection Act of 1970 in the United States and the Szolucha 3 Control of Pollution Act 1974 in Britain. The Environmental Protection Agency was set up in the US and the Department of the Environment was established in the UK around that time as well (Sandbach, 1978). Although these developments contained popular fears, they by no means put an end to local, issue- and community-based campaigns. The Irish environmental movement was also born around this time in the context of Wood Quay and the Carnsore Point protests (Leonard, 2008). What dominated the wave of mainstream environmentalism in the 1970s was a distinct approach – epitomised in The Club of Rome’s conclusions and organisational principles – that was largely top-down, technical, expert-led and global rather than local (Eastin et al., 2011). A view from below was lacking, and the democratic and anti-authoritarian impulse that undoubtedly drove a lot of environmental activism of the time was domesticated by the promises of regulatory and expert oversight. The transformational potential that was required to make substantive changes in the way people treated the environment was spent on the creation of recycling programmes and environmental curricula in schools (Ogrodnik and Staggenborg, 2016). Isn’t this exactly where we are heading today? The top-down and expert-led approach to tackling climate change is still dominant in intergovernmental negotiations and has even been adopted by some of its critics in social movements who use it to address the powers that be and receive massive media resonance. Emission targets often remain the main reference point for the formal mitigation pledges and efforts. Even the distinctly global approach to the problem and the popularisation of climate change by the mass media are exactly what scholars were hailing as a new quality of the 1970s environmentalism: “What is new” they wrote “is, on the one hand, the global approach to the problem – both figuratively and literally – and, on the other hand, the popularisation of the issues by the mass media” (Kimber and Richardson, 1974: 3). The rhetoric of ecological catastrophe propagated by such figures as Greta Thunberg or Sir David Attenborough also bears an uncanny resemblance to the “eco-doom” literature that was popular in the 1970s. The tactics and methods used by some of the contemporary environmental movements and grassroots campaigns, that employ high-visibility direct action rather than discrete lobbying, were also characterised as novel ... 50 years ago. At the time, such environmental groups as Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace distinguished themselves from the Conservation Society or the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England by undertaking more militant actions that addressed concerns pertaining to the general environmental crisis rather than single issues (Herring, 2001). Today, new social movement organisations and local groups seem to be taking up the mantle of more confrontational environmentalism. Notwithstanding these historical similarities, it would be wrong to conclude that nothing has changed in the last 50 years. Popular environmental protest can teach us a lesson about why popular democratic demands are important for effecting change in many aspects of politics 4 Irish Journal of Sociology 0(0) and society. But first, how should we think about these new, old developments in the environmental movements and popular ecological awareness? What we are witnessing is perhaps less of a “new” type of environmentalism and more of an important moment in the evolution of the environmental movement and the history of climate action. These moments happen maybe once in a generation, roughly. In the 1970s, the new global environmentalism was part of an age of protest and was instrumental in the emergence of the environmental justice movement which highlighted the social bias and racism of siting decisions. Twenty years after that, anti-nuclear mobilisations in various countries in Europe and anti-road protests in Britain again led to the emergence of new ecological groups and renewed public interest in environmental problems. The 2000s in Ireland were definitely marked by the protest against the Corrib gas project in County Mayo and the jailing of the Rossport Five, which have indirectly contributed to anti-fracking resistance and a ban on the method in 2017 (Darcy and Cox, 2019). Elsewhere, global warming became one of the targets of alter-globalisation struggles that linked capitalist globalisation with international inequalities perpetuated by the extractive activities. In 2020, we are again at a historical juncture when the cultural environmental critique has merged with scientific concerns. The expanding extraction of fossil fuels in evermore unconventional ways and places is mobilising community-based campaigns that find themselves discovering a growing environmental movement that echoes and amplifies their causes. The “new” movement is itself often informed by the recent wave of pro-democratic and anti-austerity protests such as Occupy. The ideas about direct action and direct democracy that animated those mobilisations are being creatively rediscovered as a distinctive form of anti-authoritarianism in a new reality increasingly defined by the far right. Democracy and climate action From the point of view of a community-based campaign in Britain – whether opposed to or in favour of fossil fuel extraction – the scope for popular democratic action has been contracting rather than expanding. When local residents decide to get involved in community activism – the majority of them for the first time in their lives – they enter a technocratic, political and social landscape that is largely not amenable to hearing or engaging with their concerns. The UK planning system, for example, often considers the old vocabularies of local amenity and aesthetics to be more materially significant than issues of climate change and social acceptance. The central government is happy to facilitate fracking at times when it finds it expedient and suspends the controversial practice in the runup to elections. This gives rise to popular dissatisfaction which facilitates and sustains environmental networks that people organise under to address their particular and more general concerns around climate change. Popular discontent is instrumental in the emergence of a democratic impetus – a social and cultural force that appeals to egalitarianism and “the people” as the source and value of important political changes and actions. Popular democratic impulse embodied in community-based environmental campaigns delegitimises certain political decisions and challenges them from the position of grassroots experience and civic subjectivity. Every “new” era of environmental protest seems to be driven by this democratic impetus. It stems from outside the state and its only claim to power is that it is portrayed to articulate the democratic will of a community or society. If today, climate change is competing with other major issues on the national and international agenda, this is not because of an IPCC report or the most recent climate science; rather, it is because of the potent merging of environmental, democratic and anti-authoritarian feelings that have brought global warming to the fore again. Over 50 years ago, Rachel Carson – the author of “Silent Spring,” a seminal book about the environmental impacts of pesticides – recognised that some of the pressing environmental issues of the day were indicative of “an era dominated by industry, in which the right to make a dollar at whatever cost is seldom challenged” (2002: 13). A similar sentiment is also the mobilising force behind environmental movements and campaigns today. Although they have had 50 years to develop articulate understandings of social inequality, it is striking to read that some scholars still think about European environmentalism as “privileged fear” of those who will not have to bear the full weight of the climate crisis. And it is hard to blame them for this view because there is much more that could be done to give social inequality its proper place in the climate change debate. The current environmental moment is therefore susceptible to the same pitfalls and the same fate as its 1970s iteration. The social and economic dimensions of climate change may be lost again because they are not being put centre stage. The environmental and climate change protests today may not signify a beginning of an entirely new environmentalism or even a culmination of five decades of ecological struggles. Everyone is speaking about climate change again because we are at a particular moment in the complex history of climate action – when environmental, democratic and anti-authoritarian concerns have come together drawing on as well as forgetting some lessons of the previous waves of popular mobilisations around environmental issues. Part of this predicament stems from the diverse roots and organisational principles of the plethora of campaigns and actors involved in tackling the climate crisis. So, as we are all learning about the possibilities of contemporary climate action, is the history of the environmental movement “a litany of small, ephemeral, and qualified victories, many of which have been further undermined in recent years” (Boime, 2008: 298)? It is true that, in hindsight, the last 50 years of environmentalism that I sketched above can leave one with a nagging sense of disappointment at the incremental nature of climate action. On the other hand, as many local campaigners and activists would tell you, this is not how they experience their actions in real time. Is this “movement amnesia” a failure to learn within movements as well as between different waves of protest? Not necessarily. In fact, a sense of 6 Irish Journal of Sociology 0(0) transgressing old boundaries and established ways of organising are essential parts of the democratic impulse that drives social mobilisation. If arguments or strategies seem novel to some of those who undertake climate action, it may simply mean that those strategies are reaching out to broader social groups. So what are the lessons that we can draw from the last 50 years of environmental mobilisations? It seems that neither massive media interest, symbolic figures nor spectacular direct actions are a proved recipe for tackling global warming in an effective way. They are important, but I would advise caution to those who think that they indicate a real social and political change. In fact, the lesson that I take from history is this: climate change, democracy and anti-authoritarianism constitute a potent formula for environmental mobilisation as long as they remain grounded in everyday life concerns and activity of social groups regardless of individual income or identity. This is why environmental justice and democracy are so important in tackling the climate crisis; they should be a way, rather than only an effect of addressing global warming. The experience of the last 50 years shows that environmental movements come and go and, although they are instrumental in effecting socio-political change, it is the democratic agency of society that gives them their impetus and legitimacy. And it seems that, in some parts of contemporary Europe, fighting for a liveable climate may need to go hand in hand with fighting for democracy.

#### Democracy *solves* climate change but we need an *increase* in pace of action

Casas-Zamora 21 [Dr. Kevin Casas-Zamora is the Secretary-General of the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), with over 25 years of experience in democratic governance as a researcher, analyst, educator, consultant and public official. Here he discusses the role that democracy plays in mitigating climate change. 06/29/2021 Why democracy is the key ingredient to battling climate change” <https://www.euronews.com/green/2021/06/29/why-democracy-is-the-key-ingredient-to-battling-climate-change> ] //aaditg

The recent court rulings tell us a lot, not just about the powerful assets that democracy can deploy in the struggle against climate change, but also the long-term robustness of the case for democracy as a political system. Democracies are under pressure from populism, disinformation, inequality and voter frustration, according to the Global State of Democracy report from the intergovernmental organisation International (IDEA). They are also afflicted by a crisis of self-confidence. Fairly or not, the current pandemic has helped cement a narrative portraying liberal democracies as lumbering and too divided to cope with big challenges, while extolling the presumed ability of authoritarian systems to act decisively. Andre Penner/AP2011 Deforestation in the Brazilian AmazonAndre Penner/AP2011 ‘Extremists and populists on the rise’: Why the EU needs a green prosecutor What are the vices to democracy? This narrative is not concocted out of thin air. Democracies do suffer from vices when it comes to slow-burning crises like global warming. Voters and politicians have short attention spans. Balances of power mean reforms can be held hostage to obstinate US Senators or oil lobbyists. Science can play second fiddle to voters if it entails higher taxes - France’s yellow vest protests, sparked by fuel price rises, are a case in point. And yet, despite all this, the facts are clear - 9 out of the 10 top performers in the 2021 Climate Change Performance Index are democracies. Sweden tops the list of 57 countries. China is 30th. The reasons for this are not hard to fathom. Democracies allow for the free flow of information that enables policy makers to debate and find solutions, and for civil society to mobilise. It is no coincidence that youth campaigner Greta Thunberg helped spark a global movement from a lone street demonstration in Sweden, one of the world’s top performing democracies. It is no coincidence that youth campaigner Greta Thunberg helped spark a global movement from a lone street demonstration in Sweden, one of the world’s top performing democracies. Democracies are more effective against climate change for the same reasons that they don’t experience famines, as Nobel Laureate Indian economist Amartya Sen suggested long ago - because in allowing freedom of expression, a vibrant civil society, regular elections and the workings of checks and balances, they increase the likelihood that crises will be met and destructive policies corrected. Democracy is not simply elections - it is the often chaotic workings of myriad institutions and groups as well as a culture of open debate, where climate reform is nudged along by courts, free media, parliaments, and public protests. Democracy’s most powerful weapon against the challenges of this century is its ability to self-correct. And then there is the capacity of democratic systems to forge the social consensus required for long-term transformations to be sustainable. We know this story - participatory decision-making may be slower than executive decrees, but almost always yields outcomes that are more legitimate and accepted by society, and hence more durable. Canva Democracy is a key ingredient to fighting climate changeCanva This is vital for climate change. Decarbonisation is not something governments do by fiat, though act they must - it is something societies as a whole must do by conviction. Consumer habits will need to change, from reducing air travel to adjusting diets. Trillions of dollars will have to be invested in transforming the sources of energy that fuel economies. New social contracts will have to be devised so that the burden of these fiscal bills can be equitably shared. There is no guarantee that democracies will succeed in building the consensus needed to save our species, but their odds are better than those of any other political arrangement. Could decarbonising our cities be the answer to climate change? Kids are disappointed in grownups’ ‘un-green’ ways: Here are their plans for a cleaner future Democratic governance could slow down climate change This is, however, the key question – while it is clear that the attributes of democracy are potentially superior to deal with climate change, it is much less clear that they will be actually deployed with the celerity required. This is, precisely, what courts are doing in Germany and elsewhere - they are moving forward the deadlines that political systems and societies must meet if our species is to avoid disaster. Those deadlines are tight – a few decades, at most. But courts alone won’t do the trick. Democratic governments, parliaments, and political leaders must also dramatically increase the pace of their actions. This is why it is so vital to connect the discussion of climate change with debates on the quality of democratic governance. We must distill, disseminate, and design the institutions and practices that are more likely to allow democracies to build consensus, distribute burdens and make decisions effectively to meet the climate crisis. Experimenting with new forms of political deliberation, like citizens’ assemblies, enlarging the representation of young people by lowering the voting age and adopting some of the bargaining practices between industries, workers and governments that have been so instrumental in building consensus in Northern Europe - this is the stuff democratic governance agendas should be made of in the climate crisis era.

### 1AC – Solvency – Plan

#### Thus the plan – The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland should recognize an unconditional right for workers to strike.

Clarion 19 [ The Clarion is a magazine for labor activitists. 9/09/2019 “Workers need the right to strike for climate justice” https://theclarionmag.org/2019/09/09/workers-need-the-right-to-strike-for-climate-justice/ ] // aaditg

Workers need the right to strike for climate justice – repeal the anti-union laws In 2019, school students’ strikes internationally have shifted the debate about the climate crisis. Now more and more school student activists recognise that they alone cannot tackle the crisis and win a fundamental transformation of society. A just transition to a new economic system run in the interests of people and planet, not profit, must have workers at its core. For more than thirty years, workers in the UK have been fenced in by laws which make quick and effective strike action difficult, and action over political issues like climate change more difficult still. Workers do take radical action despite the law; but over the years the anti-union laws have helped weaken the culture of workplace organisation and workers’ direct action. The urgency of the climate crisis demands both bending and defiance of these laws – as groups of workers will undertake on 20 September – and a renewed campaign for them to be scrapped completely. In the context of climate chaos, workers urgently need freedom to take quick and effective industrial action to defend themselves against dangerous and unstable working conditions. They urgently need freedom to take solidarity action to support other workers in their communities, across the UK and – crucially in an interconnected world where the global poor are on the frontline – in other countries. And they urgently need freedom to take industrial action for political issues, most importantly a just solution to the climate crisis. We therefore call on all organisations who seriously want to fight climate change to call for the abolition of all anti-union laws and their replacement with strong legal rights for workers and unions, including the right to strike quickly and effectively, in solidarity with others and for political demands. We congratulate the Greens for taking a strong stand on these issues. We call on Labour to carry out the policy passed by its conference in 2017 and 2015. We welcome the motion to the TUC Congress submitted by the Fire Brigades Union.

#### UK seeking climate leadership now, and climate reform gets modeled by other T15 fossel fuel financiers

LaFortune 10/29 [Rachel, Researcher, Environment and Human Rights, “UK Needs to Provide Genuine Leadership on Fossil Fuel Financing”, 10-29-2021, https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/10/30/uk-needs-provide-genuine-leadership-fossil-fuel-financing]//pranav

In the leadup to the United Nations climate summit in Glasgow, COP26, the United Kingdom has sought to position itself as a leader in global efforts to end government support for fossil fuels. The UK’s Special Envoy to COP26, John Murton, announced earlier in October the United Kingdom’s intention to forge an alliance of governments and public-finance institutions to phase out international public finance for fossil fuels and increase support for renewables. There is no question that leadership on this critical issue is desperately needed to avert the worst climate outcomes. The question is whether the United Kingdom will do what’s necessary to deliver on this promise, and whether other top fossil fuel financers will likewise rise to the occasion. Governments should urgently be taking every possible measure to stop the flow of financial support to fossil fuels. Such support – through subsidies and public finance – artificially reduces the cost of fossil fuel exploration, production, and consumption, incentivizing further production and wasteful energy use. The International Energy Agency made clear in a 2021 report that all governments need to eliminate fossil fuel subsidies in the next few years and completely halt investment in new fossil fuel production this year to meet world climate targets. Ultimately, phasing out support for fossil fuels is a matter of governments meeting their human rights obligation to address the climate crisis. This move is key to reducing emissions and ensuring that governments can tap into their full resources to support communities bearing the brunt of climate impacts. Yet governments continue to provide billions of dollars in support for fossil fuels. From 2018 to 2020, G20 countries and the multilateral development banks they govern provided at least US$63 billion per year in international public finance for oil, gas, and coal projects, 2.5 times as much as for renewable energy. Looking at public finance along with domestic subsidies and other supports, G20 governments provided US$584 billion a year to support fossil fuels between 2017 and 2019. Positively, there is a growing movement to end international financing for coal, including a G7 commitment in June to phase out most public international finance for coal-fired power generation. The Chinese government – by far the world’s largest international public financer of coal – pledged several months later to stop building coal-fired power plants overseas, potentially signaling a significant shift. Now, with COP26 and the G20 summit just around the corner, the United Kingdom’s climate team has set the ambitious goal of eliminating not only public financing for coal, but for all fossil fuels. This is an important step, and everyone should join in. In particular, countries such as Canada – the top fossil fuel public financer – and Italy, Germany, and France – among the top 15 G20 fossil fuel financers – should embrace this commitment. But more is needed. International public finance is key, but governments should also end the billions more they provide in domestic subsidies and broader government support for fossil fuels, while protecting low-income households from associated price increases. And while joint commitments are a positive first step, they must be followed by concrete, timely action. Past commitments to phase out fossil fuel subsidies have stagnated. Despite repeated pledges, G20 governments have collectively achieved just a nine percent reduction in the billions in fossil fuel subsidies provided from the period of 2014-2016 to 2017-2019. The United Kingdom itself exhibits how commitments to eliminate government support for fossil fuels can fall short in important ways. On international public finance, the United Kingdom announced the immediate end to support for the fossil fuel sector overseas starting this year. But the plan has loopholes that will allow continued support for fossil fuels, particularly for gas. The United Kingdom is in fact continuing support for a massive gas project in Mozambique that it agreed to fund just months before its commitment to end support for fossil fuels abroad. As governments from around the world gather in Glasgow in November to chart a course forward on climate, with so much hanging in the balance, the United Kingdom and other big emitters need to break from the past and lead a new type of international collaboration to phase out support for fossil fuels. It should be marked by timely action, broad support, and clear commitments to prevent the worst climate outcomes and their impact on human rights the world over.

#### Climate strikes spur business and government climate reform – ambitions are high, but sustained strikes are key

Diggle ’19 [James, Head of Energy and Climate Change, CBI, “How the UK can compete as the world transitions to a low-carbon economy”, 11-05-2019, UKSPA, https://www.ukspa.org.uk/how-the-uk-can-compete-as-the-world-transitions-to-a-low-carbon-economy/]//pranav

The public demand for action on climate change is clear. Climate strikes and protests throughout the year, culminating in a global day of action that preceded Greta Thunberg’s appearance at the UN Climate Action Summit are making this an issue global leaders cannot ignore. This level of public concern should come as no surprise given the weight of scientific evidence coupled with the real-world impacts of a changing climate that are becoming common place around the world. But this is not just a problem for governments to solve alone. The business community is acutely aware of its role in delivering the switch to cleaner energy and low-carbon solutions for our transport, heating and industrial activity. But government does have an important role to play in setting targets and creating the environment for businesses to invest and consumers to change behaviours and adopt new technologies. In June, after compelling evidence from the Committee on Climate Change, the then Prime Minister, Theresa May, reformed legislation of the UK’s Climate Change Act to upgrade our emissions reduction targets from 80% to net-zero by 2050. The new target was backed by the CBI and the business community. Net-zero demonstrates clear UK ambitions on tackling climate change by becoming the first major economy to legislate for this level of emissions reduction. The target also brings UK legislation in line with commitments made at the Paris Climate Change Conference (COP21) in 2015. Meeting a goal of net-zero emissions by 2050 will require far-reaching changes beyond those already under way in energy, industry, buildings and transport. It means that business and government must work together avoid the most damaging effects of climate breakdown. Achieving a net-zero target will require a huge expansion of renewable and low-carbon power, mass uptake of electric cars, smarter buildings using low-carbon sources of heating, and using nature and technology to capture carbon. All this and much more will shape the future of the UK. It is important that we view the transition as an opportunity for the UK. Society stands to benefit from cleaner technology that can both improve our environment, and at the same time reduce the risks associated with a changing climate. There is an economic case too. As the country continues to debate the nature of its place in a changing world, we can be sure that becoming a leader in the technologies of the future is one way to enable a prosperous future. We can build on the success already achieved. Ambition from the business and academic community has helped the UK achieve some major milestones on the road to net-zero. A sharp reduction in the use of coal for power generation, rapid falls in the costs of onshore and offshore wind, restarting new nuclear construction, and integration of new battery storage into our electricity grid are all steps in the right direction. With the support of government policy, power sector emissions have reduced six years in a row, and are now the lowest since 1888. The lessons we learn from this success include the need for ambitious, and predictable government policy that supports market-led delivery of investment and innovation. It is a model that we must use for our other challenges, including transport and heat decarbonisation.

**UK Business action is critical for climate change and reductions don’t effect economic growth**

**Colback 20** [Lucy Colback is Asia Lex editor for the Financial Times. She joined the Financial Times' Lex column in June 2014. Dec 17, 2020 Financial times “The role of business in climate change” <https://www.ft.com/content/7ab0bfb0-b37c-463d-b132-0944b6fe8e8b> ] //aaditg

So far, in the UK at least**, a reduction in emissions has had no effect on economic growth. The** Clean Growth Strategy of 2017 said Britain’s economy had expanded by two-thirds since 1990: it outpaced other G7 nations and it also did better at cutting emissions. The outlook for business **British business will not be let off the hook.** In 2018 the commercial sector was responsible for 18 per cent of CO2 emissions, just behind homes. In the same year, US industry accounted for more than a fifth of greenhouse-gas emissions, according to a Senate Democrats’ report. In its 2019 progress report, **the UK committee on climate change said: “It will be businesses that primarily deliver the net-zero target and provide the vast majority of the required investment**”, adding that policy needed to give a “clear and stable direction”. The UK, which is due to host the COP26 summit in Glasgow in November 2021, is priming companies for action with policies directed at specific sectors. At the opening of the COP26 private finance agenda in February, before Covid struck in the west, Alok Sharma, the COP26 president and UK business secretary, highlighted the need for a shift in funding**. “Only decarbonised economies”, he said, “will be able to grow through the worst impacts of climate change.”** Speaking later to business leaders, Mr Sharma noted that the **fight against climate change “has to be a joint endeavour between nations, civil society and business**”. He called on businesses to commit to targets such as sourcing 100 per cent renewable energy by 2050 and switching all vehicles to zero emissions by 2030. The climate-related shift could be as transformational as the advent of the internet. Businesses that do not adapt will be at risk, while those that embrace change will see greater opportunities. **Dr Bell describes climate change as “the greatest economic transformation in our lifetime**, because it impacts on every single industry sector. Nobody’s immune”. Andy Howard, head of sustainable investment at Schroders, the investment manager, agrees. “[Given] the scale of disruption we are talking about, there won’t be any easy wins,” he says. The Race to Zero Coalition, a global initiative under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, counts among its supporters more than 1,000 companies, 450 cities, 549 universities and 45 investors. Climate Action 100+, an investor initiative that started in 2017, includes more than 500 investors that urge companies into action on climate issues. CDP, which runs a disclosure system for environmental effects, publishes an annual climate action ranking of groups, based on a questionnaire; in 2020, 9,600 companies took part.

### 1AC – Method

**Engagement with climate debates develops understanding of continuous climate evolution – current climate curriculum bad- we epistemologically straight turn ground level clean tech movements pragmatically necessary to solve climate.**

**Mehling et al. ’20** [Michael, Deputy Director, Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Research (CEEPR), Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Cambridge, MA, USA; Professor of Practice, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK. (mmehling@mit.edu) Harro van Asselt, Professor of Climate Law and Policy, Centre for Climate Change, Energy and Environmental Law (CCEEL), University of Eastern Finland Law School, Joensuu, Finland. Kati Kulovesi, Professor of International Law, Centre for Climate Change, Energy and Environmental Law (CCEEL), University of Eastern Finland Law School, Joensuu, Finland. Elisa Morgera, Professor of Global Environmental Law, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK, *“Teaching Climate Law: Trends, Methods and Outlook”*, Journal of Environmental Law, <https://advance.lexis.com/api/document?collection=analytical-materials&id=urn:contentItem:62H0-BSY1-JFSV-G3J9-00000-00&context=1516831>, 11/1/2020, LexisNexis, NDawson]

As the exploratory survey presented in this article has shown, climate change presents unique challenges for legal education. It is technically complex and normatively contested, evolves at a dynamic pace and freely crosses established boundaries between academic disciplines, branches of law and levels of jurisdiction. Academic instructors therefore face difficult choices when designing a climate law curriculum. As climate law moves closer to maturity, its academic instruction is displaying a tendency towards specialisation and consolidation, just as climate change becomes increasingly mainstream across the legal curriculum. The breadth, scale and variability of climate law caution against exhaustive coverage of legal doctrine and technical detail in climate law teaching. **Engagement with** central concepts and **debates,** instead, appears more apt to **support students in developing skills** for the continuous understanding of evolving climate law and its mutual interactions with other areas of law. Equally, experiential learning methods hold greater promise as ways to prepare students for the demands of climate law practice. Priorities in climate law education will change over time as policy responses progress and climate impacts grow; by contrast, the ability to integrate evolving sets of facts and rules, a capacity for **critical reasoning and systemic legal thinking**, and sound judgment will **remain decisive skills for future climate lawyers**. Going forward, further study-including, ideally, empirical research using structured interviews and questionnaires-will be warranted to refine our understanding of how climate law is being taught at universities, and how learning can be further improved to reflect evolving needs and circumstances.

### 1AC – Underview

#### [1] 1AR theory –

#### A. AFF gets it because otherwise the neg can engage in infinite abuse, making debate impossible.

#### B. Drop the debater – the short 1AR irreparably skewed from abuse on substance and time investment on theory.

#### C. No RVIs – the 6-minute 2nr can collapse to a short shell and get away with infinite 1nc abuse via sheer brute force and time spent on theory.

#### D. No new 2NR theory, paradigm issues, or recontextualizations – allows them to spam frivolous shells in the 2NR and prove why theirs outweighs which gives them a 6-3 structural skew where they can always win on uplayering or outspreading