### 1

#### Counterplan Text: A just government should recognize an unconditional right for workers, except police officers, to strike.

**Police unions are**

**Roufa 19** The Balance. “The Benefits of Joining a Police Union and Why They Exist.” The Balance Careers, 2015, www.thebalancecareers.com/what-are-police-unions-for-and-should-you-join-one-974885. Accessed 21 Oct. 2021. DN‌

Police unions [that] work with law enforcement leaders and rank-and-file members to negotiate better pay and protect the rights of officers. Unions were instrumental in introducing and implementing job protections like the Police Officers Bill of Rights around the U.S. Besides championing better wages and working hours, though, police unions have significantly influenced how and when officers can be disciplined. They've also established systems of due process for officers to have their discipline reviewed, which has, in turn, helped protect rank and file police officers from false accusations and potential political abuses.

#### Police unions with the right to strike incites violence towards citizens and delegitimizes labor unions

**Greenhouse 20** Greenhouse, Steven. “How Police Unions Enable and Conceal Abuses of Power.” The New Yorker, The New Yorker, 18 June 2020, www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/how-police-union-power-helped-increase-abuses. Accessed 21 Oct. 2021. ‌DN

Police unions have long had a singular—and divisive—place in American labor. What is different at this fraught moment, however, is that these unions, long considered untouchable, due to their extraordinary power on the streets and among politicians, face a potential reckoning, as their conduct roils not just one city but the entire nation. Since the nineteen-sixties, when police unions first became like traditional unions and won the right to bargain collectively, they have had a controversial history. And recent studies suggest that their political and bargaining power has enabled them to win disciplinary systems so lax that they have helped increase police abuses in the United States. A 2018 University of Oxford study of the hundred largest American cities found that the extent of protections in police contracts was directly and positively correlated with police violence and other abuses against citizens. A 2019 University of Chicago study found that extending collective-bargaining rights to Florida sheriffs’ deputies led to a forty per cent statewide increase in cases of violent misconduct—translating to nearly twelve additional such incidents annually. In a forthcoming study, Rob Gillezeau, a professor and researcher, concluded that, from the nineteen-fifties to the nineteen-eighties, the ability of police to collectively bargain led to a substantial rise in police killings of civilians, with a greater impact on people of color. “With the caveat that this is very early work,” Gillezeau wrote on Twitter, on May 30th, “it looks like collective bargaining rights are being used to protect the ability of officers to discriminate in the disproportionate use of force against the non-white population.” Other studies revealed that many existing mechanisms for disciplining police are toothless. WBEZ, a Chicago radio station, found that, between 2007 and 2015, Chicago’s Independent Police Review Authority investigated four hundred shootings by police and deemed the officers justified in all but two incidents. Since 2012, when Minneapolis replaced its civilian review board with an Office of Police Conduct Review, the public has filed more than twenty-six hundred misconduct complaints, yet only twelve resulted in a police officer being punished. The most severe penalty: a forty-hour suspension. When the St. Paul Pioneer Press reviewed appeals involving terminations from 2014 to 2019, it discovered that arbitrators ruled in favor of the discharged police and corrections officers and ordered them reinstated forty-six per cent of the time. (Non-law-enforcement workers were reinstated at a similar rate.) For those demanding more accountability, a large obstacle is that disciplinary actions are often overturned if an arbitrator finds that the penalty the department meted out is tougher than it was in a similar, previous case—no matter if the penalty in the previous case seemed far too lenient. To critics, all of this highlights that the disciplinary process for law enforcement is woefully broken, and that police unions have far too much power. They contend that robust protections, including qualified immunity, give many police officers a sense of impunity—an attitude exemplified by Derek Chauvin keeping his knee on George Floyd’s neck for nearly nine minutes, even as onlookers pleaded with him to stop. “We’re at a place where something has to change, so that police collective bargaining no longer contributes to police violence,” Benjamin Sachs, a labor-law professor at Harvard, told me. Sachs said that bargaining on “matters of discipline, especially related to the use of force, has insulated police officers from accountability, and that predictably can increase the problem.” For decades, members of the public have complained about police violence and police unions, and a relatively recent development—mobile-phone videos—has sparked even more public anger. These complaints grew with the killings of Eric Garner, Laquan McDonald, Walter Scott, Tamir Rice, Philando Castile, and many others. Each time, there were protests and urgent calls for police reform, but the matter blew over. Until the horrific killing of George Floyd. Historians often talk of two distinct genealogies for policing in the North and in the South, and both help to explain the crisis that the police and its unions find themselves in today. Northern cities began to establish police departments in the eighteen-thirties; by the end of the century, many had become best known for using ruthless force to crush labor agitation and strikes, an aim to which they were pushed by the industrial and financial élite. In 1886, the Chicago police killed four strikers and injured dozens more at the McCormick Reaper Works. In the South, policing has very different roots: slave patrols, in which white men brutally enforced slave codes, checking to see whether black people had proper passes whenever they were off their masters’ estates and often beating them if they did something the patrols didn’t like. Khalil Gibran Muhammad, a historian at Harvard, said that the patrols “were explicit in their design to empower the entire white population” to control “the movements of black people.” At the turn of the twentieth century, many police officers—frustrated, like other workers, with low pay and long hours—formed fraternal associations, rather than unions, to seek better conditions—mayors and police commissioners insisted that the police had no more right to join a union than did soldiers and sailors. In 1897, a group of Cleveland police officers sought to form a union and petitioned the American Federation of Labor—founded in 1886, with Samuel Gompers as its first president—to grant them a union charter. The A.F.L. rejected them, saying, “It is not within the province of the trade union movement to especially organize policemen, no more than to organize militiamen, as both policemen and militiamen are often controlled by forces inimical to the labor movement.” After the First World War, millions of workers began protesting that their wages lagged far behind inflation, and many police officers got swept up in the ferment. In 1919, Boston’s city police applied to the A.F.L. for a charter; they were angry about their meagre salaries and having to pay hundreds of dollars for uniforms. The police commissioner, Edwin Upton Curtis, forbade his officers from joining any outside organization other than patriotic groups, such as the American Legion. The police proceeded to unionize, and Curtis suspended nineteen of the union’s leaders for insubordination. When most of the city’s fifteen hundred police officers walked off the job, rioting and widespread looting engulfed the city. Curtis fired eleven hundred strikers, and Calvin Coolidge, who was then the governor of Massachusetts, supported his hard line, saying, “There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, anytime.” Coolidge’s stance thrust him into the national spotlight. He went on to serve as Vice-President and President. For decades, that stance deterred police unionization. But, in the nineteen-fifties and sixties, with private-sector unions winning middle-class wages and solid benefits for millions of workers, police officers again started rumbling for a union. Their fraternal orders weren’t doing enough; the police wanted collective bargaining. Officers became increasingly impatient, and militant. In the early sixties, police engaged in a work slowdown in New York and a sit-in in Detroit. In 1964, New York’s mayor, Robert F. Wagner, Jr., blessed a compromise between his police commissioner and the Patrolmen’s Benevolent Association. The P.B.A. renounced the right to strike and was recognized as the bargaining agent for the city’s police. Wagner had previously agreed to bargain with other municipal unions, but he had held off with the police, because of its singular role and of fears that officers might strike. (The National Labor Relations Act of 1935—sponsored by Wagner’s father, Senator Robert F. Wagner, Sr.—gave most private-sector workers a federal right to unionize and collectively bargain, but left it up to individual states and cities to decide whether to grant the same rights to government employees.) As a full-fledged union, the P.B.A. didn’t wait long to declare war against any push for increased accountability. In 1966, New York’s new mayor, John V. Lindsay, after being pressed by the Congress of Racial Equality, added four civilian members to the city’s Civilian Complaint Review Board; the original three members were deputy police commissioners. Then, as now, many African-Americans complained about police misconduct. The P.B.A., which renamed itself the Police Benevolent Association last year, bitterly resisted adding civilians to the board. When the City Council held a hearing on civilian review, the union mounted a five-thousand-member picket line in protest. The P.B.A. then organized a public referendum aimed at eliminating the board. It put up posters showing a young white woman exiting a subway and heading onto a dark, deserted street. “The Civilian Review Board must be stopped,” the poster read. “Her life . . . your life . . . may depend on it. . . . [A] police officer must not hesitate. If he does . . . the security and safety of your family may be jeopardized.” As the vote approached, the P.B.A.’s president, John Cassese, had played on racial divisions, declaring, “I’m sick and tired of giving in to minority groups with their whims and their gripes and shouting.” Lindsay, the American Civil Liberties Union, and New York’s two senators—the Republican Jacob Javits and the Democrat Robert F. Kennedy—opposed the P.B.A.-backed referendum. In a humbling defeat for liberals, sixty-three per cent of New Yorkers voted to abolish the review board. Across the U.S., a similar dynamic played out. First, many cities followed New York’s lead and agreed to bargain with their police unions. Initially, newly established unions focussed on winning better wages and benefits. A major recession in the early eighties and the anti-tax fervor of the Reagan era caused budget crunches in many cities. Local leaders told police unions and other public-sector unions that they had little money for raises. In turn, the police demanded increased protections for officers facing disciplinary proceedings. Since the eighties, police contracts in New York and many other cities have added one protection after another that have made it harder to hold officers accountable for improper use of force or other misconduct. Such protections included keeping an officer’s disciplinary record secret, erasing an officer’s disciplinary record after a few years, or delaying any questioning of officers for twenty-four or forty-eight hours after an incident such as a police shooting. “They have these unusual protections they’ve bargained very hard for, measures that insulate them from accountability,” William P. Jones, a history professor at the University of Minnesota and the president of the Labor and Working-Class History Association, told me. Jones said that other public-employee unions have some of the same protections but that police unions “are particularly effective utilizing them in their favor.” In 2017, a Reuters a special report on police-union contracts in eighty-two cities found that most required departments to erase disciplinary records, in some cases after only six months. Eighteen cities expunged suspensions from an officer’s record in three years or less. Anchorage, Alaska, removed demotions, suspensions, and disciplinary transfers after twenty-four months. Reuters also found that almost half of the contracts let officers accused of wrongdoing see their entire investigative file—including witness statements, photos, and videos—before being questioned, making it easier for them to finesse their way through disciplinary interrogations. Joseph McCartin, a labor historian at Georgetown, told me that one political factor explains why police unions have won so many protections. “They have more clout than other public-sector unions, like the teachers or sanitation workers, because they have often been able to command the political support of Republicans,” he said. “That’s given them a big advantage.” The string of police killings captured on mobile phones increased public dismay with police unions. After the killing of George Floyd, they became a pariah. Many protesters, and even some unions, including the Writers Guild of America, East, have called on the A.F.L.-C.I.O., the nation’s main labor federation, to expel the International Union of Police Associations, which represents a hundred thousand law-enforcement officers. The Association of Flight Attendants adopted a resolution demanding that police unions immediately enact policies to “actively address racism in law enforcement and especially to hold officers accountable for violence against citizens, or be removed from the Labor movement.” The Service Employees International Union, with two million members, has called for “holding public security unions accountable to racial justice,” and the Seattle area’s main labor coalition issued an ultimatum to the local police union: acknowledge and address racism in law enforcement or risk being kicked out.

#### Excessive police union bargaining from strikes destroys accountability for police misconduct

Greenhouse, 20, The New Yorker, “How Police Unions Enable and Conceal Abuses of Power”, Steven Greenhouse is an American labor and workplace journalist and writer. He covered labor for The New York Times for 31 years, 2010 Society of Professional Journalists Deadline Club Award: Beat reporting for newspapers and wire services, for "World of Hurt" with N.R. Kleinfield; 2010 New York Press Club Award: Outstanding enterprise or investigative reporting, for "World of Hurt" with N.R. Kleinfield; 2009 The Hillman Prize for The Big Squeeze: Tough Times for the American WorkerURL: <https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/how-police-union-power-helped-increase-abuses>, KR

Police unions have long had a singular—and divisive—place in American labor. What is different at this fraught moment, however, is that these unions, long considered untouchable, due to their extraordinary power on the streets and among politicians, face a potential reckoning, as their conduct roils not just one city but the entire nation. Since the nineteen-sixties, when police unions first became like traditional unions and won the right to bargain collectively, they have had a controversial history. And recent studies suggest that their political and bargaining power has enabled them to win disciplinary systems so lax that they have helped increase police abuses in the United States.

A 2018 University of Oxford study of the hundred largest American cities found that the extent of protections in police contracts was directly and positively correlated with police violence and other abuses against citizens. A 2019 University of Chicago study found that extending collective-bargaining rights to Florida sheriffs’ deputies led to a forty per cent statewide increase in cases of violent misconduct—translating to nearly twelve additional such incidents annually.

In a forthcoming study, Rob Gillezeau, a professor and researcher, concluded that, from the nineteen-fifties to the nineteen-eighties, the ability of police to collectively bargain led to a substantial rise in police killings of civilians, with a greater impact on people of color. “With the caveat that this is very early work,” Gillezeau wrote on Twitter, on May 30th, “it looks like collective bargaining rights are being used to protect the ability of officers to discriminate in the disproportionate use of force against the non-white population.”

Other studies revealed that many existing mechanisms for disciplining police are toothless. WBEZ, a Chicago radio station, found that, between 2007 and 2015, Chicago’s Independent Police Review Authority investigated four hundred shootings by police and deemed the officers justified in all but two incidents. Since 2012, when Minneapolis replaced its civilian review board with an Office of Police Conduct Review, the public has filed more than twenty-six hundred misconduct complaints, yet only twelve resulted in a police officer being punished. The most severe penalty: a forty-hour suspension. When the St. Paul Pioneer Press reviewed appeals involving terminations from 2014 to 2019, it discovered that arbitrators ruled in favor of the discharged police and corrections officers and ordered them reinstated forty-six per cent of the time. (Non-law-enforcement workers were reinstated at a similar rate.) For those demanding more accountability, a large obstacle is that disciplinary actions are often overturned if an arbitrator finds that the penalty the department meted out is tougher than it was in a similar, previous case—no matter if the penalty in the previous case seemed far too lenient.

To critics, all of this highlights that the disciplinary process for law enforcement is woefully broken, and that police unions have far too much power. They contend that robust protections, including qualified immunity, give many police officers a sense of impunity—an attitude exemplified by Derek Chauvin keeping his knee on George Floyd’s neck for nearly nine minutes, even as onlookers pleaded with him to stop. “We’re at a place where something has to change, so that police collective bargaining no longer contributes to police violence,” Benjamin Sachs, a labor-law professor at Harvard, told me. Sachs said that bargaining on “matters of discipline, especially related to the use of force, has insulated police officers from accountability, and that predictably can increase the problem.”

For decades, members of the public have complained about police violence and police unions, and a relatively recent development—mobile-phone videos—has sparked even more public anger. These complaints grew with the killings of Eric Garner, Laquan McDonald, Walter Scott, Tamir Rice, Philando Castile, and many others. Each time, there were protests and urgent calls for police reform, but the matter blew over. Until the horrific killing of George Floyd.

Historians often talk of two distinct genealogies for policing in the North and in the South, and both help to explain the crisis that the police and its unions find themselves in today. Northern cities began to establish police departments in the eighteen-thirties; by the end of the century, many had become best known for using ruthless force to crush labor agitation and strikes, an aim to which they were pushed by the industrial and financial élite. In 1886, the Chicago police killed four strikers and injured dozens more at the McCormick Reaper Works. In the South, policing has very different roots: slave patrols, in which white men brutally enforced slave codes, checking to see whether black people had proper passes whenever they were off their masters’ estates and often beating them if they did something the patrols didn’t like. Khalil Gibran Muhammad, a historian at Harvard, said that the patrols “were explicit in their design to empower the entire white population” to control “the movements of black people.”

At the turn of the twentieth century, many police officers—frustrated, like other workers, with low pay and long hours—formed fraternal associations, rather than unions, to seek better conditions—mayors and police commissioners insisted that the police had no more right to join a union than did soldiers and sailors. In 1897, a group of Cleveland police officers sought to form a union and petitioned the American Federation of Labor—founded in 1886, with Samuel Gompers as its first president—to grant them a union charter. The A.F.L. rejected them, saying, “It is not within the province of the trade union movement to especially organize policemen, no more than to organize militiamen, as both policemen and militiamen are often controlled by forces inimical to the labor movement.”

After the First World War, millions of workers began protesting that their wages lagged far behind inflation, and many police officers got swept up in the ferment. In 1919, Boston’s city police applied to the A.F.L. for a charter; they were angry about their meagre salaries and having to pay hundreds of dollars for uniforms. The police commissioner, Edwin Upton Curtis, forbade his officers from joining any outside organization other than patriotic groups, such as the American Legion. The police proceeded to unionize, and Curtis suspended nineteen of the union’s leaders for insubordination. When most of the city’s fifteen hundred police officers walked off the job, rioting and widespread looting engulfed the city. Curtis fired eleven hundred strikers, and Calvin Coolidge, who was then the governor of Massachusetts, supported his hard line, saying, “There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, anytime.” Coolidge’s stance thrust him into the national spotlight. He went on to serve as Vice-President and President.

For decades, that stance deterred police unionization. But, in the nineteen-fifties and sixties, with private-sector unions winning middle-class wages and solid benefits for millions of workers, police officers again started rumbling for a union. Their fraternal orders weren’t doing enough; the police wanted collective bargaining. Officers became increasingly impatient, and militant. In the early sixties, police engaged in a work slowdown in New York and a sit-in in Detroit.

In 1964, New York’s mayor, Robert F. Wagner, Jr., blessed a compromise between his police commissioner and the Patrolmen’s Benevolent Association. The P.B.A. renounced the right to strike and was recognized as the bargaining agent for the city’s police. Wagner had previously agreed to bargain with other municipal unions, but he had held off with the police, because of its singular role and of fears that officers might strike. (The National Labor Relations Act of 1935—sponsored by Wagner’s father, Senator Robert F. Wagner, Sr.—gave most private-sector workers a federal right to unionize and collectively bargain, but left it up to individual states and cities to decide whether to grant the same rights to government employees.) As a full-fledged union, the P.B.A. didn’t wait long to declare war against any push for increased accountability. In 1966, New York’s new mayor, John V. Lindsay, after being pressed by the Congress of Racial Equality, added four civilian members to the city’s Civilian Complaint Review Board; the original three members were deputy police commissioners. Then, as now, many African-Americans complained about police misconduct. The P.B.A., which renamed itself the Police Benevolent Association last year, bitterly resisted adding civilians to the board. When the City Council held a hearing on civilian review, the union mounted a five-thousand-member picket line in protest. The P.B.A. then organized a public referendum aimed at eliminating the board. It put up posters showing a young white woman exiting a subway and heading onto a dark, deserted street. “The Civilian Review Board must be stopped,” the poster read. “Her life . . . your life . . . may depend on it. . . . [A] police officer must not hesitate. If he does . . . the security and safety of your family may be jeopardized.” As the vote approached, the P.B.A.’s president, John Cassese, had played on racial divisions, declaring, “I’m sick and tired of giving in to minority groups with their whims and their gripes and shouting.” Lindsay, the American Civil Liberties Union, and New York’s two senators—the Republican Jacob Javits and the Democrat Robert F. Kennedy—opposed the P.B.A.-backed referendum. In a humbling defeat for liberals, sixty-three per cent of New Yorkers voted to abolish the review board.

Across the U.S., a similar dynamic played out. First, many cities followed New York’s lead and agreed to bargain with their police unions. Initially, newly established unions focussed on winning better wages and benefits. A major recession in the early eighties and the anti-tax fervor of the Reagan era caused budget crunches in many cities. Local leaders told police unions and other public-sector unions that they had little money for raises. In turn, the police demanded increased protections for officers facing disciplinary proceedings.

Since the eighties, police contracts in New York and many other cities have added one protection after another that have made it harder to hold officers accountable for improper use of force or other misconduct. Such protections included keeping an officer’s disciplinary record secret, erasing an officer’s disciplinary record after a few years, or delaying any questioning of officers for twenty-four or forty-eight hours after an incident such as a police shooting. “They have these unusual protections they’ve bargained very hard for, measures that insulate them from accountability,” William P. Jones, a history professor at the University of Minnesota and the president of the Labor and Working-Class History Association, told me. Jones said that other public-employee unions have some of the same protections but that police unions “are particularly effective utilizing them in their favor.”

In 2017, a Reuters a special report on police-union contracts in eighty-two cities found that most required departments to erase disciplinary records, in some cases after only six months. Eighteen cities expunged suspensions from an officer’s record in three years or less. Anchorage, Alaska, removed demotions, suspensions, and disciplinary transfers after twenty-four months. Reuters also found that almost half of the contracts let officers accused of wrongdoing see their entire investigative file—including witness statements, photos, and videos—before being questioned, making it easier for them to finesse their way through disciplinary interrogations.

Joseph McCartin, a labor historian at Georgetown, told me that one political factor explains why police unions have won so many protections. “They have more clout than other public-sector unions, like the teachers or sanitation workers, because they have often been able to command the political support of Republicans,” he said. “That’s given them a big advantage.”

#### Its competitive – A worker is

**Ministry of Labour, Training and Skills Development 15** “‘Worker’ as Defined in OHSA | Ministry of Labour.” Gov.on.ca, 2015, www.labour.gov.on.ca/english/hs/worker\_defn.php. Accessed 20 Oct. 2021. **‌**DN

Under the Occupational Health and Safety Act (OHSA), a “worker” is any of the following: A person who performs work or supplies services for monetary compensation. A secondary school student who performs work or supplies services for no monetary compensation under a work experience program authorized by the school board that operates the school in which the student is enrolled. A person who performs work or supplies services for no monetary compensation under a program approved by a college of applied arts and technology, university, private career college or other post-secondary institution. Repealed: 2017, c. 22, Sched. 1, s. 71 (2). Other persons who work or provide services to an employer for no money, who may be prescribed by regulation. (At this time, no such persons have been prescribed as a “worker” under the OHSA.) The definition of “worker” does not include: an inmate of a correctional institution or similar facility who participates inside the institution or facility in a work project or rehabilitation program; a volunteer who works for no monetary payment of any kind.

#### Police work for monetary compensation, and you can’t give an unconditional right to strike to all workers without giving the right to strike to police so the counterplan competes.

#### PICs are the best thing to ever happen to debate.

Branson 07 Josh Branson, CSIS and graduated from Harvard Law. “Reflections about debate and policymaking” 2007. IB

Well, thats not the way it worked at all, at least for me. No doubt in a collegiate debate judged by one of ya’ll I could have killed them all on the Pan K, probably even if we talked slow, but in the real world, I was kind of surprised to find that the knowledge generated by debate proved to be fairly damn cursory and artificial. I could rattle off a list of most of the arguments for/against most of the general nonproliferation doctrines, but a lot of the empirical and factual basis for these arguments was completely missing in my brain. I could make the basic claim for almost anything in the field, but the technical issues that underlines a lot of them (the names and locations of the Russian CW destruction plants, an understanding of how the fine points of the budget process works, how a capital market sanction would actually be implemented, where did we get our intelligence that revealed Chinese serial proliferators selling bombs to AQ Khan, how does a centrifuge cascade work and why exactly would multilateral sanctions undermine Irans ability to get uranium gas piping technology, the names of the key players in the various foreign governments that make nonproliferation policy etc) was all missing. Maybe this stuff sounds pretty boring, and some of it is, but this is the type of stuff that really determines whether or not policies are successful and whether or not they are effectively promulgated. But the details pretty much get left out in debates, replaced by a simplistic and power-worded DA that culminates in nuclear winter.’ To my surprise, when setting out in the nonproliferation world, you don’t get to make grand pronouncements about the impact of funding Nunn-Lugar on US soft power or whether funding it would cause a budget deficit which would collapse the global economy and cause multiple scenarios for nuclear war. Instead, most of the work that is done is deciding which and what type of Russian facilities to allocate the money to, knowing the specific people within the Russian government we can trust, which types of nuclear disposition is safest and what types of transportation we should use when moving spent fuel back to storage, etc. When dealing with these discussions repeatedly, I found that debate had provided me a very sound abstract conceptual frame through which to analyze the general issues being raised, but little in a way of meaningfully engaging the policy process. Of course, debaters can learn this language. There are plenty who have. But I’d wonder whether or not people who claim that debate has trained people for this life are mistaking correlation with causation. Two other interesting conclusions: A) To all the people who attack debate for propounding an overly elitist and undemocratic discourse and undermines good broadly appealing public speaking skills: I think you’ve got it backwards. Yes, a lot of debates involve jargon, no question. But at least in my experience, I found that debate provided me the opposite. The times I was most confident at CSIS were when we were doing public debates or discussions in front of unqualified audiences. I could take on even the most senior experts; in these types of forums, I could out debate them and rhetorically counteract their vast experience/knowledge advantage. On the flip side, when I was in conferences with only experts in the field, I often felt at a severe disadvantage. In forums like this, bad arguments get called out, and rhetorically powerful but intellectually flimsy claims are pretty much non-starters. Debate experience wasn’t a ton of help. In terms of research, I did feel that all the debate research I’ve done provided some advantages and gave me a marginal edge over a lot of other people at CSIS, but nothing enormous. Most of the people there, even though they’d never done debate, can research just as well as the average college debater (ESPECIALLY on technical issues). I realize there are problems with the sample size etc, but it made me think twice about the infallible research advantages supposedly generated by policy debate. B) How to make debate more like the technical policy world? Narrower debates. PICs are vital to this (sorry, Duck). Thinking back on my 8 years in debate, the topic about which I can best converse with experts about is the design of emissions trading schemes. That was because the literature was deep and the prevalence of upstream/downstream/auctioned/timetable PICs narrowed the debates and forced a real in-depth discussion. I just don’t think we get that in a ton of debates, because most PICs are either wanky rhetoric PICs (and yes I was an extreme culprit) or something even worse like Consultation. Thinking back on it, I don’t think that the legal topic was worded particularly poorly, I just think that our strategic norms of judging/debating create a lot of problems in generating the type of education a lot of us want. But one of the most striking thing for me about last year’s topic was that I learned more from Repko’s post about his day at the Supreme Court than I did from all the debates I judged combined. In any event, how to create the types of narrow debates that will general real sustainable expertise on topics is tough. I think that we’ve got to learn how to become accepting as a community of analytical smart arguments to answer carded-yet-stupid arguments, maybe start accepting intrinsicness (something that I might post on some other day) as a way to eliminate politics DAs and consultation CPs, and start modifying our theory dispositions to be willing to call out bullshit CPs (see DHeidts new judge philosophy), and finally moving away from the cult of new and surprise arguments (see below). This will also involve changing the way we teach kids as they enter debate; I know I, for one, am going to change the way I teach camp this summer to include at least a little of these thoughts. Of course, the focus must remain on winning above all else, but I think that that pursuit can be synthesized with a change in some of our debate practices. 2. Why an elite or technical discourse is important My second conclusion is directed at people who decry the topic process because it’s too technical, too narrow, drown out the personal or the things that people want to talk about. Again, my opinion is that this is backwards. I think it’s a major problem that more of the people who conduct policy and who are influential in the process are not well-schooled in the actual empirical pragmatic details of the policies that they are advocating. I’ve read a significant amount about Iraq lately, and got to talk to a bunch of people who were intimately involved in the process, and one of the primary problems was that too much of our policy was executed in a cavalier and emotion-laden fashion. The dangerous pursuit of the “liberation of the oppressed” Iraqis at the expense of all the obvious problems entailed with that pursuit, the complete “lack of a plan,” for how to stabilize the country, and an utter ignorance of the technical or real policy issues facing a peacebuilding operation of that magnitude---these are all issues that come up REPEATEDLY when discussing the reason we went into Iraq in such a cavalier and short-sighted manner. A bunch of the more scathing indicts of the topic committee’s work---that the topic is too technical, that it undermines creativity etc…these are traits that for me are reflected in some of the most loathsome policymakers we have. Bush is by all accounts an idiot when it comes to policy expertise, but he’s the president that most people would love to have a beer with, and one who has let his personal conviction guide his policymaking more than any I can remember. His administration appears to conceive of the world in relatively simple generic conceptual dichotomies (stay the course vs. cut and run, terrorists are good or evil, our intelligence is either 100% accurate or its not). Is that really what we want our topics to boil down to? A be nice to the Middle East topic? Because its in the extra 60 words that the real problems with policy are revealed, and its there that we find the difference between an effective invasion that removes a horrible dictator from power and one which kills thousands of people and causes the region to implode. Yeah, you can rail against the elitism and technical nature of a lot of the academic literature all you want, and say that policy debate is exclusionary, but I think that we need more of the elite technical people and fewer of the smoke and mirrors BS artists running things. The policy world could use more Naveens and DHeidts. 3. Qualifications matter. Way more than I thought. My boss this year was the guy who basically ran our proliferation policy under Clinton, and has decades of experience negotiating with foreign officials, of dealing hands-on with our nuclear posture, of having access to intelligence at the highest levels etc. No matter how sweet we debaters think we are at analyzing things, there is a real difference between people like that and those of us who lack that experience. In debate, this guy’s opinion is basically equal to a J.D. Candidate’s. In any other arena, that is a laughable proposition. In debate, by far more important than how credible or qualified your argument is how NEW it is. You surprise the other team with a new strategy (no matter how idiotic) and the chances are good that you will win. Of course, that doesn’t really work in the think tank world. I actually think that debate would be way more educational and realistic if teams were forced to disclose their arguments before hand. I understand all the problems with mandating this, and realize it won’t happen, but I do think that the cult of newness at times is profoundly uneducational. 4. A large percentage of “fairness” impact arguments in debate are stupid. People’s obsession with “fairness” or “competitive equity” is misguided. One of the most valuable things about debate is adapting to unfair circumstances. If the neg runs conditional CPs, get better and deal with it. If the aff doesn’t specify their agent, figure out something else besides your same old agent CP. This is what the policy world is like; you’ve got to react and deal with tough situations. Do I think it’s fair that it’s hard to get published without a graduate degree or personal connections? Not really. Are most people in the policy community open-minded and unbiased? Nope. Policymaking is about dealing with unfair and difficult situations, and sometimes debate can be the same way. Looking back, for me a lot of the most intellectually invigorating parts of debate were also the hardest and most “unfair.” It was unfair that Klinger was so fast and clear, it was unfair that MSU at times read short shitty unpredictable evidence, it was unfair that Fullerton didn’t have a plan and was able to emotionally intimidate judges, it was unfair that a lot of people resented me because I wanted to win and didn't exert much effort socializing at tournaments, it was unfair that some judges were biased and we had to adapt our arguments, and it was unfair that Emory had more card cutters on their team than we did. I’m sure a lot of people feel similar or worse things about debating against Northwestern. But adapting to this stuff is part of life, and certainly part of the policy world. But in debate we certainly cry foul a lot. Maybe too much.

### 2

#### The global economy is recovering and is set to accelerate this year, but any shocks can devastate growth

World Bank 21 - [The World Bank is an international financial institution that provides loans and grants to the governments of low- and middle-income countries for the purpose of pursuing capital projects.] "The Global Economy: on Track for Strong but Uneven Growth as COVID-19 Still Weighs" 06/08/2021 <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2021/06/08/the-global-economy-on-track-for-strong-but-uneven-growth-as-covid-19-still-weighs> VS

A year and a half since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the global economy is poised to stage its most robust post-recession recovery in 80 years in 2021. But the rebound is expected to be uneven across countries, as major economies look set to register strong growth even as many developing economies lag. Global growth is expected to accelerate to 5.6% this year, largely on the strength in major economies such as the United States and China. And while growth for almost every region of the world has been revised upward for 2021, many continue to grapple with COVID-19 and what is likely to be its long shadow. Despite this year’s pickup, the level of global GDP in 2021 is expected to be 3.2% below pre-pandemic projections, and per capita GDP among many emerging market and developing economies is anticipated to remain below pre-COVID-19 peaks for an extended period. As the pandemic continues to flare, it will shape the path of global economic activity. The United States and China are each expected to contribute about one quarter of global growth in 2021. The U.S. economy has been bolstered by massive fiscal support, vaccination is expected to become widespread by mid-2021, and growth is expected to reach 6.8% this year, the fastest pace since 1984. China’s economy – which did not contract last year – is expected to grow a solid 8.5% and moderate as the country’s focus shifts to reducing financial stability risks.

#### Strikes deck economy– 3 warrants

#### 1] Stop investment

Tenza 20 - Tenza, Mlungisi. . [Senior Lecturer, University of KwaZulu-Natal] “The Effects of Violent Strikes on the Economy of a Developing Country: A Case of South Africa.” Obiter, Nelson Mandela University, 2020, http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci\_arttext&amp;pid=S1682-58532020000300004VS

These strikes are not only violent but take long to resolve. Generally, a lengthy strike has a negative effect on employment, reduces business confidence and increases the risk of economic stagflation. In addition, such strikes have a major setback on the growth of the economy and investment opportunities. It is common knowledge that consumer spending is directly linked to economic growth. At the same time, if the economy is not showing signs of growth, employment opportunities are shed, and poverty becomes the end result. The economy of South Africa is in need of rapid growth to enable it to deal with the high levels of unemployment and resultant poverty.

One of the measures that may boost the country's economic growth is by attracting potential investors to invest in the country. However, this might be difficult as investors would want to invest in a country where there is a likelihood of getting returns for their investments. The wish of getting returns for investment may not materialise if the labour environment is not fertile for such investments as a result of, for example, unstable labour relations. Therefore, investors may be reluctant to invest where there is an unstable or fragile labour relations environment.

#### 2] Strikes negatively impact labor and confidence, causing major economic losses

Tenza 20 - Tenza, Mlungisi. . [Senior Lecturer, University of KwaZulu-Natal] “The Effects of Violent Strikes on the Economy of a Developing Country: A Case of South Africa.” Obiter, Nelson Mandela University, 2020, http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci\_arttext&amp;pid=S1682-58532020000300004. VS

When South Africa obtained democracy in 1994, there was a dream of a better country with a new vision for industrial relations.5 However, the number of violent strikes that have bedevilled this country in recent years seems to have shattered-down the aspirations of a better South Africa. South Africa recorded 114 strikes in 2013 and 88 strikes in 2014, which cost the country about R6.1 billion according to the Department of Labour.6 The impact of these strikes has been hugely felt by the mining sector, particularly the platinum industry. The biggest strike took place in the platinum sector where about 70 000 mineworkers' downed tools for better wages. Three major platinum producers (Impala, Anglo American and Lonmin Platinum Mines) were affected. The strike started on 23 January 2014 and ended on 25 June 2014. Business Day reported that "the five-month-long strike in the platinum sector pushed the economy to the brink of recession".7 This strike was closely followed by a four-week strike in the metal and engineering sector. All these strikes (and those not mentioned here) were characterised with violence accompanied by damage to property, intimidation, assault and sometimes the killing of people. Statistics from the metal and engineering sector showed that about 246 cases of intimidation were reported, 50 violent incidents occurred, and 85 cases of vandalism were recorded.8 Large-scale unemployment, soaring poverty levels and the dramatic income inequality that characterise the South African labour market provide a broad explanation for strike violence.9 While participating in a strike, workers' stress levels leave them feeling frustrated at their seeming powerlessness, which in turn provokes further violent behaviour.10 These strikes are not only violent but take long to resolve. Generally, a lengthy strike has a negative effect on employment, reduces business confidence and increases the risk of economic stagflation. In addition, such strikes have a major setback on the growth of the economy and investment opportunities. It is common knowledge that consumer spending is directly linked to economic growth. At the same time, if the economy is not showing signs of growth, employment opportunities are shed, and poverty becomes the end result. The economy of South Africa is in need of rapid growth to enable it to deal with the high levels of unemployment and resultant poverty.

#### 3] Even just the right to strike causes to these impacts– the right to strike is accompanied with increased strikes, many of them being violent, devastating key industries and the economy

Tenza 20 - Tenza, Mlungisi. . [Senior Lecturer, University of KwaZulu-Natal] “The Effects of Violent Strikes on the Economy of a Developing Country: A Case of South Africa.” Obiter, Nelson Mandela University, 2020, http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci\_arttext&amp;pid=S1682-58532020000300004. VS

Economic growth is one of the most important pillars of a state. Most developing states put in place measures that enhance or speed-up the economic growth of their countries. It is believed that if the economy of a country is stable, the lives of the people improve with available resources being shared among the country's inhabitants or citizens. However, it becomes difficult when the growth of the economy is hampered by the exercise of one or more of the constitutionally entrenched rights such as the right to strike.1 Strikes in South Africa are becoming more common, and this affects businesses, employees and their families, and eventually, the economy. It becomes more dangerous for the economy and society at large if strikes are accompanied by violence causing damage to property and injury to people. The duration of strikes poses a problem for the economy of a developing country like South Africa. South Africa is rich in mineral resources, the world's largest producer of platinum and chrome, the second-largest producer of zirconium and the third-largest exporter of coal. It also has the largest economy in Africa, both in terms of industrial capacity and gross domestic product (GDP).2 However, these economic advantages have been affected by protracted and violent strikes.3 For example, in the platinum industries, labour stoppages since 2012 have cost the sector approximately R18 billion lost in revenue and 900 000 oz in lost output. The five-month-long strike in early 2014 at Impala Platinum Mine amounted to a loss of about R400 million a day in revenue.4 The question that this article attempts to address is how violent strikes and their duration affect the growth of the economy in a developing country like South Africa. It also addresses the question of whether there is a need to change the policies regulating industrial action in South Africa to make them more favourable to economic growth.

#### Econ collapse goes nuclear

Mann 14 (Eric Mann is a special agent with a United States federal agency, with significant domestic and international counterintelligence and counter-terrorism experience. Worked as a special assistant for a U.S. Senator and served as a presidential appointee for the U.S. Congress. He is currently responsible for an internal security and vulnerability assessment program. Bachelors @ University of South Carolina, Graduate degree in Homeland Security @ Georgetown. “AUSTERITY, ECONOMIC DECLINE, AND FINANCIAL WEAPONS OF WAR: A NEW PARADIGM FOR GLOBAL SECURITY,” May 2014, <https://jscholarship.library.jhu.edu/bitstream/handle/1774.2/37262/MANN-THESIS-2014.pdf>)

The conclusions reached in this thesis demonstrate how economic considerations within states can figure prominently into the calculus for future conflicts. The findings also suggest that security issues with economic or financial underpinnings will transcend classical determinants of war and conflict, and change the manner by which rival states engage in hostile acts toward one another. The research shows that security concerns emanating from economic uncertainty and the inherent vulnerabilities within global financial markets will present new challenges for national security, and provide developing states new asymmetric options for balancing against stronger states.¶ The security areas, identified in the proceeding chapters, are likely to mature into global security threats in the immediate future. As the case study on South Korea suggest, the overlapping security issues associated with economic decline and reduced military spending by the United States will affect allied confidence in America’s security guarantees. The study shows that this outcome could cause regional instability or realignments of strategic partnerships in the Asia-pacific region with ramifications for U.S. national security. Rival states and non-state groups may also become emboldened to challenge America’s status in the unipolar international system.¶ The potential risks associated with stolen or loose WMD, resulting from poor security, can also pose a threat to U.S. national security. The case study on Pakistan, Syria and North Korea show how financial constraints affect weapons security making weapons vulnerable to theft, and how financial factors can influence WMD proliferation by contributing to the motivating factors behind a trusted insider’s decision to sell weapons technology. The inherent vulnerabilities within the global financial markets will provide terrorists’ organizations and other non-state groups, who object to the current international system or distribution of power, with opportunities to disrupt global finance and perhaps weaken America’s status. A more ominous threat originates from states intent on increasing diversification of foreign currency holdings, establishing alternatives to the dollar for international trade, or engaging financial warfare against the United States.

### 3

#### Counterplan text: Governments should fund and participate in initiatives to support democratic development in authoritarian countries

#### International cooperation solves democracy better than case

Freedom House 21

Freedom House, [Freedom House is a non-profit, non-governmental organization in Washington, D.C., that conducts research and advocacy on democracy, political freedom, and human rights], 2021, “Policy Recommendations: Strengthening Democracy ”, [https://freedomhouse.org/policy-recommendations/strengthening-democracy-abroad //](https://freedomhouse.org/policy-recommendations/strengthening-democracy-abroad%20//) AK

Emphasizing democracy-strengthening programs in foreign assistance. Democracies are to be applauded for the significant resources they have invested in recent decades to strengthen democratic movements, systems, and institutions around the world. Yet significant, consistent funding and creative approaches that take advantage of new technological tools and data are needed to counter authoritarian resurgence. Democracies should select priorities based on recognition of what can realistically be achieved through external assistance, with emphasis on long-term and locally driven solutions. A high priority should be supporting nonstate actors, including civil society and citizen-led social movements, with technical assistance and training on issues such as coalition and constituency building, advocacy, and how to operate safely both physically and digitally. Connecting activists across borders so that they can share strategies, tools, and approaches should also be prioritized. Programs that ensure that elections are free, fair, and transparent and that power is genuinely contested are also critical. Focusing attention and funding on countries at critical junctures. These include countries that have experienced recent expansions in freedom, such as Ethiopia and Sudan, as well as countries in which democratic progress is threatened, such as Benin and Sri Lanka. Policymakers from democratic nations should engage in high-level public diplomacy with these states to signal international commitment to democratic progress. Funding should assist democratically inclined leaders and local civil society organizations in delivering tangible expansion of political rights and civil liberties. Supporting civil society and grassroots movements calling for democracy. Peaceful protest movements calling for reform can spur long-term democratic change, but face greater odds without international support. Democratic governments should provide vocal, public support for grassroots pro-democracy movements, and respond to any violent crackdowns by authorities with targeted sanctions, reduced or conditioned foreign assistance, and public condemnation. Investing in alliances with other democracies, and in multilateral institutions. Confronting authoritarian and antidemocratic trends globally requires a united front among democratic nations. Assumptions that a country’s individual sovereignty is threatened by deep cooperation with allies will only isolate democracies from one another, leaving them weaker and less capable of meeting the challenge of resurgent authoritarianism. Democracies should work together to promote their shared values and constrain the behavior of autocratic powers by coordinating aid and public diplomacy efforts, including by bolstering initiatives that promote transparency and accountability in governance, and by issuing joint statements condemning human rights violations. Full engagement by democracies in multilateral institutions strengthens and improves the work of these bodies; moreover, it helps prevent authoritarian rulers from taking advantage of international systems—such as China’s efforts to constrain Taiwan’s participation in international fora, the recent abuse of Interpol “red notices” to apprehend journalists and rights defenders, and joint efforts by undemocratic rulers to cut the number of human rights–related jobs within UN peacekeeping missions. Addressing impunity by imposing targeted sanctions on individuals and entities involved in human rights abuses and acts of corruption. In the United States, a variety of laws allow authorities to block visas or freeze the assets of any person or entity, including private companies, that engages in or supports corruption or human rights abuses. These accountability tools allow governments to sanction perpetrators without harming the general population, and should be applied to individuals and entities regardless of whether their home country is considered an ally or adversary. Countries with similar laws should robustly enforce them, and legislatures in countries without such laws should seek to pass them.

#### Even if unions helped support democracy in the past, direct international involvement creates larger structural reforms

### Case

1] may help with making facilities, but not boosting innovation

2] no link - strikes support unionization protesting unfair working conditions, but unions like the skilled craft unions in pilma 21 DON'T STRIKE but just create spaces for hands-on workers to work

#### THEY SAY SUPPORT FOR UNIONS IS THE INTERNAL LINK – THAT IS AT AN ALL TIME HIGH - the aff doesn’t increase anything

**Hess 21,** (Abigail Hess is a multimedia reporter for NBC, “How the Coronavirus Pandemic may be causing support of labor unions to rise”), NBC, 1-29-21, https://www.heritage.org/jobs-and-labor/report/what-unions-do-how-labor-unions-affect-jobs-and-the-economy // MNHS NL

In 2018, researchers at MIT found that approximately 48% of nonunion workers would join a union if they could — representing some 58 million workers and nearly half of the nonunion workforce.

Gallup estimates that as of 202065% of all Americans approve of labor unions; including 83% of Democrats, 64% of independents and 45% of Republicans.  Gallup's figures indicate that public support for unions peaked in the 1950s, when as many as 75% of Americans agreed about the benefits of unionization. Support appears to have dipped during times of economic difficulty, including the 1980s and mid-2000s.  "Now**,** unions are at an all-time high when it comes to favorability ratings," claimsRichard Trumka, president of The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, the largest federation of unions in the United States and commonly referred to as the AFL-CIO. "Half the workforce said they would join a union today if given the opportunity because they know that without the power of a union, workers are helpless."The coronavirus pandemic is behind the latest surge in support, he says. "This pandemic has amplified [public support] even more. It showed how helpless workers are without a union. They couldn't even get PPE and unions were able to get it for them," says Trumka. "For years and years and years, people that we call 'essential workers' were invisible. It was as if no one knew they existed. They did their jobs every day to keep the country and the economy going. And then Covid came and everybody was staying home except people they called 'essential workers', people that were driving buses, and delivering food, and taking care of sick people, and making us better.  "Now people see those workers and the dignity that they represent."  In November 2020, Democrat Congressmen Mark Pocan of Wisconsin and Donald Norcross of New Jersey announced the creation of the Labor Caucus. Both longtime union members, the pair hope to represent the interests of organized labor in the House alongside more than 50 fellow caucus members.At the time of the announcement, Pocan told CNBC that he also sensed growing support for unions —despite long-time efforts to limit them. “There’s been ongoing organized attacks on working people on behalf of Republican legislatures and governors, including in my state of Wisconsin, for years. They destroyed public employee unions back in 2010 and then Wisconsin became a ‘Right to Work’ state, which we never were. They even went after prevailing wage laws,” he says. “We’ve seen this across the country, but public opinion for people having a voice in their workplace through labor unions is at almost an all-time high. It’s really up there because people have seen those attacks have really made it harder for people to get a fair share and a fair shake in their workplace.”Labor union advocates “have strong public support,” said Pocan. “We just have to make sure that we actually deliver on some of the things that people want us to deliver on.”For the Labor Caucus, those deliverables include passing the PRO Act and raising the national minimum wage.But “support for unions is not just about wages and benefits,” says Trumka. “It’s respect, it’s dignity and it’s health and safety.”

#### Empirics prove unions actively decrease innovation - new patents and citations decline

**Bradley et al 17,** (Daniel Bradley, Incheol Kim, Xuan Tian, “Do Unions Affect Innovation?”), Management Science, 2017, http://www.pbcsf.tsinghua.edu.cn/Upload/file/20180410/20180410135835\_4501.pdf // MNHS NL

In this paper, we examine the effect of unionization on the innovation activities of firms. We find that patent counts and citations decline significantly after firms elect to unionize. Economically, passing a union election leads to an 8.7% decline in patent counts and a 12.5% decline in the number of citations per patent three years after the election. We provide a battery of diagnostic and robustness tests and find that our conclusions are unchanged. Next, we show that the results are statistically insignificant in states with right-to-work legislation where unions have less bargaining power to expropriate rents. A reduction in R&D expenditures, reduced productivity of existing and newly hired inventors, and the departure of innovative individuals appear as plausible underlying mechanisms through which unionization impedes innovation. Finally, in response to unionization, we find that firms move their innovation activities away from states where union elections win. Although we show a negative effect of unions on innovation using the regression discontinuity approach, one needs to use caution when interpreting and generalizing our results because of some limitations of the RDD. First, although the RDD has strong local validity, it has weak external validity. Therefore, the negative effect of unions on innovation may only apply to firms that fall in a narrow band of vote shares around the cutoff. For firms in which unions overwhelmingly win or lose the elections, we cannot establish the effect of unionization on innovation. Second, there might be a selection issue for firms that choose to hold or not hold union elections. Because our focus is on the firms that hold union elections and we explore how barely passing or failing the election affects firm innovation, our setting is not subject to this selection problem. However, our findings cannot answer the question of whether holding a union election would affect innovation. Third, the political science literature (e.g., Snyder 2005, Caughey and Sekhon 2011) has shown that substantial imbalance near the threshold that distinguishes winners from losers may create “strategic sorting” around the election threshold and bias the results. In other words, some firm observable attributes appear to be significantly correlated with victory even in very close elections. Although we have shown that this is not the case in our setting because ex ante characteristics of publicly traded firms that barely pass and fail the union elections are comparable, we cannot completely rule out the possibility that our results are driven by strategic sorting because we do not observe attributes of privately held firms falling in the small margin around the cutoff because of data limitations.  Our study has important implications for policy makers when they alter union regulations or labor laws to encourage innovation, which is perhaps the most important driver of economic growth. Our paper also highlights the importance of blue-collar workers in the innovation process, which has been generally ignored by the previous literature but has received more interest and attention as of late. Finally, although a fast-growing literature has provided empirical evidence supporting the implications of Manso (2011) that tolerance for failure is necessary for motivating innovation (e.g., Bernstein 2015, Ederer and Manso 2013, Tian and Wang 2014), our paper shows that one cannot ignore the importance of the other side of the story, namely, that agents need to be rewarded for success in the long run. Labor unions are a good example of contract arrangements that tolerate failure in the short term but do not reward success in the long run, and hence impede innovation. Our research calls for future studies that explore contract designs that combine both short-term failure tolerance and long-term reward for success and that best nurture firm innovation

#### No impact

Sandberg 14

Anders Sandberg is James Martin Research Fellow at the Future of Humanity Institute, Faculty of Philosophy and Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford, Phys.org, May 29, 2014, "The five biggest threats to human existence", http://phys.org/news/2014-05-biggest-threats-human.html

Natural pandemics have killed more people than wars. However, natural pandemics are unlikely to be existential threats: there are usually some people resistant to the pathogen, and the offspring of survivors would be more resistant. Evolution also does not favor parasites that wipe out their hosts, which is why syphilis went from a virulent killer to a chronic disease as it spread in Europe.

#### Warming doesn't cause extinction

Bjørn Lomborg, an adjunct professor at the Copenhagen Business School, founded and directs the Copenhagen Consensus Center, Project Syndicate, February 14, 2014, "The Davos Apocalypse", http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/bj-rn-lomborg-criticizes-global-leaders-for-creating-an-atmosphere-of-panic-about-climate-change

The apocalyptic bombast is even more disturbing. According to Angel Gurría, Secretary-General of the OECD, “our planet is warming dangerously,” and we need to act now “to avoid catastrophe”; the United Nations climate chief, Christiana Figueres, maintains that global warming means that “the world economy is at risk.”

Former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan takes the prize for the **most extreme rhetoric**, claiming that not curbing global warming is “a terrible gamble with the future of the planet and with life itself.”

Yet, the rhetoric is unconvincing. Yes, global warming is real and man-made. But creating panic and proposing unrealistic policies **will not help in tackling the problem.**

Both Annan and Gurría cited Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines last November as evidence of increased climate-change-related damage. Never mind that the latest report by the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) found that “current datasets indicate no significant observed trends in global tropical cyclone frequency over the past century” and reported “low confidence” that any changes in hurricanes in recent (or future) decades had anything to do with global warming.

Annan and Gurría also neglected to note that global Accumulated Cyclone Energy, an index for total hurricane activity, is hovering at the lowest values seen since the 1970’s. Indeed, the trend for strong hurricanes around the Philippines has declined since 1951.

Similarly, Gurría tells us that Hurricane Sandy, which slammed into New York City in 2012, is an example of inaction on climate change, costing the United States “the equivalent of 0.5% of its GDP” each year. In fact, the US currently is experiencing the longest absence of intense landfall hurricanes **since records began** in 1900, while the adjusted damage cost for the US during this period, including Hurricane Sandy, has fallen slightly.

Figueres claims “that current annual losses worldwide due to extreme weather and disasters could be a staggering 12% of annual global GDP.” But the study she cites shows only a possible loss of 1-12% of GDP in the future, and this is estimated not globally but within just eight carefully selected, climate-vulnerable regions or cities. By contrast, according to the IPCC, “long-term trends in economic disaster losses adjusted for wealth and population increases **have not been attributed to climate change**.”

On the contrary, the bulk of peer-reviewed economic evidence indicates that, up to around 2050-2070, the net global economic impact of rising temperatures is likely to be positive. Although global warming will create costs stemming from more heat-related deaths and water stress, they will be **outweighed by the benefits** from many fewer cold-related deaths and higher agricultural productivity from higher levels of CO2.

Global warming is a long-term problem. Most models indicate that the cost toward the end of the century will be 1-5% of world GDP. This is not a trivial loss; but nor does it put “the world economy at risk.” For comparison, the IPCC expects that by the end of the century, the average person in the developing world will be 1,400-1,800% richer than today.

Such incorrect statements by leading officials reinforce **wasteful policies** based on **wishful thinking**. Figueres sees “momentum growing toward” climate policies as countries like China “reduce coal use.” In the real world, China accounts for almost 60% of the global increase in coal consumption from 2012 to 2014, according to the International Energy Agency. While Figueres lauds China for dramatically increasing its solar-power capacity in 2013, the increase in China’s reliance on coal power was 27 times greater.

Figueres’s weak grasp on the facts has led her not only to conclude that China is “doing it right” on climate change, but also to speculate that China has succeeded because its “political system avoids some of the legislative hurdles seen in countries including the US.” In other words, the UN’s top climate official seems to be suggesting that an authoritarian political system is better for the planet.

The fact remains that global wind and solar power usage in 2012 cut, at most, 275 million tons of CO2, while soaking up $60 billion in subsidies. With the electricity worth possibly $10 billion, the average cost of cutting a ton of CO2 is about $180. The biggest peer-reviewed estimate of the damage cost of CO2 is about $5 per ton. This means that solar and wind power avoid about $0.03 of climate damage for every dollar spent.

Compare this to smarter technological solutions. In the short run, the US shale-energy revolution has replaced high-polluting coal with cheaper, cleaner natural gas. This has cut about 300 million tons of US emissions – more than all the world’s solar and wind power combined – and at the same time has profited Americans by saving them $100 billion in energy costs.

In the long run, current investment in green research and development will help drive the price of future renewable energy below that of fossil fuels, enabling a choice that is both environmentally and economically sound. In the meantime, even dramatic cuts in CO2 emissions will have very little impact on hurricanes 50-100 years from now. Lifting billions of people out of poverty, however, would not only be intrinsically good; it would also make societies much more resilient in the face of extreme weather, whether caused by global warming or not.

**e**