# 1ac- Big Tech

### 1AC – Lobbying

#### Big tech holds a massive amount of political power, and their “climate change” measures are a façade to hide the actual lobbying that they do.

**Terstein 21** [Terstein, Zoya, 1-28-2021, "Big Tech says it wants to solve climate change. Its lobbying dollars say otherwise.," https://grist.org/politics/big-tech-says-it-wants-to-solve-climate-change-its-lobbying-dollars-say-otherwise/] //DDPT

It’s hard to quantify political power, but it’s safe to say that big tech companies wield a lot of it. A decade ago, companies like Amazon and Google employed just a smattering of lobbyists who worked to influence D.C. policymakers on their behalf. Now, the Big Five tech companies — Apple, Microsoft, Facebook, Google, and Amazon — spend tens of millions of dollars each year lobbying Congress. In 2020, they collectively spent $61 million domestically lobbying on issues that included international tax policies, copyright reform, and content policy. Only a tiny fraction of Big Tech’s legislative lobbying might is going toward advocating for climate policy, according to a new report from the think tank InfluenceMap. Between 2019 and 2020, just 4 percent of Apple, Alphabet (Google’s parent company), Amazon, Facebook, and Microsoft’s self-reported lobbying activities targeted climate-related policy at the federal level. In Europe, these companies do even less lobbying on climate — InfluenceMap says they have been “largely silent on the EU’s ambitious climate policy agenda.” This halfhearted effort to promote climate-friendly policies stands in sharp contrast to Big Tech’s much-publicized promises to lead the rest of the business sector, and indeed the entire world, toward a greener future. Apple, for instance, revealed a plan last summer to make its supply chain and products carbon neutral by 2030, something CEO Tim Cook said will be good for the planet and its products. “With our commitment to carbon neutrality, we hope to be a ripple in the pond that creates a much larger change,” Cook said. In 2019, Amazon unveiled a climate plan that aims to get the company to meet the decarbonization requirements of the Paris Agreement 10 years early. “If we can do this, anyone can do this,” Amazon founder Jeff Bezos said at the time. “Climate change is a crisis we will only be able to address if we all work together on a global scale,” Facebook founder Mark Zuckerberg said. Facebook aims to make its global operations net-zero, starting with making its value chain net-zero by 2030. “We will support new public policy initiatives to accelerate carbon reduction and removal opportunities,” Microsoft president Brad Smith wrote in January last year, outlining seven principles the company will adhere to in its quest to remove more emissions than it produces by 2030 and eliminate all of its emissions since 1975 by mid-century. “We know that no company, no matter how ambitious, can solve a challenge like climate change alone,” Google said in its sustainability report last September. It’s clear that these companies like to talk about climate action being a collective effort. But despite the many detailed climate plans and pledges, Big Tech has done strikingly little government-level work to bring about the global-scale climate action it says it wants to see. The little lobbying the Big Five do has been largely focused on technical rules that are directly tied to these companies’ abilities to stick to their climate commitments, like procuring enough renewable energy. Meanwhile, the world is nowhere near where it needs to be to meet the climate targets outlined in the Paris Agreement. “Relative to their scale, they invest very little in saving the planet,” Nic Bryant, a spokesperson for the climate activist group Extinction Rebellion, told Grist, referring to tech companies. “These companies could and should be leading the way.”

#### Terstein continues:

Further complicating Big Tech’s stance on climate are its membership in industry associations. InfluenceMap scored each of the Big Five tech companies on the climate-friendliness of the industry groups they belong to. These are organizations like the Chamber of Commerce, the most powerful trade organization in the world, which has lobbied extensively against climate policy, as well as groups with progressive agendas like the Renewable Energy Buyers Alliance. By looking at Big Tech’s membership in industry associations across the board, InfluenceMap found “misalignment between the companies’ own climate lobbying positions and those of their industry associations.”“Big Tech has no problem shelling out tens of millions of dollars jockeying for their own interests in Washington, so we know their failure to lobby for climate solutions is not due to a lack of means, but a lack of will,” David Arkush, director of the climate program at the nonprofit consumer advocacy organization Public Citizen, told Grist. “If they’re serious about climate, they need to push for government climate action at the scale and speed we need.”

#### Big tech lobbying is uniquely key to effective climate action – it’s the only way to ensure federal policy change.

**Winston 19** [Winston, Andrew, Harvard Business Review, 10-15-2019, "Corporate Action on Climate Change Has to Include Lobbying," https://hbr.org/2019/10/corporate-action-on-climate-change-has-to-include-lobbying] //DDPT

The business world has recently started acting on climate change in earnest. Hundreds of the world’s largest companies have agreed to use 100% renewable energy and set targets that commit them to reduce emissions at the pace that science demands. Companies are buying many gigawatts of renewable energy, slashing their own energy use, and innovating to create products that help customers reduce their emissions. But it’s not nearly enough. The climate crisis is upon us, and there’s no time to wait for voluntary corporate action to tackle the challenge. We need the collective will that government provides. Many in business will rebel against this idea, but we are long past the point where free markets alone could solve the challenge in time (if such a possibility ever even existed). Business needs to, in the words of Environmental Defense Fund president Fred Krupp, “unleash the most powerful tool they have to fight climate change: their political influence.” This is the logic and imperative behind an announcement today from 11 environmental and sustainability organizations that have significant influence on the world’s largest companies and on policymakers. Using a full-page ad in The New York Times, the group is calling for business to advocate for policies, at all levels of government, that are consistent with what climate science is telling us we need to do — what they’re calling a “science-based climate policy agenda.” The statement also calls for companies to adjust their trade associations’ advocacy to align with climate science. (The signatories are the heads of BSR, C2ES, CDP, Ceres, Conservation International, Environmental Defense Fund, The Climate Group, The Nature Conservancy, the Union of Concerned Scientists, World Resources Institute, and WWF U.S.) In support of this public plea, the Sustainable Food Policy Alliance — which includes food and consumer products giants Nestle, Unilever, Mars, and Danone — is running the same letter in Roll Call with the message “we agree.” The new statement is also building on a similar call to action last month from 200 investors with more than $6 trillion in assets. It’s about time. Companies have long allowed a chasm to open up between their own statements and actions on climate and what their government relations and lobbying teams are doing in the halls of power. Most of these companies have also conveniently ignored that their own industry and trade associations have generally been fighting climate policy every step of the way. It’s an important discussion to have right now and this initiative could have an impact. I want to offer some thoughts on the context and where the policy discussion could, or should, go. This isn’t the first attempt. In 2006, some of these same NGOs formed the U.S. Climate Action Partnership with notable business partners such as Alcoa, BP, Caterpillar, Dupont, and GE. While the call to action was vague, it was an important message from some heavy industry players that they wanted pro-climate policies. But when the Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade climate bill failed in the U.S. Senate in 2009, and climate policy entered the wilderness for years, the partnership petered away. Over the last decade, the nonprofit Ceres, a signer on this latest statement, has convened the Business for Innovative Climate and Energy Policy, or BICEP, to bring company leaders in to talk to legislators. And more recently, a group of scientists and former high-ranking government officials (mostly Republican), launched the Climate Leadership Council, which is pushing for a package of policies that includes a carbon fee and “dividend” that returns most of the revenue to citizens. But none of these have really gotten the kind of traction we need. This time could be different. A few shifts in the world may make this push more effective. First, climate change is real and affecting businesses today. We’re not just discussing a model of future weather and costs; we’re seeing very real and massively expensive disruptions to operations, supply chains, and communities. Second, with increasing transparency, it’s much harder to hide the disconnect between what companies are saying they’re doing and what they’re actually advocating for behind the scenes. A just-released analysis of corporate lobbying shows that major auto companies, while talking up their efforts on electric vehicles, have lobbied aggressively to fight any real climate policy. Third, stakeholders — customers, employees, and communities — are demanding more action and are less tolerant of inconsistencies on this issue. Recently Microsoft employees staged a walkout for climate, and almost 8,700 Amazon employees have signed an open letter calling on their CEO to lead on the issue. (Amazon then announced it would go climate-neutral by 2040 and buy 100,000 electric vans). There’s clearly pressure on business to take a broader role in society, which is why about 200 big-company CEOs signed a statement from the Business Roundtable pledging that they would focus on stakeholder needs, not just shareholder value.

#### US climate action specifically spills over and spurs global climate action.

Geman 6/7/21 [National Journal Energy and Environment Correspondent, reporter for Axios, Ben, “The global stakes of Biden's infrastructure negotiations.” https://www.axios.com/biden-infrastructure-bill-climate-change-87b70d16-fdec-4c84-84a6-e7532c592f15.html]

The infrastructure drama enveloping Capitol Hill could spill onto the global climate stage. Why it matters: Major new U.S. investments and policies could help spur other nations to take more aggressive and tangible steps to cut emissions. But failure to steer major new initiatives through Congress could hinder the White House diplomatic posture as the U.N. conference looms. State of play: The White House is negotiating with Republicans amid all kinds of uncertainty over whether Democrats can pass legislation without GOP backing. President Biden has proposed major investments in electric vehicles, grid tech, mass transit, clean energy tax incentives and many other initiatives. The negotiations with Republicans — who object to the plan's steep price tag and expansive definition of infrastructure — come ahead of November's critical United Nations climate summit. What they're saying: "Because of the importance of American leadership on climate, the rest of the world is definitely watching what happens on Capitol Hill," said the Environmental Defense Fund's Nathaniel Keohane. Keohane, who leads EDF's climate program, said major U.S. investments will bolster the country's economy and competitiveness. But they're also consequential internationally, he said. "The more the U.S. can demonstrate leadership — not only in the ambition of its targets but in the ambition of its implementation and the seriousness of its implementation — the more likely we are to see the rest of the world stepping into its ambition and accelerating its own climate action," he said. Catch up fast: In April the White House set a voluntary target under the Paris Agreement of cutting U.S. emissions by 50% below 2005 levels by 2030.But that's much harder to achieve absent Capitol Hill approval of new investments and incentives. The Atlantic Council's Margaret Jackson said Biden's climate initiatives thus far have borne some fruit, pointing to several nations strengthening their Paris targets. But Jackson, who has written about the importance of congressional action, also tells Axios: "U.S. allies and partners are still somewhat skeptical in terms of how much this administration can really accomplish, and will it be lasting."

#### Warming causes extinction.

**Xu 17** [Yangyang Xu 17, Assistant Professor of Atmospheric Sciences at Texas A&M University; and Veerabhadran Ramanathan, Distinguished Professor of Atmospheric and Climate Sciences at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, 9/26/17, “Well below 2 °C: Mitigation strategies for avoiding dangerous to catastrophic climate changes,” Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, Vol. 114, No. 39, p. 10315-10323]

We are proposing the following extension to the DAI risk categorization: warming greater than 1.5 °C as “dangerous”; warming greater than 3 °C as “catastrophic?”; and warming in excess of 5 °C as “unknown??,” with the understanding that changes of this magnitude, not experienced in the last 20+ million years, pose existential threats to a majority of the population. The question mark denotes the subjective nature of our deduction and the fact that catastrophe can strike at even lower warming levels. The justifications for the proposed extension to risk categorization are given below. From the IPCC burning embers diagram and from the language of the Paris Agreement, we infer that the DAI begins at warming greater than 1.5 °C. Our criteria for extending the risk category beyond DAI include the potential risks of climate change to the physical climate system, the ecosystem, human health, and species extinction. Let us first consider the category of catastrophic (3 to 5 °C warming). The first major concern is the issue of tipping points. Several studies (48, 49) have concluded that 3 to 5 °C global warming is likely to be the threshold for tipping points such as the collapse of the western Antarctic ice sheet, shutdown of deep water circulation in the North Atlantic, dieback of Amazon rainforests as well as boreal forests, and collapse of the West African monsoon, among others. While natural scientists refer to these as abrupt and irreversible climate changes, economists refer to them as catastrophic events (49). Warming of such magnitudes also has catastrophic human health effects. Many recent studies (50, 51) have focused on the direct influence of extreme events such as heat waves on public health by evaluating exposure to heat stress and hyperthermia. It has been estimated that the likelihood of extreme events (defined as 3-sigma events), including heat waves, has increased 10-fold in the recent decades (52). Human beings are extremely sensitive to heat stress. For example, the 2013 European heat wave led to about 70,000 premature mortalities (53). The major finding of a recent study (51) is that, currently, about 13.6% of land area with a population of 30.6% is exposed to deadly heat. The authors of that study defined deadly heat as exceeding a threshold of temperature as well as humidity. The thresholds were determined from numerous heat wave events and data for mortalities attributed to heat waves. According to this study, a 2 °C warming would double the land area subject to deadly heat and expose 48% of the population. A 4 °C warming by 2100 would subject 47% of the land area and almost 74% of the world population to deadly heat, which could pose existential risks to humans and mammals alike unless massive adaptation measures are implemented, such as providing air conditioning to the entire population or a massive relocation of most of the population to safer climates. Climate risks can vary markedly depending on the socioeconomic status and culture of the population, and so we must take up the question of “dangerous to whom?” (54). Our discussion in this study is focused more on people and not on the ecosystem, and even with this limited scope, there are multitudes of categories of people. We will focus on the poorest 3 billion people living mostly in tropical rural areas, who are still relying on 18th-century technologies for meeting basic needs such as cooking and heating. Their contribution to CO2 pollution is roughly 5% compared with the 50% contribution by the wealthiest 1 billion (55). This bottom 3 billion population comprises mostly subsistent farmers, whose livelihood will be severely impacted, if not destroyed, with a one- to five-year megadrought, heat waves, or heavy floods; for those among the bottom 3 billion of the world’s population who are living in coastal areas, a 1- to 2-m rise in sea level (likely with a warming in excess of 3 °C) poses existential threat if they do not relocate or migrate. It has been estimated that several hundred million people would be subject to famine with warming in excess of 4 °C (54). However, there has essentially been no discussion on warming beyond 5 °C. Climate change-induced species extinction is one major concern with warming of such large magnitudes (>5 °C). The current rate of loss of species is ∼1,000-fold the historical rate, due largely to habitat destruction. At this rate, about 25% of species are in danger of extinction in the coming decades (56). Global warming of 6 °C or more (accompanied by increase in ocean acidity due to increased CO2) can act as a major force multiplier and expose as much as 90% of species to the dangers of extinction (57). The bodily harms combined with climate change-forced species destruction, biodiversity loss, and threats to water and food security, as summarized recently (58), motivated us to categorize warming beyond 5 °C as unknown??, implying the possibility of existential threats. Fig. 2 displays these three risk categorizations (vertical dashed lines).

### 1AC – AI

#### US companies are on track to develop lethal AI weapons now.

**Dellinger 19** [AJ Dellinger, 8-22-2019, "Could advancements in AI eventually lead to ‘Terminator’-style killer robots?," Mic, https://www.mic.com/p/microsoft-amazon-other-big-tech-companies-are-putting-us-at-risk-of-a-killer-ai-study-says-18689833] //PT

Tech companies are happy to tout their innovations and latest developments, but one organization is warning that not all advancements are good ones. Dutch nonprofit PAX, an organization that advocates for peace, recently looked into how the tech sector is handling the development of artificial intelligence and its potential to become an automated destructive force that could turn on humanity. What it found is that just seven of the 50 companies it investigated partake in "best practices" to mitigate the risk of an eventual AI apocalypse. Twenty-one firms, including the likes of Amazon and Microsoft, were marked as "high concern." PAX's research focused on answering three different questions: Is the company developing technology relevant to the potential development of lethal autonomous weapons, is the firm working on military projects that may enable deadly force, and has the company committed to not contributing to the development of autonomous weapons? Companies were given high marks for committing themselves to not contributing to the development of potentially deadly machines. Meanwhile, companies that freely work alongside the military without a clear plan in place to prevent their technology from being used for lethal purposes received demerits. Given that, it's not surprising that Amazon and Microsoft would sit atop the list of companies that just may push us toward a future filled with killer robots. The two have spent the better part of the last year locked in an ongoing competition to land a massive government contract to build the Pentagon a "war cloud" known as the Joint Enterprise Defense Infrastructure, or JEDI. The project would equip the United States Department of Defense with a cloud infrastructure that would allow branches of the military to freely share information, from sensitive documents to mission plans, across multiple theaters. The appeal of tackling the proposal is clear for Amazon and Microsoft: it carries a $10 billion contract that will be rewarded to the company that can provide the service the government is looking for. But, in winning the contract and building the war-enabling technology that the military wants, one of these companies will undoubtedly contribute to the deaths of humans. U.S. Department of Defense Chief Management Officer John H. Gibson II has made that abundantly clear in talking about JEDI, stating publicly that "This program is truly about increasing the lethality of our department." The criticisms of the companies extend beyond just their interest in taking on the JEDI project. Microsoft has taken heat in the past for providing its technology to the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), including providing the organization tasked with separating migrant children from their families with "facial recognition and identification" tools. Last year, the company called the separation policy "abhorrent" and said its technology isn't being used to enable those practices, though it shied away from canceling ongoing work with ICE or from taking on future contracts with the government agency. Microsoft has urged Congress to take steps to regulate facial recognition technology before it is put to use in overzealous and potentially harmful ways, so points for recognizing the risk even if the company is profiting off it anyway. While Microsoft has at least shown a little bit of caution when it comes to deploying its technology, Amazon has been a bit more brazen in offering up facial recognition services. Earlier this year, Andy Jassy — the CEO of Amazon Web Services (AWS) — said the company would offer its technology to "any government department that is following the law." That's pretty broad, and since the government has a pretty powerful hand in deciding what exactly the law is, it can be read as Amazon offering its facial recognition project Rekognition up carte blanche to any agency that wants to use it. The company hasn't been shy about selling Rekognition to law enforcement agencies across the country despite concerns it contributes to the invasion of the public's right to privacy. It also hasn't been particularly dissuaded from profiting off the technology even though it's actually pretty terrible at identifying people and displays a clear bias when attempting to identify women and people of color. Add to that the concern that it may one day contribute to the development of automated killing machines, as PAX would suggest, and you have a real recipe for something awful.

#### These companies will sell AI weapons to the US military which will ensure the AI arms race – but workers have empirically caused them to back out of weapons development.

**Skolnik 3/16** [Jon Skolnik, 3-16-2021, "Big Tech is fueling an AI "arms race": It could be terrifying — or just a giant scam," Salon, https://www.salon.com/2021/03/16/big-tech-is-fueling-an-ai-arms-race-it-could-be-terrifying--or-just-a-giant-scam/] //PT

Early in the 2020 presidential campaign, Democratic candidates Pete Buttigieg and Andrew Yang tried to build political momentum around the claim that the United States is losing ground in a new arms race with China — not over nuclear missiles or conventional arms but artificial intelligence, or AI. Around the same time, former President Trump launched the American AI Initiative, which sought to marshal AI technologies against "adversarial nations for the security of our economy and our nation," as Trump's top technology adviser put it. Buttigieg, Yang and Trump may have agreed about little else, but they appeared to go along with the nonpartisan think tanks and public policy organizations –– many of them funded by weapons contractors –– that have worked to promote the supposedly alarming possibility that China and Russia may be "beating" the U.S. in defense applications for AI. Hawkish or "centrist" research organizations like the Center for New American Security (CNAS), the Brookings Institution and the Heritage Foundation, despite their policy and ideological differences in many areas, have argued that America must ratchet up spending on AI research and development, lest it lose its place as No. 1. Just last week, the National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence (NSCAI) published a sweeping 756-page report, culminating two years of work following the 2019 National Defense Authorization Act, asking Congress to authorize a $40 billion federal investment in AI research and development, which the NSCAI calls "a modest down payment." The commission also urged President Biden to reject the push for a global ban on AI-enabled autonomous weapons — a ban proposed by thousands of scientists and thought leaders in an open letter written in 2015. Concerned about the threat of increasing AI sophistication in Russia and China, the commission warned lawmakers that America "will not be able to defend against AI-enabled threats without ubiquitous AI capabilities and new warfighting paradigms." It offered a laundry list of recommendations to put these paradigms into action, including a "Steering Committee on Emerging Technology" within the Defense Department, an accredited university designed to produce and recruit tech talent for the defense sector, and a ramped-up investment in semiconductor manufacturing designed to keep the U.S. "two generations" ahead of China. One question, however, was not directly answered in the NSCAI's gigantic report or in all the think-tank policy papers that preceded it: Is this science fiction-flavored arms race against largely imaginary Chinese and Russian techno-weapons of the future really necessary? Is it remotely a good idea, or likely to improve the lives of any human beings on the planet? (Excepting, that is, those who stand to profit from it.) Jim Naureckas, the editor of Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting (FAIR) and a frequent critic of military spending, told Salon in an interview that framing of AI development as an "arms race" is irresponsible, but in the larger sweep of history is also nothing new. "The whole military industry is driven by fear as a motivator," he said. "There's a logic to an arms race that's different from the logic of arms control." After its release, the NSCAI report was greeted with a deluge of largely uncritical media coverage, most of it echoing concerns about the U.S. losing the "AI arms race" — a term not mentioned in the report itself, but certainly evoked by its framing. "Unless America acts now," a Washington Post headline read, "China could trounce it in artificial intelligence." "Which country is emerging as the global leader in AI?" echoed TechHQ. "America wakes up to the China threat," chimed the Wall Street Journal. As Naureckas pointed out, the notion that that the U.S. will soon fall behind its global competitors in military technology is a tried-and-true scare tactic, employed at various times in slightly different registers by both Democrats and Republicans. In reality, U.S. military spending remains mind-bogglingly high. For the 2020 fiscal year, the Trump administration approved a military budget of $738 billion, a $21 billion increase from the previous year and it passed with overwhelming bipartisan support, facing only 48 "no" votes in the House and eight in the Senate. In 2019, the militarized budget accounted for 64.5 percent of all federal discretionary spending. The U.S. has 800 military bases on foreign soil, far more than any other country in the world. According to Military.com, America is the world leader in every significant category of military hardware, and has roughly 1.4 million active-duty military personnel. In 2020, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) found that the U.S. allocated more to its military budget than the next 10 nations combined. American military spending is about 2.7 times greater than that of China — which has a much larger population — and more than 10 times higher than Russia's, or that of any other single country. Meanwhile, bureaucratic and operational waste within the defense budget abound. In 2016, for example, it was discovered that the Pentagon had buried an internal study finding that it had spent some $125 billion in wasteful business operations. More recently, it was discovered that the Pentagon's F-35 fighter jet program — which costed taxpayers somewhere in the neighborhood of $1.5 trillion — has been riddled with software glitches and operational failures since 2006, rendering an untold number of fighter jets (each one costing $100 million) not flight-ready. In spite of all its administrative bloat and operational dysfunction, the military remains exceptionally well-funded. Why, then, would the NSCAI insist it needs billions more for a hypothetical arms race against badly underfunded opponents? The report's authors may tell a better story than the report itself. Jack Poulson, a former Google employee who resigned over the company's plan to launch a censored version of its search engine in China, told Salon that profit motives is deeply entrenched in the NSCAI report. "It should not come as a surprise that a commission packed with tech billionaires would call for increased intellectual property protections, oppose regulation (including on Lethal Autonomous Weapons), propose toothless ethics principles, and call for more federal funding of their industry," Poulson said in a statement. Indeed, many commission members are past and present tech executives of companies on the fore of AI — companies that have much to gain from future contracting deals with the Pentagon. The commission's chair, for example, is Eric Schmidt, the former CEO of Google, who remains — as Poulson pointed out — a major shareholder in Alphabet, Google's parent company. Google's head of AI, Andrew Moore, is also a member of the NSCAI. Google already has an extensive history of working with the Pentagon. According to The Intercept, in a federally-funded $70 million program called Project Maven, Google developed "algorithmic warfare initiative to apply artificial intelligence solutions to drone targeting." The company expecting that revenue would steadily rise from $15 million to $250 million a year for such defense projects. In April of 2018, however, 3,000 Google employees signed an open letter decrying the company's involvement in defense technology, a move that eventually led to Google's ultimate decision to back out of the deal. Schmidt strongly objected to Google's decision, calling it an "aberration" within the tech industry, which he felt was otherwise inclined to collaborate with the Defense Department. Former Undersecretary of the Navy Robert Work, the vice chairman of NSCAI, called Google's decision "hypocritical," using language that suggested a new cold war is already underway: "Anything that's going on in the AI center in China is going to the Chinese government and then will ultimately end up in the hands of the Chinese military." Other members of the commission include Oracle CEO Safra Catz, Microsoft chief scientific officer Eric Horvitz, and Andrew Jassy, the future CEO of Amazon Web Services, all of whom received cloud awards as part of the CIA's Commercial Cloud Enterprise (C2E), as Poulson noted. Oracle, Amazon and Microsoft, in fact, are currently involved in an acrimonious legal battle over a $10 billion cloud-computing contract called the Joint Enterprise Defense Initiative (JEDI). The deal was initially considered to be "gift-wrapped" for Amazon until Oracle butted in, alleging improprieties. In an odd turn of events, the Pentagon awarded the contract to Microsoft, prompting Amazon to sue the federal government for anti-Amazon bias, based on ex-President Trump's overheated rhetoric. When it comes to securing Big Tech's enormous future contracts with the Pentagon, it appears that Jassy, Catz and Horvitz have set aside their mutual grievances for the time being Other board members of NSCAI include Gilman Louie and Christopher Darby, who are the founder and vice president (respectively) of a CIA-funded nonprofit called In-Q-Tel, which invests money in private companies who are developing technologies that might be useful to the intelligence community. According to a Wall Street Journal investigation from 2015, half of In-Q-Tel's trustees were financially connected to private companies in which In-Q-Tel had invested. Another board member, William Mark, a vice president of SRI International, has served on the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), a government-run program that partners with a variety of private companies and research institutions to "make pivotal investments in breakthrough technologies for national security." DARPA has awarded SRI numerous contracts for the development of speech recognition, translation and, most recently, deep-fake recognition systems. In other words, nearly everyone involved in preparing or supporting the NSCAI report would seem likely to benefit from the perception that the U.S. is falling behind other nations in vital defense technology. The Defense Department, Poulson told Salon, "prefers to run the race as if it is losing — which happens to increase military budgets, justify post-government consulting careers and help tech CEOs oppose regulation." It's only natural that government authorities would seek out industry experts to consult on AI projects — it's a fast-developing field that almost no one outside the tech world understands. Poulson wonders, however, "whether the U.S. will give human rights organizations — such as Human Rights Watch and the Campaign to Stop Killer Robots — as much of a seat at the table as it does tech billionaires." The very fact that the NSCAI is stacked with panel members with an obvious incentive to weaponize new technologies raises the question whether there needs to be an AI "arms race" at all. That term, of course, harkens back to Cold War hysteria surrounding the threat of nuclear annihilation, which led U.S. lawmakers to grow unduly concerned with the "missile gap," a widely held misconception that the Soviet Union was outpacing the U.S. with superior ballistic missile capabilities. (As intelligence sources knew even at the time, the Soviet nuclear arsenal was in bad shape and much smaller than advertised.) Arms control strategies, in fact, may be a more effective strategy in the AI realm, just as it was with nuclear missiles, especially given that America already collaborates heavily with China in AI research. As Graham Webster wrote recently in MIT Tech Review: Unlike the US and USSR, in which science and technology developed on largely independent tracks, the US and China are part of a globally intertwined ecosystem. Even if the US and China cut off trade with each other, both countries would still have to worry about security risks from components, since risks along the supply chain exist everywhere. For example, Alibaba, a tech giant on the forefront of AI, has multiple offices in the U.S., and Google AI chief Jeff Dean is an adviser at China's Tsinghua University, which opened an Institute for Artificial Intelligence in June 2018. Stanford University's Artificial Intelligence lab has a partnership with one of China's biggest retailers. In other words, an arms race in which the two nations are locked in silos of information, research and development is not just ethically dubious but logistically impossible. Will China and Russia explore uses of AI in weapons of the future? Almost certainly — both countries have already signaled movement in that direction. But if American politicians and scientists want to maximize the potential of AI, framing its development in terms of an international "arms race" seems like a strategic and philosophical mistake on a huge scale. AI has the potential to revolutionize health care, education, climate science and many other fields — and those things all play a fundamental role in national security. But these new technologies will not make America more secure if they are understood as weapons of international combat.

#### AI weapon arms racing causes nuclear war – lack of verification methods and uncertainty about technological trajectory ensures racing likely to escalate.

**Horowitz 19** [Michael C. Horowitz, Political Science Professor, Director Perry World House, and Perry Professor at the University of Pennsylvania, author of the Diffusion of Power: Causes and Consequences for International Politics and co-author of Why Leaders Fight, “When Speed Skills: Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems, deterrence and stability, https://sci-hub.st/https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01402390.2019.1621174?src=recsys&journalCode=fjss20]

55 All arms races share an underlying political dynamic whereby fear of developments by one or multiple other actors, and the inability to verify that those actors are not developing particular capabilities, fuels more intense development of new weapon systems than would happen otherwise.56 An arms race in the area of machine autonomy would be no different in that dimension. The root would be inherently political.57 Actors would also have to believe that they would gain an advantage from the developing LAWS, or least be at a significant disadvantage if they did not develop those weapon systems. Jervis argues that arms races occur due to a security dilemma when states have the ability to measure each other’s capabilities, but not their intentions.58 The opacity surrounding LAWS development might generate increased risk for arms competition because of potential opacity about capabilities, in addition to the ‘normal’ opacity that exists about intentions. First, it will be extremely difficult for states to credibly demonstrate autonomous weapon capabilities. The difference between a remotely piloted system and an autonomous system is software, not hardware, meaning verification that a given country is operating an autonomous system at all would be difficult. Second, uncertainty about the technological trajectory of machine learning and specific military applications means that countries might have significant uncertainty about other countries’ capabilities. Thus, countries might invest a lot in AI applications to military systems due to fear of what others are developing. The heightened role of uncertainty about what other countries are developing would make an LAWS arms competition different than many historical arms races – for example, the Anglo-German naval arms race prior to World War I. In the Anglo-German naval arms race case, both sides could see the ships being produced by the other side because those ships left port for testing, and were subject to reporting by spies who could observe construction patterns.59 Even though there was some uncertainty about the specific capabilities of battleships and battlecruisers, each side could count the number and size of the guns deployed on each ship. Third, the rules of engagement for LAWS would also likely be unknown – and use of an LAWS by a state in one engagement might not generate predictability, since a state could change the programming of the system prior to the next engagement. Thus, opacity surrounding AI capabilities could, potentially, lead to worse case assumptions about capability development by potential adversaries, thus making arms race dynamics more likely. Research on bargaining and war also suggests that uncertainty about capabilities makes it harder for countries to come to agreements when they enter into disputes. Private information about military capabilities means both sides can believe they are likely to win if a dispute escalates.60 The dispute then becomes harder to resolve and more likely to escalate. To the extent that machine learning systems generate more uncertainty due to their opacity, an arms race over machine learning systems might therefore be somewhat more likely to escalate. The extent of the effect would be difficult to determine, however.

#### Nuclear war causes extinction – ozone layer loss, firestorms, and agricultural disruption.

Starr 17 (Steven; Steven Starr is the director of the University of Missouri’s Clinical Laboratory Science Program, as well as a senior scientist at the Physicians for Social Responsibility. He has been published in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists and the Strategic Arms Reduction (STAR) website of the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology; Jan 09, 2017; “Turning a Blind Eye Towards Armageddon — U.S. Leaders Reject Nuclear Winter Studies”; Federation of American Scientists; https://fas.org/2017/01/turning-a-blind-eye-towards-armageddon-u-s-leaders-reject-nuclear-winter-studies/; DOA December 8, 2019; JPark)

The detonation of an atomic bomb with this explosive power will instantly ignite fires over a surface area of three to five square miles. In the recent studies, the scientists calculated that the blast, fire, and radiation from a war fought with 100 atomic bombs could produce direct fatalities comparable to all of those worldwide in World War II, or to those once estimated for a “counterforce” nuclear war between the superpowers. However, the long-term environmental effects of the war could significantly disrupt the global weather for at least a decade, which would likely result in a vast global famine. The scientists predicted that nuclear firestorms in the burning cities would cause at least five million tons of black carbon smoke to quickly rise above cloud level into the stratosphere, where it could not be rained out. The smoke would circle the Earth in less than two weeks and would form a global stratospheric smoke layer that would remain for more than a decade. The smoke would absorb warming sunlight, which would heat the smoke to temperatures near the boiling point of water, producing ozone losses of 20 to 50 percent over populated areas. This would almost double the amount of UV-B reaching the most populated regions of the mid-latitudes, and it would create UV-B indices unprecedented in human history. In North America and Central Europe, the time required to get a painful sunburn at mid-day in June could decrease to as little as six minutes for fair-skinned individuals. As the smoke layer blocked warming sunlight from reaching the Earth’s surface, it would produce the coldest average surface temperatures in the last 1,000 years. The scientists calculated that global food production would decrease by 20 to 40 percent during a five-year period following such a war. Medical experts have predicted that the shortening of growing seasons and corresponding decreases in agricultural production could cause up to two billion people to perish from famine. The climatologists also investigated the effects of a nuclear war fought with the vastly more powerful modern thermonuclear weapons possessed by the United States, Russia, China, France, and England. Some of the thermonuclear weapons constructed during the 1950s and 1960s were 1,000 times more powerful than an atomic bomb. During the last 30 years, the average size of thermonuclear or “strategic” nuclear weapons has decreased. Yet today, each of the approximately 3,540 strategic weapons deployed by the United States and Russia is seven to 80 times more powerful than the atomic bombs modeled in the India-Pakistan study. The smallest strategic nuclear weapon has an explosive power of 100,000 tons of TNT, compared to an atomic bomb with an average explosive power of 15,000 tons of TNT. Strategic nuclear weapons produce much larger nuclear firestorms than do atomic bombs. For example, a standard Russian 800-kiloton warhead, on an average day, will ignite fires covering a surface area of 90 to 152 square miles. A war fought with hundreds or thousands of U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons would ignite immense nuclear firestorms covering land surface areas of many thousands or tens of thousands of square miles. The scientists calculated that these fires would produce up to 180 million tons of black carbon soot and smoke, which would form a dense, global stratospheric smoke layer. The smoke would remain in the stratosphere for 10 to 20 years, and it would block as much as 70 percent of sunlight from reaching the surface of the Northern Hemisphere and 35 percent from the Southern Hemisphere. So much sunlight would be blocked by the smoke that the noonday sun would resemble a full moon at midnight. Under such conditions, it would only require a matter of days or weeks for daily minimum temperatures to fall below freezing in the largest agricultural areas of the Northern Hemisphere, where freezing temperatures would occur every day for a period of between one to more than two years. Average surface temperatures would become colder than those experienced 18,000 years ago at the height of the last Ice Age, and the prolonged cold would cause average rainfall to decrease by up to 90%. Growing seasons would be completely eliminated for more than a decade; it would be too cold and dark to grow food crops, which would doom the majority of the human population.

### 1AC – Solvency

#### Plan: The United States ought to recognize the unconditional right of big tech workers to strike.

#### Tech worker strikes lead to quick, concrete, climate action from policymakers and tech leaders – protests are a start but strikes work better

Baca and Greene ’19 [Amazon, Google, other tech employees protest in support of climate action, Marie Baca and Jay Greene, https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2019/09/20/amazon-google-other-tech-employees-protest-support-climate-action/, September 20 2019, Education: Stanford University, BA in Human Biology; Stanford University, MA in Communications, Graduate Program in Journalism Marie C. Baca was a breaking news technology and business reporter in San Francisco. She left The Post in December 2019, Education: Macalester College, BA in English; Columbia University, MS in Journalism Jay Greene is a reporter for The Washington Post who is focused on technology coverage in the Pacific Northwest.] [SS]

Thousands of workers at the nation’s largest tech companies were expected to walk off their jobs Friday to urge industry and world leaders to address climate change more aggressively, part of a larger wave of demonstrations expected to draw millions of people across the globe. The group Amazon Employees for Climate Justice said more than 1,800 Amazon employees in 25 cities pledged to walk out. Google Workers for Action on Climate tweeted that they expected about 700 workers to strike as of Thursday. Similar groups that said they were representing employees at Microsoft, Facebook, Twitter, Square and other major tech companies tweeted that they also expected significant numbers of employees to walk out. Hundreds gathered Friday outside Amazon’s headquarters in downtown Seattle as part of the demonstrations. Participants chanted, “Hey hey, ho ho, fossil fuels have got to go” and held signs with messages such as “Amazon, Let’s lead. Zero Emissions By 2030.” Rebecca Sheppard, 28, works in Amazon’s air, science and tech group to make the online retail giant’s planes more efficient. She said she thought about quitting last year over her concerns about Amazon’s massive carbon footprint, but colleagues discouraged her, saying she could effect change by sticking around. “We’ve just got to double down,” she said about employee efforts to produce change. (Amazon founder and chief executive Jeff Bezos owns The Washington Post.) ‘I hope the politicians hear us’: Millions of youth around the world strike for action The strike is being held in advance of a Monday climate summit at the United Nations. U.N. Secretary-General António Guterres has insisted that instead of bringing “fancy speeches” with them to the meeting, the countries must offer concrete commitments such as reaching net zero emissions by 2050 or eliminating the construction of coal-fired power plants. Strike organizers expected more than 1,000 events to take place in the United States alone. The tech workers joined millions of youths from more than 150 countries around the world who skipped school Friday in solidarity with the movement. Among them was 16-year-old Swedish climate activist Greta Thunberg, who has given a speech before the United Nations, met with political and business leaders, and has been nominated for a Nobel Peace Prize for her work. Facebook released a statement Friday expressing its support for employees who chose to walk out and said that the company is “building sustainability into our operations as well as engaging the global community on this important issue with our products.” Microsoft declined to comment. Google, Twitter and Square were not immediately available to comment. At Amazon, the walkout came a day after Bezos announced a “Climate Pledge” that would require signatories to meet the goals of the Paris climate agreement a decade early. The pledge also requires regular measuring and reporting of emissions, as well as obtaining net zero carbon across businesses by 2040, among other stipulations. U.S. takes a low profile as nations gather in New York to debate steps to combat climate change Bezos said Amazon would be the first company to sign the pledge. Critics, who have long claimed Amazon does little to offset the emissions it produces, say the pact lacks transparency and standardized rules for what is measured and reported. Amazon declined to comment on the walkout. In Seattle, workers who walked out held signs that opposed deals with gas and oil companies. The crowd booed when a speaker noted that Amazon funds climate-denying lobbyists. There was also a speaker from Google. Sarah Read, a user experience researcher with Prime Video, said Thursday’s announcement shows employees are having an impact. She said she believes the Climate Pact is related to an employee-sponsored shareholder resolution that would have required the company create a plan to address climate change, a resolution that failed in spring. Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos announces new ‘Climate Pledge’ ahead of employee protests “It’s a direct response to Amazon employees standing up, speaking out and saying this is important to them,” Read said.

**And, the major issue with current climate strikes is that there is not enough traction due to threats- the 1AC allows for consistent strikes, increases turnout, and forces companies to take significant action towards reducing greenhouse gases- Australia proves.**

**Clark 19-** Benjamin Clark is a writer and media worker based in Melbourne. His work has appeared in *Crikey*, *The Age*, *Junkee* and *Kill Your Darlings*.“We Can't Tackle Climate Change without Tackling Striking Laws.” *Crikey*, 24 Sept. 2019, www.crikey.com.au/2019/09/24/first-post-industrial-strike/.

**Friday’s climate strike was a brief but exhilarating dash of hope amid the dispiriting intransigence of Australian environmental politics. Standing among the** [**100,000-plus crowd in Melbourne**](https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-09-20/school-strike-for-climate-draws-thousands-to-australian-rallies/11531612)**, with hippies, suits and tradies embracing in raucous chants, one could briefly fantasise that we were winning; that the political climate, if not the physical one, might be changing for the better. Significantly, the third global climate strike was the first in Australia to include mass participation of workers alongside students. Indeed, the protest rivalled the largest worker-dominated rallies in Australian history, despite the teenage organisers lacking the resources and networks of the Australian Council of Trade Unions. The youth-led movement did face difficulties in encouraging workers into the fold, though not for lack of adult enthusiasm. The problem is that workers are subject to myriad restrictions on their right to peaceful civic engagement. You can’t sack students When organising students, Greta Thunberg’s disciples had a clear theory of change — young activists could pressure powerful adults to act on climate change by making inaction costly. They did what workers once could, absent legislative barriers — disrupt the daily operations of important institutions and cause headaches for those in power. Conservatives whinged but were powerless to stop it, as disciplining students remains the purview of teachers who often encourage their students to be civically engaged. The power of workers to similarly disrupt “business as usual” has been systemically stymied by draconian legislation that severely limits their right to strike.** The Fair Work Act affords no legal protection for striking except in limited circumstances, such as during EBA negotiations. Striking for non EBA-related matters, particularly political issues, can see your pay docked or your contract terminated. **On Thursday, the Fair Work Commission reminded workers that if they wanted to attend the climate strike, they would require permission from their employer and/or may need to use their annual leave (if they had any). Unions agreed these were the only options for many workers. The only workers known to have taken industrial action to attend the climate strike were** [**some Sydney wharfies**](https://www.afr.com/policy/energy-and-climate/wharfies-to-strike-to-attend-climate-action-rallies-20190918-p52shb) **whose EBA negotiations fell at a coincidental time. So for most workers it wasn’t really a “strike” at all. It was a protest, lacking the central element of industrial action: the collective withdrawal of labour to coerce institutions to alter their actions. Many workers missed out on attending the protest, unable to forego the income or defy the boss for fear of retaliation. Solidarity forever™ Some employers** [**granted their workers time off**](https://10daily.com.au/views/a190919hqjfb/why-im-paying-my-staff-to-strike-for-the-climate-20190919) **and a select few actually paid their staff to attend. Such supportive corporate interventions rightly place the burden back on institutions to make the necessary sacrifices. However, they still disempower workers and reinforce that these are decisions for boardrooms, not breakrooms. Hostile companies were answerable principally to consumers and competitors, coerced only by the threat of a socially irresponsible image. Yet many employers simply don’t care, opportunistically** [**“greenwashing”**](https://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/2016/aug/20/greenwashing-environmentalism-lies-companies) **for brand exposure while doing little else to affect change. While institutions are far more responsible** [**than individuals**](https://theconversation.com/climate-change-focusing-on-how-individuals-can-help-is-very-convenient-for-corporations-108546) **for the environmental crisis we face,** corporations still largely insulate themselves from adverse consequences and outsource the moral burden to resist. The workers united need legislative support The protected right to strike, enshrined in global standards, must surely be extended beyond its current limited remit. Firstly, workers should be afforded legal protection for strike action on any matter that directly relates to their workplace pay and conditions, whether during a negotiating period or not. Secondly**, legal protection should be afforded to a specified number of non-workplace-specific strikes per year for workers in large companies (the use of which must be negotiated in good faith between unions and employers). This would allow workers and their representatives to prioritise and pursue pressing political goals, including issues that affect all workers, such as a just transition to a low-carbon economy. I doubt Scott Morrison has any intention of facilitating the positive freedoms required to foster a vibrant civic culture. After all, a truly liberal framework would allow even more protesters to highlight his government’s callous disregard for our planet’s future. But the union movement, currently mulling its next move after the “Change the Rules” campaign, should take heed of society’s growing appetite for civil demonstration and imagine the possibilities that could arise if workers’ passion was less shackled.**

#### Strikes are key to preventing companies from developing lethal AI.

**Tiku 18** [Nitasha Tiku, 10-4-2018, "The Year Tech Workers Realized They Were Workers," Wired, https://www.wired.com/story/why-hotel-workers-strike-reverberated-through-tech/]

2018 WAS THE year that Big Tech’s mission statements came back to haunt it. When employees felt that their products were damaging the world and that management wouldn't listen, they went public with their protests. At Google and Amazon, they challenged contracts to sell artificial intelligence and facial-recognition technology to the Pentagon and police. At Microsoft and Salesforce, workers argued against selling cloud computing services to agencies separating families at the border. Technology’s unintended consequences were also central to the most disruptive labor action in the Bay Area this year, a strike by nearly 8,000 Marriott employees, including many in downtown San Francisco, just a dockless scooter ride from the headquarters of many major tech firms. Unite Here, the union representing strikers in eight cities, including San Jose and Oakland, demanded limits on automation like facial recognition at the front desk or the use of Alexa in lieu of a concierge. Marriott agreed to notify workers 150 days before implementing new technology and to give workers committee representation while the technology is still in development, among other protections. Union organizers say they wouldn’t have won the changes without the strike, which lasted two months. When Google employees and contractors briefly stepped away from their desks to protest the company’s policies on sexual harassment on November 1, Marriott workers in San Francisco had already been striking for 27 days, with 32 days still ahead of them—just like Marriott workers in San Jose, where Google plans to build a controversial new mega-campus. Both the highly paid engineers and the low-paid housekeepers want a seat at the table when it comes to deploying technology. Both sets of workers are also demanding changes in how their employers handle sexual harassment. A week after the walkout, Google tweaked its arbitration policy for sexual harassment claims. Facebook, Airbnb, and Square soon followed. In Marriott’s case, the union secured GPS-enabled silent panic buttons for all workers and policy changes, like removing and banning guests who harass women, and the right not to serve a guest who they believe harassed them. In fact, the parallels between the two high-profile movements—despite vast differences in market power, class, and income—suggest that Google employees’ sense of exceptionalism may be starting to crack, along with illusions about how Google operates. If tech’s moment of reckoning has taught us that Silicon Valley is the same old capitalism, then perhaps Googlers are not a new kind of worker, and maybe some traditional labor rules apply: like the need for collective action in order to make structural change. But the proximity of the Marriott strike also brings into focus both the potential and the limits of the fledgling revolt within Big Tech. “When tech workers see that people who get paid way, way, way, way less than they do strike for months, it makes them realize, ‘What the fuck are we doing when we walk out for half an hour?’” says a former Google employee of the Marriott workers. “The difference in the last few months has been more people realizing that we are actually better if we organize.” The public actions that started the year---open letters, petitions, and Medium posts---are ultimately an appeal to a company’s values. But after The New York Times reported that Google gave a $90 million exit package to Android founder Andy Rubin after he was accused of sexual harassment, employees lost faith. Then at a company-wide meeting, executives offered business-as-usual pablum. Disgust was universal enough that the 20,000-person walkout was arranged in just three days. “Last year feels like it was a century ago. So much has changed,” says Stephanie Parker, one of the walkout organizers. “Seeing the cafeteria workers and security guards at Silicon Valley companies bravely demand access to benefits and respect was a deeply inspiring experience for me and many other tech workers this past year. It helped me to see parallels between the struggles of these service workers and my own experience as a black woman in tech, and also prepared me to identify with the struggles happening in other local industries, like the Marriott hotel strike.” Nelson Lichtenstein, a history professor and director of the Center for the Study of Work, Labor, and Democracy at UC Santa Barbara, says that over time, corporate success and growing size tend to create divisions and inequalities. “It takes a while. Sometimes it takes a generation, or a little less, for the ordinary person—not the person who’s hired on day one with stock options—to say, ‘Wait a minute, this thing isn’t working for me, and I can see some corruption in the institution.'” So far, tech-worker activism has been most visible at Google. Might workers elsewhere adopt similar tactics? Take Amazon, a company known for its aggressive anti-union tactics. This spring, white-collar employees told WIRED that their colleagues are too pragmatic and fearful of retaliation to go the way of Google activists. In December, however, employees said workers have been more vocal and restless over issues like the facial-recognition service Amazon sells to police departments and Amazon’s fierce opposition to a proposed Seattle tax on the company that would have funded homeless programs. “We’re just beginning to challenge the fear that drives what looks from the outside to be apathy,” says one Amazon employee. “Social movements are funny creatures. They sometimes pop up in unexpected places with unexpected rapidity,” says Joshua Freeman, a professor at CUNY’s School of Labor and Urban Studies. He sees in the recent protests some echoes of the 1930s, when workers who had seen themselves as “individualists”---most notably news reporters---realized they needed union support as much as blue-collar workers. Then, too, society was in tumult. "There was a general radicalization of American society in response to the Great Depression, in the sense that the corporate economy had failed most Americans,” he says. Reporters were also unhappy with their employers using their pages to “promote conservative political positions,” Freeman says. Rachel Gumpert, Unite Here’s head of communications, was not surprised to see both sets of workers organize around an issue like sexual harassment. “Sometimes your base salary doesn’t protect you,” says Gumpert. “Everybody needs to have voice in their job and dignity at work.”

## Framing

### 1AC – Util

#### The standard is maximizing expected well-being.

#### 1] Phenomenal introspection – it’s the most epistemically reliable- historical and moral disagreement over internal conceptions of morality such as questions of race, gender, class, religion, etc. prove the fallibility of non-observational based ethics. Introspection means that we value happiness because we can determine that we each value it – just as I can observe a lemon’s yellowness, we can make those judgements about happiness.

#### 2] Actor specificity – A] Aggregation – every policy benefit some and harms others, which also means that side constraints freeze action, B] No act-omission distinction – choosing to omit is an act itself – governments actively decide not to act so there is no omission, C] States lack wills or intentions since policies are inherently collective actions. Actor specificity comes first since different agents have different ethical standings.

#### 3] Only consequentialism can explain degrees of wrongness – If I break a promise to meet up for lunch that is not as bad as breaking a promise to take a dying person to the hospital. Only by evaluating the consequences of each scenario can we explain why the second one is much worse than the first.

#### 4] Extinction first under any other framework – A] It precludes the possibility of any kind of moral value – we can’t confer value onto anything if we’re not alive, B] Future generations mean infinite magnitude – we must look towards future lives as well.