# FW

### Util

#### Pleasure is an intrinsic good.

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

Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues**.** This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for **there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels,** and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative. 2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values. If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good. 3 As Aristotle observes: “**We never ask what her**~~is~~ **end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.**”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value. Although pleasure and pain thus seem to be good candidates for intrinsic value and disvalue, several objections have been raised against this suggestion: (1) that pleasure and pain have instrumental but not intrinsic value/disvalue; (2) that pleasure and pain gain their value/disvalue derivatively, in virtue of satisfying/frustrating our desires; (3) that there is a subset of pleasures that are not intrinsically valuable (so-called “evil pleasures”) and a subset of pains that are not intrinsically disvaluable (so-called “noble pains”), and (4) that pain asymbolia, masochism, and practices such as wiggling a loose tooth render it implausible that pain is intrinsically disvaluable. I shall argue that these objections fail.

**And, consequentialism is true—**

**A] All actions are forward-looking, so intentions are constituted by foreseen consequences. If I throw my hand towards your face, I intend to punch you.**

**B] Moral substitutability—if I ought to mow the lawn, then I ought to turn on the lawnmower. Thus, an obligation requires all of its necessary enablers.**

**Thus, the standard is *maximizing pleasure and minimizing pain*. Calc indicts don’t link—my framework is a general principle to be applied intuitively, not a rigid calculator. Prefer—**

**1 – Death first – their framework assumes perfect rationality, but agents can’t deliberate on ethics if they fear for their bodily security – proves my offense turns and outweighs theirs.****2 – Actor-Spec – Governments are institutions with pragmatic purposes and not agents with intentions so non-consequentialist impacts are incoherent—outweighs since different agents have different obligations. Takes out calc indicts—   
  
3 – A just government refers to one that acts utilitarian meaning that a utilitarian framework is key to understand the perspective of the actor in the res  
MVO 18’** What does a just government mean? [https://www.mvorganizing.org/what-does-a-just-government-mean/]

**A just government is fair to ALL people that it governs**. This includes not only the governed, but also the governors. Subjecting the governors **to** the same laws as the governed will help to **ensure that no one group’s interests are served at the expense of others**.

# Solvency

#### Plan text: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike. CX checks theory interps to avoid frivolous debates – otherwise I get an I meet.

#### Definition of unconditional right to strike:

**NLRB 85** [National Labor Relations Board; “Legislative History of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947: Volume 1,” Jan 1985; <https://play.google.com/store/books/details?id=7o1tA__v4xwC&rdid=book-7o1tA__v4xwC&rdot=1>]

\*\*Edited for gendered language

As for the so-called absolute or **unconditional** right to strike—there are no absolute rights that do not have their **corresponding** **responsibilities**. Under our American Anglo-Saxon system, each individual is **entitled** to the maximum of freedom, provided however (and this provision is of first importance), his [their] freedom has **due** **regard** for the **rights** and **freedoms** of **others**. The very **safeguard** of our freedoms is the recognition of this fundamental principle. I take **issue** very definitely with the suggestion that there is an absolute and **unconditional** **right** to concerted action (which after all is what the **strike** is) which **endangers** the **health** and **welfare** of our people in order to attain a **selfish** **end**.

#### Enforcement through IFAs is normal means – that solves credibility concerns and legal loopholes which encourages striking.

**Neill 12** [Emily CM; “The Right to Strike: How the United States Reduces it to the Freedom to Strike and How International Framework Agreements can Redeem it,” 1/1/12; Labor & Employment Law Forum Volume 2 Issue 2 Article 6; <https://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1047&context=lelb>]

IFAs **open the door to** **collective** **bargaining** by creating a space that **alters** the traditionally **antagonistic** **employer**-**employee** engagement and is more **hospitable** to the organizing process.83 MNC commitment to respect the core ILO principles of **freedom** of **association** and the rights to **organize** and **collectively** **bargain** through IFAs are **instrumental** to **realizing** that purpose.84 1. The **Creation** and **Proliferation** of **International** **Framework** **Agreements** An IFA is an agreement **negotiated** between an **MNC** and typically85 a **global** **union86** to establish an **ongoing** **relationship** between the signatories and ensure **adherence** to uniform **labor** **standards** by the MNC in all countries in which it operates.87 IFAs are the first and only **formally**-**negotiated** instruments between unions and corporations at the **global** **level** and a **significant** development in **labor** **relations**.88 Since the signing of the first IFA in 1988, they have spread at a steadily increasing rate. 89 Their proliferation since 2000 has been especially dramatic—with the number of IFAs signed in 2003-2006 nearly doubling the number signed in the first fifteen years.90 By 2008, approximately sixty-five agreements had been concluded.91 At the end of 2010, that number had jumped to seventy-six.92 2. Context of Framework Agreements: Corporate Social Responsibility While both **corporate** codes of conduct and **IFAs** can be traced to a **consumer** **driven** **push** for corporate **social** **responsibility**, a key difference separates the two: **credibility**. In the late 1980’s, MNCs in the United States began to respond to campaigns by non-governmental organizations accusing MNCs of international human rights abuses by **elaborating** **internal** **codes** of **conduct**.93 These codes, unilaterally written and implemented, tend to be **vague** and provide for **no** **enforcement** **mechanism**.94 The **voluntary**, **self**-**enforcing** nature of these commitments has led **critics** to conclude that they are mere **marketing** **ploys** lacking in **credibility** or having any real social impact.95 IFAs were **developed**, in part, as an alternative to **corporate** **codes** of **conduct** to raise **labor** **standards**.96 Unlike unilateral codes, IFAs are **negotiated** between the **two** principal actors—**employers** and **workers**—in the employment **relationship**.97 Involvement of the very party the agreement is meant to protect attaches greater meaning and significance to the instrument.98The purpose of IFAs is to **promote** fundamental **labor** **rights** by **regulating** **corporate** **conduct** on a global level.99 This brings us to another **key** **distinction** between corporate codes of conduct and IFAs: their concrete normative content. 3. Core ILO Principles as the Substantive Content of IFAs Whereas codes tend to be **vague** in their commitments, MNCs commit themselves to **concrete** **international** **labor** **norms** through **framework** **agreements**. The **key** **areas** of IFAs are the **acceptance** of the four core **labor** **standards**, as articulated in the 1998 ILO Declaration.100 The Declaration itself is typically not mentioned, but rather the four rights are referred to in IFAs by their convention numbers.101 Thus, apart from a very few exceptions, IFAs refer explicitly to ILO Conventions 87 and 98 on freedom of association and the right to organize and collective bargaining, respectively.102 As previously discussed, ILO standards are the **principal** **source** of **international** **labor** norms.103 ILO Conventions 87 and 98 are perhaps the most **important** of ILO principles since the **right** to **organize** and **bargain** **collectively** is essential to the **defense** of **working** **conditions** like wages, hours, and health and safety through the **collective** **bargaining** **process**.104 4. Scope of IFAs, MNCs and Supply Chains One of the most important features of IFAs is their goal of addressing behavior not only within the signatory MNC, but along their supply chains as well.105 According to one study, of the IFAs in existence as of 2008, eighty eight percent explicitly indicated that the norms of the agreements applied to their subsidiaries and seventy-three percent contained provisions defining their application to suppliers and subcontractors.106 These provisions contain varying degrees of commitment on behalf of the signatory MNC. Some MNCs agree to place very concrete obligations on supply chain parties, going so far as to detail sanctions to be imposed upon non-compliant suppliers.107 Others contain provisions that are less mandatory, limiting the MNC’s obligation to informing or encouraging its suppliers and subsidiaries to respect the principles of the agreement. For instance, the PSA Peugeot Citroen IFA was amended in 2010, changing its once relatively firm language by which suppliers are “required” to make similar commitments to a much weaker provision in which the MNC agrees to “request” that its suppliers a similar commitment in respect of their own suppliers and sub-contractors.108 III. ANALYSIS The principal weapon workers have to leverage their bargaining power is the strike.109 The **permanent** **strike** **replacement** **policy** renders [strikes] this weapon almost **meaningless** by **subjecting** workers that employ it to a risk of **job** **loss**. This practice **deviates** from international norms on **freedom** of **association**, the **right** to **organize**, and bargain collectively, as enunciated in Conventions 87 and 98, and reaffirmed in the ILO 1998 Declaration to the point of rendering the right to strike a mere freedom to strike.110 Fortunately, IFAs have the potential to bring many U.S. operating companies into **compliance** with **international** **standards** on the **right** to **strike**, which **prohibits** the use of permanent **replacements**. This Section first addresses the effect of the permanent replacement doctrine on the right to strike in the United States. It next argues that as a member of the ILO, the U.S. is obligated to amend this policy to guarantee workers protection in their right to strike. Finally, it argues that even if the U.S. permits permanent strike replacements, certain U.S. companies are bound to IFAs that prohibit them from taking advantage of the policy. A. Interference with the Right to Strike is an **Abridgement** of **ILO** **Principles** Collective bargaining is the mechanism through which workers present their demands to an employer and, through negotiations, determine the **working** **conditions** and **terms** of **employment**.111 The right to strike arises most often in the **context** of **collective** **bargaining**, though as a **weapon** of **last** **resort**.112 The employment relationship is an **economic** one—with most workers’ demands **encompassing** improved pay or other working conditions.113 To bring balance to the employment relationship at the bargaining table, one of the **primary** **weapons** available to workers in defending their interests is the threat of **withholding** **labor** to inflict costs upon the employer.114 The principle of the **strike** as a **legitimate** **means** of action taken by workers’ organizations is **widely** **recognized** in countries throughout the world, almost to the point of universal recognition.115 The ILO Committee on Freedom of Association holds the position that the right to strike is a basic consequence of the right to organize.116 **Interference** or **impairment** of the right to strike is **inconsistent** with Articles 3, 8, and 10 of Convention 87 guaranteeing workers **freedom** of **association** and the right to take **concerted** **actions** to further their interests. Article 3 recognizes the right of workers’ organizations to organize their activities and to formulate their programs.117 Article 10 states that the term “organization” means any organization for furthering and defending the interests of workers.118 When read together with Article 10, Article 3 **protects** activities and **actions** that are designed to further and defend the **interests** of **workers**. Recall that strikes are **recognized** as an **essential** **means** through which workers further and defend their interests.119 Article 8 declares that **no** **national** **law** may **impair** **the** **guarantees** of the Convention.120 Because strike action falls under the **activities** protected by Article 3, which are aimed at **furthering** and **defending** **workers’** **interests**, limitations on the right to **strike** may contravene Conventions 87 and 98.121 This subsection addresses the lawful practice of hiring of permanent replacements for striking workers in the United States as it relates to ILO principles. 1. The Use of Permanent Strike Replacements Reduces the ‘Right’ to Strike to the Unprotected ‘Freedom’ to Strike In refraining from ratifying ILO Conventions 87 and 98, the United States government has insisted that U.S. law sufficiently guarantees workers protections of the principles of freedom of association, the rights to organize, and bargain collectively.122 While Section 13 of the NLRA addresses the right to strike,123 in reality, enforcement of the NLRA falls short of its goals and departs from international norms, which afford the right to strike fundamental status.124 The Mackay doctrine, permitting **permanent** **replacement** of strikers renders the **right** a **mere** **privilege**, or **freedom**, because it removes **meaningful** **protection** of the **right** by stripping employers of a duty to refrain from interference with striking.125 Wesley Hohfeld’s famous account of legal rights provides a **useful** **analytical** **framework** for distinguishing between the colloquial uses of the “rights” and their implications.126 Under this framework, rights are **distinguished** from what he calls **privileges**, or **freedoms**, by the **existence** or inexistence of a **corresponding** **duty**. All rights have a **corresponding** **duty**, or a legal **obligation** to respect the **legal** **interest** of the right-holder and **refrain** from **interfering** with it.127 In the example of the right to strike, the correlative is the employer’s duty to not interfere with the employees’ right.128 On the other hand, a ‘freedom’ is the liberty to act, but without the imposition of a duty upon others.129 When one has the freedom to act, others simply do not have a right to prevent her from acting.130 In the strike context, if employees enjoy the freedom to strike, an employer does not have the right to stop the employees from striking, but does not have a duty to not interfere with the act of striking.131 In establishing the Mackay permanent strike replacement Doctrine, the Supreme Court reasoned that the ‘**right’** to strike does not **destroy** an employer’s right to **protect** and **continue** **business** by filling the vacancies of the strikers.132 In so holding, the Court actually transformed the ‘**right’** to strike it into the ‘**freedom’** to strike by removing a **corresponding** **affirmative** **duty** not to interfere with the exercise of the right from the employer.133 The hire of permanent replacements interferes with strike action by inflicting substantial repercussions upon the employees that undertake the action, loss of employment opportunities.134 The Mackay **doctrine** forces an **employee** to **choose** **to** **strike**—at the risk of losing the very **job** that is the object of the **gains** and **benefits** sought— rendering the **act** **virtually** **useless**.135 The threat of being permanently replaced has, in fact, **discouraged** **workers** from **exercising** their ‘right’ to strike.136 Application of the Mackay doctrine produces results that are inconsistent with the NLRA’s provisions regarding protected activity, making the diminution of protection for striking employees even more apparent. In recognizing an **employer** **right** to hire **permanent** **replacements**, the Mackay Court created a **loophole** for employers who otherwise are **prohibited** from **firing** **striking** **employees** under the Section 8(a)(3) of the NLRA, which proscribes **retaliation** against employees that engage in **protected** **union** **activity**.137 While the act of **permanently** **replacing** **strikers** is **lawful**, firing strikers is **unlawful**, although both acts **produce** the same result: **loss** **of** a **job** as a **consequence** of striking.138 The result renders the **NLRA’s** **protections** for striking workers a **dead** **letter**. Although employers have a duty to refrain from **retaliation** against workers engaged in union activity in the form of firing, employers do not have a duty to refrain from reaching the same result through a different tactic—**permanent** **replacement**.139 Thus, this removal of a duty to refrain from interference renders the ‘right’ to strike, an unprotected ‘freedom’ to strike that yields to an employer’s corresponding freedom to replace strikers.140 In other words, the Mackay doctrine preserves the NLRA Section 13 reference to strike action as a lawful recourse for workers, but not one afforded the status of a protected right.

# AC

### Climate Advantage

#### Climate strike participants get arrested now.

**Scanlan 19** [Quinn. Quinn Scanlan. Voting, campaigns & elections for [@ABC](https://twitter.com/ABC). “Jane Fonda arrested in climate change strike outside Capitol”. 10-11-2019. ABC News. https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/jane-fonda-arrested-climate-change-strike-capitol/story?id=66209415.]

**Academy Award winning actress Jane Fonda, 81, was arrested by police with a group of about a dozen protesters Friday after being warned repeatedly to leave the steps of the U.S. Capitol.** Inspired by youth climate activists like Sweden's Greta Thunberg, 16, who herself recently came to Washington to [testify in front of Congress](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/greta-thunberg-teen-climate-activist-tells-us-lawmakers/story?id=65692288), Fonda, who, throughout her long career, has engaged in activism, dating as far back as the Vietnam War, recently told ABC News that while she's in the nation's capital, every Friday, she'll attend "Fire Drill Friday," a weekly event featuring scientists, celebrities and activists addressing the various facets and impacts of climate change. **The event title is a play on Thunberg saying during a speech at the World Economic Forum's annual meeting in Davos, Switzerland in January, "I want you to act as if our house is on fire. Because it is." "11 o'clock every Friday morning come get arrested with me or choose not to it doesn't matter," told ABC News in an earlier interview about her planned effort.**  Fonda said she decided to leave her home, and comfort zone, through the holidays, and move to Washington for four months, because she wanted to "make a commitment to" the issue of climate change. In an interview with ABC News Deputy Political director MaryAlice Parks for an episode of of ABC News Live's "The Briefing Room," Fonda said that while they bear no blame for causing it, the [kids are leading the charge](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/teenage-climate-change-activist-greta-thunbeerg-takes-global/story?id=65601228) on fighting climate change. "They're saying, 'Come on, you know, you're taking our future away from us. We need -- we need you to support us.' And so grandmas unite," she said. "I want to stand with them and raise up... their message. This is -- this is serious... This is a crisis unlike anything that has ever faced humankind." Stressing she was not being hyperbolic, Fonda said this is the "one issue" that matters because it "will [determine the survival of our species](https://abcnews.go.com/International/united-nations-report-details-looming-climate-crisis/story?id=58354235)," and said that's why she'll be attending Fire Drill Fridays weekly. David Swanson/AP, FILE *Actress and activist Jane Fonda talks to a crowd of protestors during a global climate rall...Read More* "I think every single human being has to say, 'What can I do to put this at the forefront?'" she said. "(With) everything that's going on in the news, well, we have to fight our way through that and find ways to get climate change in people's minds." **The esteemed actress pushed back against criticism that Hollywood's presence could make climate change a more polarizing issue.** "What we're facing is so important and so urgent, it doesn't matter. Those -- those things don't even matter," she told Parks. "This is the future. This is whether we're going to survive." **Fonda also said that the United States needs "to lead the way" on this issue, so that other countries who contribute heavily to greenhouse gas emissions, like China and India, "follow suit." While she's been passionate about this issue for "decades," she credits her current endeavors on** [**Thunberg's recurring protest**](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/teenage-climate-change-activist-greta-thunbeerg-takes-global/story?id=65601228) **outside Swedish parliament, and other student climate strikers around the world for taking on this issue so passionately.**

#### Strikes incentivize companies to take climate action seriously.

**Ivanova 19** [Irin. Work, tech, climate and data for [@CBSNews](https://twitter.com/CBSNews). Priors: [@HuffPost](https://twitter.com/HuffPost), [@CrainsNewYork](https://twitter.com/CrainsNewYork), [@newmarkjschool](https://twitter.com/newmarkjschool). “These businesses are closing for Friday's climate strike”. 9-20-2019. No Publication. https://www.cbsnews.com/news/global-climate-strike-businesses-close-their-doors-in-time-for-climate-strike-2019/.]

**Thousands of people are planning to walk out of work or school on Friday to press global leaders for solutions to rapidly escalating climate change. And while it was students who started the movement, more and more workers—and even companies—are joining them in support.** Some businesses are letting workers take the day off to protest, while others plan to close their doors outright. They tend to be small or mid-sized businesses — most of the country's largest corporations have yet to weigh in on the strike, although plenty of people who work at them might yet participate when walkouts are set to start Friday afternoon. Here are the ways workers and companies are supporting the strike. **Walkouts Amazon is expected to see more than 1,500 employees walk out, with the largest contingent exiting its Seattle headquarters, as they push the company to cut ties with fossil-fuel companies and stop funding groups that deny climate science. The company on Thursday announced it would make its operations carbon-neutral by 2040 and run entirely on renewable energy within a decade.** More than 900 **Google** workers and unknown numbers of workers from **Facebook, Atlassian, Cobot, Ecosia, Microsoft** and **Twitter** are vowing walkouts. The strikers have details at [Tech Workers Coalition.](https://techworkerscoalition.org/climate-strike/) Some smaller companies are giving workers paid time off to participate in the walkouts. These include **Atlassian, Sustain Natural, Grove Collaborative** and others. **Closures Ben & Jerry's corporate offices in South Burlington, Vermont, will be closed during the strike** on Friday, while shops worldwide will either be closed or open later than usual. The company is also stopping production at its manufacturing plants in Vermont and the Netherlands, according to [Adweek](https://www.adweek.com/brand-marketing/brands-are-closing-their-doors-in-support-of-the-global-climate-strike/). **"We recognize that climate change is an existential threat to our planet and all its inhabitants, and therefore we are proud standing with the youth-led movement demanding bold action in response to the climate emergency," a spokesperson said.** **Patagonia** is closing its retail stores for 24 hours on Friday. "For decades, many corporations have single-mindedly pursued profits at the expense of everything else — employees, communities and the air, land and water we all share," CEO Rose Marcario wrote on [LinkedIn](https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/enough-join-climate-strikes-demand-action-rose-marcario/?sf219300827=1). "[C]apitalism needs to evolve if humanity is going to survive." **Lush Cosmetics will close its manufacturing facilities and retail outlets on September 20 in the U.S. and on September 27 in Canada.** It's also halting online sales on Friday. **Badger Balm** is closing for the day and giving workers paid time off to demonstrate or volunteer. The company is also donating 5% of online sales from September 16 to 27 to AmazonWatch.org to aid in preserving the shrinking Amazon's ecological systems, it said. **Burton**, the outdoor retailer, is closing its offices and owned retail stores on September 20th or 27th (depending on their country of location). It also won't make any online sales for 24 hours on Friday. **SodaStream**, the seltzer maker owned by PepsiCo, is shuttering its headquarters and closing e-commerce on Friday. **Digital doings and more The heart of the strike will be in the streets, but that doesn't mean the action stops there. More than 7,000** [**companies**](https://digital.globalclimatestrike.net/) **have pledged to draw attention to the protest by either donating ad space or putting banners on their sites.** Participants include **Tumblr, WordPress, Imgur, Kickstarter, BitTorrent,** **Tor, BoingBoing**, **Greenpeace, Change.org**, among many others.

#### Companies’ influence is the key internal link to passing important Climate Policy while also boosting the economy WRL 19’ [WRI develops practical solutions that improve people’s lives and protect nature. Our more than 1,200 staff have deep expertise in policy, research, data analysis, economics, political dynamics and more. We work with partners in more than 50 countries and currently have offices in 12 countries: Brazil, China, Colombia, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, the Netherlands, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. https://www.wri.org/insights/3-ways-business-must-use-political-influence-champion-climate-ambition]

#### Reducing your "carbon footprint" may have qualified your company as a leader on climate change 10 years ago. But today you must do more than that. The definition of leadership has changed—and it increasingly includes responsible, proactive lobbying for climate action that reduces emissions. More than 500 companies have committed to emissions reductions targets based in science, and more than 150 have committed to powering their operations entirely with renewable energy by 2030. Businesses are disclosing their emissions and evaluating their supply chains for climate risks. But checking even these boxes won't be enough to be considered a corporate leader on climate in 2019, and it certainly won't be enough to stop a changing climate's worst impacts. A new report from EDF highlights how most corporate climate leadership rankings overlook policy advocacy, and argues that this is a huge "blind spot" for any true measure of a company's contribution to climate change solutions. They are correct. Companies can and must reduce emissions, but only public policy can elevate these efforts to the scale and pace of emissions reductions needed to mitigate climate change. The political influence of climate-forward businesses with long histories of successful lobbying on other industry-specific issues can lend climate policies the credibility they need to achieve lasting impact. For aspiring firms looking to start real impact at the state and national level, here are 3 important starting points for responsible climate policy advocacy. This is your 2019 corporate climate lobbying checklist: 1. Share Your "Climate Story" Companies have an authentic and credible perspective to share on the long-term threat from climate change to their operations. This perspective is your climate story; crafting an honest, persuasive one is the first step in engaging elected officials. Corporate government affairs teams need to know and show how climate connects to the company's interest areas. Climate change poses real business risks that affect the economy, jobs and the private sector's ability to provide goods and services. The person who knows the company's climate story best and the person who relays it to policymakers may not be the same. Do those who interface with policymakers in your company know what your firm is doing on climate? When sustainability and policy don't interact internally, the result is that most businesses are not getting the credit they deserve for their science-based targets and emissions reduction measures within the halls of government or having influence. When companies can share their "climate story" using data points and anecdotes, it gives policymakers the credibility and confidence to then go and advocate for ambitious policy. When elected officials can be informed by business, it gives them the confidence to speak to climate issues with authority. 2. Meet Policymakers "Where They Are" Most of us want a safe, stable climate, but engaging policymakers while lobbying isn't a conversation that starts with "I want." Government Affairs staff know this, but sustainability practitioners helping to draft talking points for interaction with policymakers may not. Recognizing that elected officials represent constituents with certain needs is an important baseline for drawing a Venn diagram between what responsible business wants and what policymakers want. Understand the local context in order to make compelling cases about whatever your issue is, whether that's procuring renewable energy or buying fleets of electric vehicles. Tailor your advocacy to issues at the core of a district or state's interests, and you are more likely to generate buy-in from elected officials. 3. Push Government to Be Bolder When businesses advocate for climate ambition and send governments clear signals of commitment, this enables governments to be bolder in their own commitments. Likewise, when government sends the private sector clear, long-term signals about climate policy, business can act with the confidence it needs to make low-carbon investments. The Ambition Loop, a paper produced by WRI with We Mean Business and the UN Global Compact, highlights instances where business and government have sent one another these clear signals, which created the enabling conditions for more confident climate action. A few market leaders have begun to harness their influence and engage in thoughtful climate advocacy. Danone North America, Nestle USA, Unilever United States and Mars, Incorporated formed the Sustainable Food Policy Alliance to advocate for public policy in the United States in five key areas, one of which is the environment and climate change. The group focuses on communicating to policymakers their support of policies such as putting a price on carbon, and recently released a set of principles advocating for ambitious action on climate. Time to Lobby Firms on the leading edge must harness their political influence and recognize that climate policy is urgently needed to protect their customers, employees, suppliers and their own business interests. The Global Commission on the Economy and Climate found that bold climate action could deliver at least $26 trillion in economic benefits and generate over 65 million new low-carbon jobs in 2030. One of the most compelling narratives a business can tell comes from the private sector harnessing the potential trillions in economic growth to be had when they do well by doing good. The pressure is on companies to put their lobbying where their climate leadership is, with investors, NGOs, and US consumers increasingly expecting companies to act. Policymakers will need to listen, but companies first must step up with authentic, credible narratives and demonstrate that they are willing to spend their political capital to further climate objectives.

#### Marginalized Groups are Disproportionately Affected by Climate Change Yip 7/21 Why Marginalized Groups are Disproportionately Affected by Climate Change<https://earth.org/marginalised-groups-are-disproportionately-affected-by-climate-change/>

**Environmental racism refers to the injustices suffered by marginalized communities in terms of unequal distribution of environmental resources and hazards, and discrimination in environmental support and policy-making.** In essence, the burdens of pollution, natural disasters, and poisoned resources are distributed unequally in society, with marginalised communities being hit disproportionately harder.When it comes to severing climate change, this means that racial minorities will be bearing the brunt of the environmental impacts. One such case of environmental racism can be observed **in the United States**, where **people of color suffer from a multitude of environmental injustices. In the US, air pollution is distributed unevenly among the different racial groups, with people of color being hit the hardest**. An important ratio to consider when assessing the distribution of adverse impacts of pollution is the ratio of how much pollution one is responsible for relative to how much pollution one is exposed to. **Scientists have found that Hispanics and African-Americans breathe in** [**63% and 56%**](https://apnews.com/article/f6bf2f47c81c4958811dc4e99d526197) **more pollution than they make respectively. On the other hand, Caucasians are exposed to 17% less air pollution than they make. This means that relative to their contribution to pollution, people of color in the US are disproportionately exposed to pollutants.** Across the country, people of colour on average are also exposed to [far higher levels of air pollutants](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/people-of-color-breathe-more-unhealthy-air-from-nearly-all-polluting-sources/) (PM2.5), regardless of region or household income. In short, people of colour in the United States are disproportionately impacted by an increasingly polluted climate, both in relative and absolute terms. **Inequality also exists on the global scale, where there exist large disparities in emissions and climate impacts from country to country.** There is a large asymmetry when it comes to the proportion of CO2 emissions from region to region. For example, **North America is home to only 5% of the world’s population, but it emits 18% of the world’s total CO2. Conversely, Africa is home to 16% of the world’s population, but emits only 4% of total CO2**. In other words, different continents hold different amounts of responsibility when it comes to climate change, and some regions should bear more of the blame. Moreover, in terms of aggregate income, **86% of global CO2 emissions are emitted by the richest half of countries in the world, whilst the bottom half only emits 14%.** This inequality in global emissions renders the issue of international climate change responsibility very delicate and contentious. In light of this, the countries hit hardest by climate change are coincidentally the countries with less relative responsibility for climate change. **For example, the Philippines** consists of 1.41% of the total world population, but it only **produces** [**0.35% of total world’s emissions of CO2**](https://www.worldometers.info/co2-emissions/philippines-co2-emissions/)**. Yet, it has been hit disproportionately hard from climate change; every year it suffers numerous casualties and damage from typhoons, floods, and landslides of increasing frequency and intensity.**

#### Climate Change leads to extinction

**Spratt and Dunlop, 19** David Spratt is a Research Director for Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration, Melbourne, and co-author of Climate Code Red: The case for emergency action. Ian T. Dunlop is a member of the Club of Rome. Formerly an international oil, gas and coal industry executive, chairman of the Australian Coal Association, chief executive of the Australian Institute of Company Directors, and chair of the Australian Greenhouse Office Experts Group on Emissions Trading 1998-2000. “Existential climate-related security risk: A Scenario Approach” Breakthrough - National Centre for Climate Restoration May 2019 https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/148cb0\_b2c0c79dc4344b279bcf2365336ff23b.pdf

An existential risk to civilisation is one posing permanent large negative consequences to humanity which may never be undone, either annihilating intelligent life or permanently and drastically curtailing its potential. With the commitments by nations to the 2015 Paris Agreement, the current path of warming is 3°C or more by 2100. But this figure does not include “long-term” carbon-cycle feedbacks, which are materially relevant now and in the near future due to the unprecedented rate at which human activity is perturbing the climate system. Taking these into account, the Paris path would lead to around 5°C of warming by 2100. 7 Scientists warn that warming of 4°C is incompatible with an organised global community, is devastating to the majority of ecosystems, and has a high probability of not being stable. The World Bank says it may be “beyond adaptation”. But an existential threat may 8 also exist for many peoples and regions at a significantly lower level of warming. In 2017, 3°C of warming was categorised as “catastrophic” with a warning that, on a path of unchecked emissions, low-probability, high-impact warming could be catastrophic by 2050. 9 The Emeritus Director of the Potsdam Institute, Prof. Hans Joachim Schellnhuber, warns that “climate change is now reaching the end-game, where very soon humanity must choose between taking unprecedented action, or accepting that it has been left too late and bear the consequences.” He says 10 that if we continue down the present path “there is a very big risk that we will just end our civilisation. The human species will survive somehow but we will destroy almost everything we have built up over the last two thousand years.” 11

### India Adv

#### Indian journalist strikes get arrested now.

**Guardian 20** [Guardian, 7-31-2020, "India arrests dozens of journalists in clampdown on critics of Covid-19 response," [https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2020/jul/31/india-arrests-50-journalists-in-clampdown-on-critics-of-covid-19-response //](https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2020/jul/31/india-arrests-50-journalists-in-clampdown-on-critics-of-covid-19-response%20//) JB]

**Journalists protest in New Delhi over** the **treatment of their colleagues**. Photograph: Sanchit Khanna/Getty Images. **Facing** a continuing **upward trajectory in Covid-19 cases**, the Indian government is **clamping down on media** coverage **critical of its handling of the pandemic**. **More than 50** Indian journalists have been **arrested** or had police complaints registered against them, or been physically assaulted. The majority of those facing action are independent journalists working in rural India, home to more than 60% of the 1.35 billion population. “The indirect message is that we cannot show the government in poor light. It does not matter if we have to turn a blind eye to issues we witness,” said **Om Sharma, a journalist with a Hindi daily** in Himachal Pradesh, a mountain state in north India. Police had **charged** him **over a Facebook live** report that **showed stranded workers in need of food** during the lockdown. Sharma faced charges of spreading false information, disobeying the order of a public servant and acting negligently to spread infection of a dangerous disease. The world’s biggest population lockdown was partially lifted last week after 10 weeks that saw many of the country’s social and economic inequalities thrown into sharper focus, with the most vulnerable badly hit as their work vanished overnight. As of Thursday, [1.58 million people](https://covid19.who.int/?gclid=EAIaIQobChMI2anHnID16gIV34BQBh2G9gBSEAAYASAAEgJd-_D_BwE) had had the virus and 38,000 had died. Just hours before announcing the lockdown, Narendra Modi, the prime minister, held a video conference with 20 owners and editors from India’s largest print media organisations. “It was important to tackle the spread of pessimism, negativity and rumour,” he told them. Modi’s **handling of the pandemic** has **been under increasing criticism** as he has changed tack on policy and failed to curb the virus’s spread, with India now the third worst affected country after the US and Brazil. In a country where half-truths circulate over social media – [in some cases spread by politicians](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/apr/16/as-coronavirus-spreads-around-the-world-so-too-do-the-quack-cures) – and dubious remedies have been pushed, the government argued before the supreme court that “fake news” triggered the exodus of day labourers from the cities. The court directed the media to “refer to and publish the official version about the developments”. Journalists complain that their freedoms are being curtailed. Sharma was refused a curfew pass by his local administration. He had no option but to work from home, relying on social media platforms, asking local people to share their issues. Earlier this month, the Committee to Protect Journalists wrote to the Himachal Pradesh government, resulting in the chief minister announcing that the cases against Sharma and five other journalists would be withdrawn. In Jammu and Kashmir, reporters have alleged physical assaults by police. On 11 April, police slapped and used batons on Mushtaq Ahmed Ganai, a Srinagar-based reporter with the Kashmir Observer, before he was arrested. Ganai was out reporting on the lockdown at the time. Charged with disobedience under sections of the 123-year-old Epidemic Diseases Act, Ganai was held for more than 48 hours. Ganai said that the “press” sticker was removed from his car before it was returned. The following day he was back in his office. “Journalism is a passion, specifically for those in Kashmir. We cannot afford to back out,” he said. The **media clampdown has added to the challenges** of severe restrictions on movement. Moreover, **access to lawyers has been limited** and courts are still hearing only urgent cases. Geeta Seshu, of the Free Speech Collective, said the restrictions were having an impact on reporting. “During the pandemic, the government has taken some crucial policy decisions regarding environment and railways. Most of the media organizations played safe by not reviewing these decisions,” she said. **India has now dropped two places** to be ranked 142 out of 180 countries **on the**[**global press freedom index**](https://rsf.org/en/ranking). Responding to this in May, India’s information and broadcasting minister, Prakash Javadekar, tweeted: “Media in India enjoy absolute freedom. We will expose, sooner than later, those surveys that tend to portray bad picture about ‘Freedom of Press’ in India.”

#### A broader system of democratic backsliding hit India the hardest – COVID’s second wave was caused through governmental failure and lack of democracy.

**Singh 7/5** [Prerna Singh, July 5, 2021 at 5:00 a.m., “India has become an ‘electoral autocracy.’ Its covid-19 catastrophe is no surprise”, [https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2021/07/05/india-has-become-an-electoral-autocracy-its-covid-19-catastrophe-is-no-surprise //](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2021/07/05/india-has-become-an-electoral-autocracy-its-covid-19-catastrophe-is-no-surprise%20//) JB recut by Lex AKo]

On Thursday, the White House announced that it is deploying [response teams](https://www.cnbc.com/2021/07/01/delta-white-house-to-deploy-response-teams-across-us-to-combat-covid-variant.html), composed of officials from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and other federal agencies, to combat the “hypertransmissible” **delta variant of the**[**coronavirus**](https://www.washingtonpost.com/coronavirus/?itid=lk_inline_manual_2)**spreading across** the United States and **the world**. This variant **first emerged in India**, where a **devastating second wave** of virus infections have been accompanied by a parallel epidemic of [mucormycosis, or “black fungus,”](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/why-deadly-black-fungus-is-ravaging-covid-patients-in-india/) that is maiming and killing patients. India’s humanitarian **tragedy is linked to a deeper political crisis** — that **of democratic erosion**. At independence from colonial rule, India had relatively low economic development and industrialization, widespread poverty and illiteracy, and immense ethnic diversity across linguistic, religious and caste lines. [Leading political science theories](https://www.jstor.org/stable/1951731) argued these conditions made India [infertile terrain](https://www.google.com/books/edition/The_Success_of_India_s_Democracy/Io0NsnlRT6sC?hl=en) for democracy. Yet in 1947, India instituted a democratic government and, with the exception of [a short time from 1975-77](https://press.princeton.edu/books/hardcover/9780691186726/emergency-chronicles), has remained one. Up until **a few weeks ago**, that is. In its influential annual rankings of countries across the world, the U.S.-based democracy watchdog **Freedom House downgraded India from a free democracy to a “**[**partially free democracy**](https://freedomhouse.org/country/india/freedom-world/2021).” Similarly, the Swedish-based V-Dem Institute demoted the country to an “[electoral autocracy](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-56393944).” Both organizations cited the regime’s crackdowns on freedom of speech — and in particular, expressions of dissent — as a key factor driving India’s slide down these indexes. How are India’s coronavirus crisis and democratic backsliding linked? Here’s what you need to know. The **decline of free speech** in the world’s largest democracy Since assuming power in 2014, the ruling Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) regime has consistently and brutally **undermined civil liberties**, especially freedom of speech. This crackdown has [affected](https://thewire.in/rights/india-modi-anti-national-protest-arrest-sedition-authoritarianism) journalists, editors, organizers, climate activists, Bollywood actors, cricketers, celebrities, and even ordinary citizens posting on social media. The BJP has forced editors of prominent newspapers to step down. Police have [raided](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/05/world/asia/india-ndtv-raids-narendra-modi-prannoy-roy.html) or shut down the offices of media outlets that featured articles challenging the regime’s actions. **Physical attacks on journalists have become commonplace**. **Some have been gunned down in broad daylight outside their homes, earning India a**[**reputation**](https://www.cjr.org/special_report/gauri-lankesh-killing.php)**as what the Columbia Journalism Review called “one of the world’s most dangerous countries to be a reporter.”** Meanwhile, reporters and media organizations sympathetic to the regime have been [protected](https://theprint.in/opinion/arnab-goswami-swift-bail-should-be-rule-for-undertrials-not-exception/545301/) and supported. [Thousands](https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/5128-uapa-cases-229-sedition-cases-lodged-in-five-years-government/articleshow/81433613.cms) of individuals and organizations critical of the regime have had wide-ranging charges filed against them. Many awaiting trial still [languish](https://thewire.in/rights/jail-bail-hearings-court-delhi-riots-elgar-parishad) in jails across the country. These attacks on freedom of speech harm democracies’ effective functioning. An uncensored public realm enables the open exchange of information; an unencumbered press enables popular accountability. That leaves governments insulated from evidence and accountability, making decisions in isolation. [What's behind India's dramatic pandemic surge? Here's one factor: Too little competition in parliament.](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2021/06/02/whats-behind-indias-dramatic-pandemic-surge-heres-one-factor-too-little-competition-parliament/?itid=lk_interstitial_manual_16) Silencing critics can be lethal during natural disasters. In their influential 1991 book “[Hunger and Public Action](https://oxford.universitypressscholarship.com/view/10.1093/0198283652.001.0001/acprof-9780198283652),” development economists Jean Drèze and Nobel laureate Amartya Sen explored why India had not endured famine since independence, despite chronic undernourishment and food production difficulties. Under colonial rule, devastating famines were numerous. Sen and Drèze concluded that the key difference since independence has been watchdog journalists whose reporting on early signs of a famine in an uncensored news media aroused public concern and pushed the government to act. But in March 2020, Prime Minister Narenda Modi’s government[petitioned](https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/politics-and-nation/sc-asks-media-to-publish-official-version-of-corona-developments/articleshow/74919142.cms?from=mdr) India’s top court to prevent journalists from reporting covid-19 information that the regime had not sanctioned. The Supreme Court denied the petition — but nevertheless directed the media to broadcast “the official version” of covid-19 developments. Meanwhile, the government has [filed charges](https://rsf.org/en/news/surge-harassment-indian-reporters-over-coronavirus-coverage) against and arrested dozens of journalists reporting on the government’s mismanagement of the coronavirus crisis, whether that was about the urban [migrant crisis](https://thewire.in/media/himachal-pradesh-firs-journalists) caused by the regime’s abrupt lockdown at the start of the pandemic; dire conditions at quarantine centers; or the shortage of oxygen and other key medical supplies. Following Drèze and Sen’s logic about famines, this quashing of a free press has both prevented the government from accessing accurate information about how the pandemic was unfolding on the ground and reduced its sense of public accountability. [Millions of people in India's crowded slums can't keep each other at a distance during a pandemic lockdown](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2020/04/13/millions-people-indias-crowded-slums-cant-keep-each-other-distance-during-pandemic-lockdown/?itid=lk_interstitial_manual_23) The In February, **the government announced** controversial[**new rules** covering digital publishing](https://time.com/5946092/india-internet-rules-impact/) that **give officials the power to block stories from being published** or to shut down entire websites. In the past few weeks, the government has [pressured social media platforms such as Facebook, Instagram, Twitter to remove posts critical of the government](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/04/25/business/india-covid19-twitter-facebook.html). Many posts — including those with the trending hashtag #ResignModi — have disappeared and mysteriously reappeared. In India’s largest state, Uttar Pradesh, one man took to Twitter to locate oxygen for an ailing family member, who subsequently died. The [police charged him with circulating misinformation](https://scroll.in/latest/993484/up-fir-filed-against-man-who-sought-twitter-help-for-oxygen-for-grandfather) “with the intent to cause fear or alarm.” These attacks on free speech are all the more dangerous because other key democratic watchdog institutions — for example, an active [political opposition](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2021/06/02/whats-behind-indias-dramatic-pandemic-surge-heres-one-factor-too-little-competition-parliament/?itid=lk_inline_manual_29) — are weak. India has protected the freedom of speech, until now BJP government extended its power to censor The freedom of speech, including the right to critique, has been at the core of Indian nationalism, forged during resistance to British colonialism. The Modi regime’s [exclusionary Hindu nationalism](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2020/01/20/india-protesters-are-singing-national-anthem-waving-flag-heres-why-that-matters/?itid=lk_inline_manual_34) deviates from that history. Muzzling free speech has been [deadly](https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2021-05-08/india-covid-pandemic-deaths-narendra-modi) during the pandemic. Today the scale of the **covid-19 crisis** that **continues to burn across India** remains unknown. Experts [warn](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/05/25/world/asia/india-covid-death-estimates.html) that **death tolls are likely many times the official reports**. Scientists remain unclear about how well each of the vaccines work against the delta strain. In the United States, [concerns](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-dangerous-is-the-delta-variant-and-will-it-cause-a-covid-surge-in-the-u-s/) about a new surge are growing. **A free press** could not have prevented the pandemic. But it **could have both provided critical early information about the unfolding second wave of virus infections and put pressure on the government to take action. This would have likely reduced the public health tragedy.**

#### That’s prompted by lack of journalistic freedom which causes IndoPak escalation.

**Somos 20** [Cut by Lexington Fortier Christy Somos, December 17, 2020, “COVID-19 has escalated armed conflict in India, Pakistan, Iraq, Libya and the Philippines, study finds,” [https://www.ctvnews.ca/world/covid-19-has-escalated-armed-conflict-in-india-pakistan-iraq-libya-and-the-philippines-study-finds-1.5236738 //](https://www.ctvnews.ca/world/covid-19-has-escalated-armed-conflict-in-india-pakistan-iraq-libya-and-the-philippines-study-finds-1.5236738%20//) JB Recut by Lex AKo]

INDIA **India saw a rise in armed conflict during the study period, with violent clashes in the Kashmir region between Kashmiri separatists facing off against the Indian military, as well as conflicts between Pakistan and India.** “So what mostly drove the increase in conflict intensity…were basically due to two factors,” Ide said. “The first being that **there is some evidence that Pakistan sponsors or supports these insurgents in Kashmir, to encourage them to increase their attacks [on Indian forces] because they perceived them to be weak and struggling with the pandemic.” The** second factor, Ide explained, was that **while Indian government enacted a “pretty comprehensive lockdown in Kashmir, and sealing it way from international media attention…launched more intense counter-insurgency efforts and…crack[ed] down on any pro-Pakistani sympathy expressions.”** IRAQ Iraq had an increase in armed conflict, but Ide noted that the overall intensity did not change that much – a “very slight upward trend” in scale that was not linear. What did increase were attacks by ISIS in April, May, and June. “The Iraqi government was really in trouble,” he said. “They had enormous economic loss, they had to go head-to-head and use troops and funds to combat the pandemic – the international coalition supporting the government partially withdrew troops or stopped their activities.” “The Iraqi government was really in a position of weakness.” Ide said the Islamic State exploited the pandemic and the thin resources at hand to the government to expand territorial control, conquer new areas and to stage more attacks. LIBYA The civil war in Libya between the Government of National Accord’s (GNA) forces and the Libyan National Army escalated during the study period, after a ceasefire brokered in January was broken, Ide said. “As soon as international attention shifted to the pandemic…they really escalated the conflict, tried to make gains while hoping the other side is weakened because of the pandemic, hoping to score an easy military victory” Ide said. “It didn’t happen.” The UN Security Council noted in a May report that the pandemic was bolstering the 15-month conflict, citing the history of more than 850 broken ceasefire agreements and “a tide of civilian deaths” on top of a worsening outbreak. PAKISTAN **The ongoing conflict with India saw a rise in armed conflict in Pakistan** during the study period – which were unrelated to the pandemic, **but also a rise in Taliban-affiliated groups and anti-government sentiments due to pandemic restrictions**, Ide said. “There were a lot of anti-government grievances,” Ide said. “There were restrictions on religious gatherings, which religious groups did not like, and there were some negative economic impacts which affected the local people.” Ide said those two factors could have been exploited by the Taliban in a quest to recruit more followers. Later in the study period, a swath Pakistani government officials were struck with COVID-19, leaving the country with a leadership crisis, which saw an increase of attacks by Taliban groups in May.

#### Extinction – first strike and fallout blocks the sun

**Roblin 21.** [(Sébastien Roblin holds a master’s degree in Conflict Resolution from Georgetown University and served as a university instructor for the Peace Corps in China, "If the Next India-Pakistan War Goes Nuclear, It Will Destroy the World," The National Interest, March 26, 2021. [https://nationalinterest.org/blog/reboot/if-next-india-pakistan-war-goes-nuclear-it-will-destroy-world-181134 //](https://nationalinterest.org/blog/reboot/if-next-india-pakistan-war-goes-nuclear-it-will-destroy-world-181134%20//) LF] TDI

Here's What You Need to Remember: India and Pakistan account for over one-fifth world’s population, and therefore a significant **share of economic** activity. Should their **major cities** become **irradiated** ruins with their populations decimated, a **tremendous disruption** would surely result. Between February 26 and 27 in 2019, Indian and Pakistani warplanes **launched strikes** on each other’s territory and engaged in **aerial combat** for the first time since 1971. **Pakistan** ominously hinted it was convening its National Command Authority, the institution which **can authorize a nuclear strike**. The **two states**, which have **retained** an **adversarial relationship** since their founding in 1947, **between them deploy nuclear warheads** that can be delivered by land, air and sea. However, those weapons are inferior in number and yield to the thousands of nuclear weapons possessed by Russia and the United States, which include megaton-class weapons that can wipe out a metropolis in a single blast. Some commenters have callously suggested that means a “limited regional nuclear war” would remain an Indian and Pakistani problem. People find it difficult to assess the risk of rare but catastrophic events; after all, a full-scale nuclear war has never occurred before, though it has come close to happening. Such assessments are not only shockingly callous but shortsighted. In fact, **several studies** have **modeled** the **global impact of a “limited” ten-day nuclear war** in which India and Pakistan each exchange fifty 15-kiloton nuclear bombs equivalent in yield to the Little Boy uranium bomb dropped on Hiroshima. Their **findings concluded that spillover** would in no way be “limited,” directly **impacting people across the globe** that would struggle to locate Kashmir on a map. And those results are merely a conservative baseline, as **India and Pakistan** are estimated to **possess over 260 warheads**. Some likely have yields exceeding 15-kilotons, which is relatively small compared to modern strategic warheads. **Casualties** Recurring **terrorist attacks** by Pakistan-sponsored militant groups over the status of India’s Muslim-majority Jammu and Kashmir state have repeatedly led to threats of a **conventional** military **retaliation** by New Delhi. **Pakistan**, in turn, **maintains** it may use **nuclear weapons as a first-strike weapon to counter-balance India’s** superior conventional **forces**. Triggers could involve the **destruction** of a large part of Pakistan’s military or **penetration** by Indian forces deep into Pakistani **territory**. Islamabad also claims it might authorize a strike in event of a damaging Indian **blockade** or political **destabilization** instigated by India. India’s official policy is that it will never be first to strike with nuclear weapons—but that **once any nukes are used** against it, New **Dehli will unleash an all-out retaliation**. The Little Boy bomb alone killed around 100,000 Japanese—between 30 to 40 percent of Hiroshima’s population—and destroyed 69 percent of the buildings in the city. But Pakistan and India host some of the most populous and densely populated cities on the planet, with population densities of Calcutta, Karachi and Mumbai at or exceeding 65,000 people per square mile. Thus, even low-yield bombs could cause tremendous casualties. A 2014 study estimates that the immediate effects of the bombs—the fireball, over-pressure wave, radiation burns etc.—would kill twenty million people. An earlier study estimated a hundred 15-kiloton nuclear detonations could kill twenty-six million in India and eighteen million in Pakistan—and concluded that escalating to using 100-kiloton warheads, which have greater blast radius and overpressure waves that can shatter hardened structures, would multiply **death tolls four-fold**. Moreover, these projected body counts omit **the secondary effects of nuclear blasts**. Many survivors of the initial explosion **would suffer slow, lingering deaths due to radiation exposure**. The **collapse of healthcare, transport, sanitation, water and economic infrastructure** would also claim many more lives. A nuclear blast could also trigger a **deadly firestorm**. For instance, a firestorm caused by the U.S. napalm bombing of Tokyo in March 1945 killed more people than the Fat Man bomb killed in Nagasaki. Refugee Outflows The civil war in Syria caused over 5.6 million refugees to flee abroad out of a population of 22 million prior to the conflict. Despite relative stability and prosperity of the European nations to which refugees fled, this outflow triggered political backlashes that have rocked virtually every major Western government. Now consider likely population movements in event of a nuclear war between India-Pakistan, which together total over 1.5 billion people. Nuclear bombings—or their even their mere potential—would likely cause many city-dwellers to flee to the countryside to lower their odds of being caught in a nuclear strike. Wealthier citizens, numbering in tens of millions, would use their resources to flee abroad. Should bombs beginning dropping, poorer citizens many begin pouring over land borders such as those with Afghanistan and Iran for Pakistan, and Nepal and Bangladesh for India. These poor states would struggle to supports tens of millions of refugees. China also borders India and Pakistan—but historically Beijing has not welcomed refugees. Some citizens may undertake risky voyages at sea on overloaded boats, setting their sights on South East Asia and the Arabian Peninsula. Thousands would surely drown. Many regional governments would turn them back, as they have refugees of conflicts in Vietnam, Cambodia and Myanmar in the past. **Fallout** **Radioactive fallout would** also **be disseminated across the globe**. The fallout from the Chernobyl explosion, for example, wounds its way westward from Ukraine into Western Europe, exposing 650,000 persons and contaminating 77,000 square miles. The long-term health effects of the exposure could last decades. India and Pakistan’s neighbors would be especially exposed, and most lack healthcare and infrastructure to deal with such a crisis. Nuclear Winter Studies in 2008 and 2014 found that of one hundred bombs that were fifteen-kilotons were used, it would blast five million tons of fine, sooty particles into the stratosphere, where they would spread across the globe, warping global weather patterns for the next twenty-five years. The particles would **block out** light from **the sun**, causing surface temperatures to decrease an average of 2.7 degrees Fahrenheit across the globe, or 4.5 degrees in North American and Europe. **Growing seasons** would be **shortened** by ten to forty days, and certain **crops** such as Canadian wheat would simply **become unviable**. Global agricultural **yields** would **fall**, leading to rising prices and **famine**. The particles may also **deplete** between 30 to 50 percent of the **ozone** layer, allowing more of the **sun’s radiation** to penetrate the atmosphere, causing increased **sunburns** and rates of **cancer** and killing off sensitive plant-life and marine plankton, with the spillover effect of **decimating fishing yields**. To be clear, these are outcomes for a **“light” nuclear winter** scenario, not a full slugging match between the Russian and U.S. arsenals. **Global Recession Any** one of the factors above would likely suffice to **cause** a **global economic recession**. All of them combined would guarantee one. India and Pakistan account for over one-fifth world’s population, and therefore a significant share of economic activity. Should their major cities become irradiated ruins with their populations decimated, a tremendous disruption would surely result. A massive decrease in consumption and production would obviously instigate a long-lasting recessionary cycle, with attendant deprivations and political destabilization slamming developed and less-developed countries alike. Taken together, these outcomes mean even a “limited” India-Pakistan nuclear war would significantly affect every person on the globe, be they a school teacher in Nebraska, a factory-worker in Shaanxi province or a fisherman in Mombasa. Unfortunately, the recent escalation between India and Pakistan is no fluke, but part of a long-simmering pattern likely to continue escalating unless New Delhi and Islamabad work together to change the nature of their relationship.

#### The aff plan is key to solve through increased support for Indian journalists which in turn de-escalates rising tensions:

#### Strikes spill-over to broader support of the labor movement and unions – every strike encourages more strikes

**Hertel-Fernandez et al. 20** [Alexander Hertel-Fernandez, associate professor of public affairs at Columbia University, where he studies American political economy, with a focus on the politics of business, labor, wealthy donors, and policy, Suresh Naidu, professor of economics and public affairs at Columbia University, where he researches economic effects of political transitions, the economic history of slavery and labor institutions, international migration, and economic applications of naturallanguage processing, and Adam Reich, associate professor of sociology at Columbia University, where he studies economic and cultural sociology, especially how people make sense of their economic activities and economic positions within organizations, 2020, “Schooled by Strikes? The Effects of Large-Scale Labor Unrest on Mass Attitudes toward the Labor Movement,” American Political Science Association, https://sci-hub.se/https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001279]/Kankee

Strikes and Labor Power in an Era of Union Decline We examined the political consequences of large-scale teacher strikes, studying how firsthand exposure changed mass **attitudes** and public preferences. Across a range of specifications and approaches, we find that increased exposure to the strikes led to **greater support** for the walkouts, more support for legal rights for teachers and unions, and, especially, greater personal interest in labor action at people’s own jobs, though not necessarily through traditional unions. Returning to the theoretical expectations we outlined earlier, the teacher strikes appear to have changed the ways that parents think about the labor movement, generating greater public support. The results regarding workers’ interest in undertaking labor action in their own jobs also suggests **evidence** in favor of the public inspiration and imitation hypothesis, underscoring the role that social movements and mobilizations can play in **teach**ing noninvolved members about the movement and tactics. Still, an important caveat to these findings is that strike-exposed parents were not more likely to say that they would vote for a traditional union at their jobs, possibly reflecting the fact that the strikes emphasized individual teachers and not necessarily teacher unions as organizations either in schools or in parents’ own workplaces. Further research might explore this difference, together with the fact that we find somewhat stronger evidence in favor of the imitation hypothesis (i.e., support for labor action at one’s own work) than for the public support hypothesis (i.e., support for the striking teachers). Before we discuss the broader implications of our findings for the understanding of the labor movement, we briefly review and address several caveats to the interpretation of our results. One concern is whether the results we identify from a single survey can speak to enduring changes in public opinion about the strikes and unions. Given the timing of the teacher strikes in the first half of 2018, our respondents were reflecting on events that happened 7–12 months in the past. We therefore think that our results represent more durable changes in opinion as a result of the strikes, in line with other studies of historical mobilizations and long-term changes in attitudes (Mazumder 2018). The AFL-CIO time-series polling data, moreover, further suggest that there were increases in aggregate public support for unions in the strike states after the strikes occurred. Nevertheless, follow-up studies should examine how opinion toward, and interest in, unions evolve in the mass teacher strike states, and it would be especially interesting to understand whether unions have begun capitalizing on the interest in the labor movement that the strikes generated. We also note that, despite the large sample size of our original survey, we still lack sufficient statistical power to fully explore the effects of the strikes on all of our survey outcomes. Future studies ought to consider alternative designs with the power to probe the individual outcomes that were not considered in this study. Another question is how to generalize from our results to other strikes and labor actions. Although it is beyond the scope of this article to develop and test a more general theory of strike action, there are factors that suggest that the teacher strikes we study here represent a hard test for building public support. The affected states had relatively weak public sector labor movements, meaning that few individuals had personal connections to unions; most were also generally conservative and Republican leaning, further potentially reducing the receptivity of the public to the teachers’ demands. And lastly, the type of work we study —teaching—involves close interaction with a very sympathetic constituency: children and their parents. This should make strike disruptions more controversial and increase the likelihood of political backlash (and indeed, we do find that the strikes were less persuasive for parents who may have lacked access to childcare). Nevertheless, additional factors may have strengthened the effects of the strikes; namely, that education spending in the strike and walkout states had dropped so precipitously since the Great Recession, giving teachers the opportunity to connect their demands to broader public goods. Considering these factors together, we feel comfortable arguing that strikes are likely to be **successful[ly]** in other contexts where involved employees can successfully **leverage close connections** to the clients and customers they serve and connect their grievances to the interests of the broader community. This is likely to be especially true in cases where individuals feel they are not receiving the level of quality service they deserve from businesses or governments. The flip side of our argument is that strikes are less likely to be successful—and may produce backlash—when the mass public views striking workers’ demands as illegitimate or opposed to their own interests or when individuals are especially inconvenienced by labor action and do not have readily available alternatives (such as lacking childcare during school strikes). This suggests that teachers’ unions’ provision of meals and childcare to parents (as happened in a number of the recent strikes) is a particularly important tactic to avoid public backlash. In addition, our results suggest that future strikes on their own are unlikely to change public opinion if all they do is to provide information about workers’ grievances or disrupt work routines. Our exploratory analysis of the mechanisms driving our results suggests that it was not necessarily information about poor school quality or the strikes themselves that changed parents’ minds, but perhaps the fact that the teachers were discussing the public goods they were seeking for the broader community. We anticipate that strikes or walkouts that adopt a similar strategy—similar to the notion of “**bargaining for the common good**”—would be most likely to register effects like ours in the future (McCartin 2016). Notably, that is exactly the strategy deployed by teachers in Los Angeles, who spent several years building ties to community members and explaining the broader benefits that a stronger union could offer to their community in the run-up to a strike in early 2019 (Caputo-Pearl and McAlevey 2019). In all, our results complement a long line of work arguing for the primacy of the strike as a tactic for labor influence (e.g. Burns 2011; Rosenfeld 2006; Rubin 1986). Although this literature generally has focused on the economic consequences of strikes, we have shown that strikes can also have significant effects on public opinion. Even though private sector strikes have long sought to amass public support, public-facing strikes are even more important for public sector labor unions, given their structure of production and the fact that their“managers”are ultimately elected officials. But how should we view strikes relative to the other strategies that public sector unions might deploy in politics, such as campaign contributions, inside lobbying, or mobilization of their members (cf. DiSalvo 2015; Moe 2011)? Given the large cost of mass strikes in terms of time and grassroots organizing, we expect that public sector unions will be most likely to turn to public-facing strikes (like the 2018 teacher walkouts) when these other lower-cost inside strategies are unsuccessful and when their demands are popular in the mass public. Under these circumstances, government unions have every reason to broaden the scope of conflict to include the mass public (cf. Schattschneider 1960). But when unions can deploy less costly activities (like simply having a lobbyist meet with lawmakers) or when they are pursuing demands that are more controversial with the public, we suspect that unions will opt for less public-facing strategies (on the logic of inside versus outside lobbying more generally, see, for example, Kollman 1998). Indeed, our results complement work by Terry Moe and Sarah Anzia describing how teacher unions work through low-salience and low-visibility strategies, such as capturing school boards, pension boards, or education bureaucracies, when they are pushing policies that tend not to be supported by the public (Anzia 2013; Anzia and Moe 2015; Moe 2011). Our results yield a final implication for thinking about the historical development of the labor smovement: they suggest that the decline of strikes we tracked in Figure 1 may form a vicious cycle for the long-term political power of labor. As we have documented, strikes seem to be an important way that people form opinions about unions and develop interest in labor action. As both strikes and union membership have declined precipitously over the past decades, few members of the public have had opportunities to gain firsthand knowledge and interest in unions. Moreover, strikes appear to foster greater interest in further strikes, feeding on one another. If unions are to regain any economic or political clout in the coming years, our study suggests that the strike **must** be a **central strategy** of the labor movement.
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#### The role of the ballot is to evaluate the consequences of the affirmative’s policy proposal.

**Scenario analysis builds portable skills of critical thinking, creativity, and planning.**

**Barma et al. ’16 [Barma, Naazneen (Naazneen H. Barma is Associate Professor of National Security Affairs at the Naval Postgraduate School), Durbin, Brent (Brent Durbin is Associate Professor of Government at Smith College), Lorber, Eric (Eric Lorber is an adjunct Fellow at the Center for a New American Security), and Whitlark, Rachel (Rachel Whitlark is an Assistant Professor of International Affairs at the Georgia Institute of Technology). “’Imagine a World in Which’: Using Scenarios in Political Science.” *International Studies Perspectives*, Volume 17, Number 2, pgs. 1-19, https://calhoun.nps.edu/bitstream/handle/10945/48304/Barma\_using\_scenarios\_in\_political\_science\_isp\_2015.pdf.]**

What Are Scenarios and Why Use Them in Political Science? Scenario analysis is perceived most commonly as a technique for examining the robustness of strategy. It can immerse decision makers in future states that go beyond conventional extrapolations of current trends, preparing them to take advantage of unexpected opportunities and to protect themselves from adverse exogenous shocks. The global petroleum company Shell, a pioneer of the technique, characterizes scenario analysis as the art of considering “what if” questions about possible future worlds. Scenario analysis is thus typically seen as serving the purposes of corporate planning or as a policy tool to be used in combination with simulations of decision making. Yet scenario analysis is not inherently limited to these uses. This section provides a brief overview of the practice of scenario analysis and the motivations underpinning its uses. It then makes a case for the utility of the technique for political science scholarship and describes how the scenarios deployed at NEFPC were created. The Art of Scenario Analysis We characterize scenario analysis as the art of juxtaposing current trends in unexpected combinations in order to articulate surprising and yet plausible futures, often referred to as “alternative worlds.” Scenarios are thus explicitly not forecasts or projections based on linear extrapolations of contemporary patterns, and they are not hypothesis-based expert predictions. Nor should they be equated with simulations, which are best characterized as functional representations of real institutions or decision-making processes (Asal 2005). Instead, they are depictions of possible future states of the world, offered together with a narrative of the driving causal forces and potential exogenous shocks that could lead to those futures. Good scenarios thus rely on explicit causal propositions that, independent of one another, are plausible—yet, when combined, suggest surprising and sometimes controversial future worlds. For example, few predicted the dramatic fall in oil prices toward the end of 2014. Yet independent driving forces, such as the shale gas revolution in the United States, China’s slowing economic growth, and declining conflict in major Middle Eastern oil producers such as Libya, were all recognized secular trends that—combined with OPEC’s decision not to take concerted action as prices began to decline—came together in an unexpected way. While scenario analysis played a role in war gaming and strategic planning during the Cold War, the real antecedents of the contemporary practice are found in corporate futures studies of the late 1960s and early 1970s (Raskin et al. 2005). Scenario analysis was essentially initiated at Royal Dutch Shell in 1965, with the realization that the usual forecasting techniques and models were not capturing the rapidly changing environment in which the company operated (Wack 1985; Schwartz 1991). In particular, it had become evident that straight-line extrapolations of past global trends were inadequate for anticipating the evolving business environment. Shell-style scenario planning “helped break the habit, ingrained in most corporate planning, of assuming that the future will look much like the present” (Wilkinson and Kupers 2013, 4). Using scenario thinking, Shell anticipated the possibility of two Arab-induced oil shocks in the 1970s and hence was able to position itself for major disruptions in the global petroleum sector. Building on its corporate roots, scenario analysis has become a standard policymaking tool. For example, the Project on Forward Engagement advocates linking systematic foresight, which it defines as the disciplined analysis of alternative futures, to planning and feedback loops to better equip the United States to meet contemporary governance challenges (Fuerth 2011). Another prominent application of scenario thinking is found in the National Intelligence Council’s series of Global Trends reports, issued every four years to aid policymakers in anticipating and planning for future challenges. These reports present a handful of “alternative worlds” approximately twenty years into the future, carefully constructed on the basis of emerging global trends, risks, and opportunities, and intended to stimulate thinking about geopolitical change and its effects.4 As with corporate scenario analysis, the technique can be used in foreign policymaking for long-range general planning purposes as well as for anticipating and coping with more narrow and immediate challenges. An example of the latter is the German Marshall Fund’s EuroFutures project, which uses four scenarios to map the potential consequences of the Euro-area financial crisis (German Marshall Fund 2013). Several features make scenario analysis particularly useful for policymaking.5 Long-term global trends across a number of different realms—social, technological, environmental, economic, and political—combine in often-unexpected ways to produce unforeseen challenges. Yet the ability of decision makers to imagine, let alone prepare for, discontinuities in the policy realm is constrained by their existing mental models and maps. This limitation is exacerbated by well-known cognitive bias tendencies such as groupthink and confirmation bias (Jervis 1976; Janis 1982; Tetlock 2005). The power of scenarios lies in their ability to help individuals break out of conventional modes of thinking and analysis by introducing unusual combinations of trends and deliberate discontinuities in narratives about the future. Imagining alternative future worlds through a structured analytical process enables policymakers to envision and thereby adapt to something altogether different from the known present.

**Policy debates empower students to activism. Apolitical narratives become coopted by institutions.**

**Coverstone ’05 Coverstone, Alan (Alan Coverstone is a debate coach at Wake Forest University). “Acting on Activism: Realizing the Vision of Debate with Pro-social Impact.” Acting on Activism: Realizing the Vision of Debate with Pro-social Impact, 17 November 2005.**

An important concern emerges when Mitchell describes reflexive fiat as a contest strategy capable of “eschewing the power to directly control external actors” (1998b, p. 20). Describing debates about what our government should do as attempts to control outside actors is debilitating and disempowering. Control of the US government is exactly what an active, participatory citizenry is supposed to be all about. After all, if democracy means anything, it means that citizens not only have the right, they also bear the obligation to discuss and debate what the government should be doing. Absent that discussion and debate, much of the motivation for personal political activism is also lost. Those who have co-opted Mitchell’s argument for individual advocacy often quickly respond that nothing we do in a debate round can actually change government policy, and unfortunately, an entire generation of debaters has now swallowed this assertion as an article of faith. The best most will muster is, “Of course not, but you don’t either!” The assertion that nothing we do in debate has any impact on government policy is one that carries the potential to undermine Mitchell’s entire project. If there is nothing we can do in a debate round to change government policy, then we are left with precious little in the way of pro-social options for addressing problems we face. At best, we can pursue some Pilot-like hand washing that can purify us as individuals through quixotic activism but offer little to society as a whole. It is very important to note that Mitchell (1998b) tries carefully to limit and bound his notion of reflexive fiat by maintaining that because it “views fiat as a concrete course of action, it is bounded by the limits of pragmatism” (p. 20). Pursued properly, the debates that Mitchell would like to see are those in which the relative efficacy of concrete political strategies for pro-social change is debated. In a few noteworthy examples, this approach has been employed successfully, and I must say that I have thoroughly enjoyed judging and coaching those debates. The students in my program have learned to stretch their understanding of their role in the political process because of the experience. Therefore, those who say I am opposed to Mitchell’s goals here should take care at such a blanket assertion. However, contest debate teaches students to combine personal experience with the language of political power. Powerful personal narratives unconnected to political power are regularly co-opted by those who do learn the language of power. One need look no further than the annual state of the Union Address where personal story after personal story is used to support the political agenda of those in power. The so-called role-playing that public policy contest debates encourage promotes active learning of the vocabulary and levers of power in America. Imagining the ability to use our own arguments to influence government action is one of the great virtues of academic debate. Gerald Graff (2003) analyzed the decline of argumentation in academic discourse and found a source of student antipathy to public argument in an interesting place. I’m up against…their aversion to the role of public spokesperson that formal writing presupposes. It’s as if such students can’t imagine any rewards for being a public actor or even imagining themselves in such a role. This lack of interest in the public sphere may in turn reflect a loss of confidence in the possibility that the arguments we make in public will have an effect on the world. Today’s students’ lack of faith in the power of persuasion reflects the waning of the ideal of civic participation that led educators for centuries to place rhetorical and argumentative training at the center of the school and college curriculum. (Graff, 2003, p. 57) The power to imagine public advocacy that actually makes a difference is one of the great virtues of the traditional notion of fiat that critics deride as mere simulation. Simulation of success in the public realm is far more empowering to students than completely abandoning all notions of personal power in the face of governmental hegemony by teaching students that “nothing they can do in a contest debate can ever make any difference in public policy.” Contest debating is well suited to rewarding public activism if it stops accepting as an article of faith that personal agency is somehow undermined by the so-called role playing in debate. Debate is role-playing whether we imagine government action or imagine individual action. Imagining myself starting a socialist revolution in America is no less of a fantasy than imagining myself making a difference on Capitol Hill. Furthermore, both fantasies influenced my personal and political development virtually ensuring a life of active, pro-social, political participation. Neither fantasy reduced the likelihood that I would spend my life trying to make the difference I imagined. One fantasy actually does make a greater difference: the one that speaks the language of political power. The other fantasy ~~disables~~ [prevents] action by making one a laughingstock to those who wield the language of power. Fantasy motivates and role-playing trains through visualization. Until we can imagine it, we cannot really do it. Role-playing without question teaches students to be comfortable with the language of power, and that language paves the way for genuine and effective political activism. Debates over the relative efficacy of political strategies for pro-social change must confront governmental power at some point. There is a fallacy in arguing that movements represent a better political strategy than voting and person-to-person advocacy. Sure, a full-scale movement would be better than the limited voice I have as a participating citizen going from door to door in a campaign, but so would full-scale government action. Unfortunately, the gap between my individual decision to pursue movement politics and the emergence of a full-scale movement is at least as great as the gap between my vote and democratic change. They both represent utopian fiat. Invocation of Mitchell to support utopian movement fiat is simply not supported by his work, and too often, such invocation discourages the concrete actions he argues for in favor of the personal rejectionism that under girds the political cynicism that is a fundamental cause of voter and participatory abstention