#### **Decisionmaking -- PICs are key to develop decision-making skills.**

**Branson 7** Josh Branson, CSIS and just graduated from Harvard Law, 2007 (“[eDebate] Reflections about debate and policymaking”, http://www.mail-archive.com/edebate@www.ndtceda.com/msg01593.html)

thats not the way it worked at all, at least for me. No doubt in a collegiate debate judged by one of ya’ll I could have killed them all on the Pan K, probably even if we talked slow, but in the real world, I was kind of surprised to find that the **knowledge generated by debate proved to be** fairly damn cursory and **artificial.** I could rattle off a list of most of the arguments for/against most of the general nonproliferation doctrines, but a lot of the empirical and factual basis for these arguments was completely missing in my brain. **I could make the basic claim for almost anything** in the field, **but the technical issues that underline**s **a lot of them** (the names and locations of the Russian CW destruction plants, an understanding of how the fine points of the budget process works, how a capital market sanction would actually be implemented, where did we get our intelligence that revealed Chinese serial proliferators selling bombs to AQ Khan, how does a centrifuge cascade work and why exactly would multilateral sanctions undermine Irans ability to get uranium gas piping technology, the names of the key players in the various foreign governments that make nonproliferation policy etc) **was** all **missing**. Maybe this stuff sounds pretty boring, and some of it is, but **this is the type of stuff that really determines whether or not policies are successful** and whether or not they are effectively promulgated. But the **details** pretty much **get left out in debates**, replaced by a simplistic and power-worded DA that culminates in nuclear winter.’ To my surprise, when setting out in the nonproliferation world, you dont get to make grand pronouncements about the impact of funding Nunn-Lugar on US soft power or whether funding it would cause a budget deficit which would collapse the global economy and cause multiple scenarios for nuclear war. Instead, most of the work that is done is deciding which and what type of Russian facilities to allocate the money to, knowing the specific people within the Russian government we can trust, which types of nuclear disposition is safest and what types of transportation we should use when moving spent fuel back to storage, etc. When dealing with these discussions repeatedly, I found that debate had provided me a very sound abstract conceptual frame through which to analyze the general issues being raised, but little in a way of meaningfully engaging the policy process. Of course, debaters can learn this language. There are plenty who have. But I’d wonder whether or not people who claim that debate has trained people for this life are mistaking correlation with causation. Two other interesting conclusions: A) To all the people who attack debate for propounding an overly elitist and undemocratic discourse and undermines good broadly appealing public speaking skills: I think you’ve got it backwards. Yes, a lot of debates involve jargon, no question. But at least in my experience, I found that debate provided me the opposite. The times I was most confident at CSIS were when we were doing public debates or discussions in front of unqualified audiences. I could take on even the most senior experts; in these types of forums, I could out debate them and rhetorically counteract their vast experience/knowledge advantage. On the flip side, when I was in conferences with only experts in the field, I often felt at a severe disadvantage. In forums like this, bad arguments get called out, and rhetorically powerful but intellectually flimsy claims are pretty much non-starters. Debate experience wasn’t a ton of help. In terms of research, I did feel that all the debate research I’ve done provided some advantages and gave me a marginal edge over a lot of other people at CSIS, but nothing enormous. Most of the people there, even though they’d never done debate, can research just as well as the average college debater (ESPECIALLY on technical issues). I realize there are problems with the sample size etc, but it made me think twice about the infallible research advantages supposedly generated by policy debate. B) **How to make debate more like the technical policy world**? Narrower debates. **PICs are vital** to this (sorry, Duck). Thinking back on my 8 years in debate, **the topic about which I can best converse with experts about is the design of emissions trading schemes**. That was **because** the literature was deep and the **prevalence of** upstream/downstream/auctioned/timetable **PICs narrowed the debates and forced** a **real in-depth discussion**. I just don’t think we get that in a ton of debates, because most PICs are either wanky rhetoric PICs (and yes I was an extreme culprit) or something even worse like Consultation. Thinking back on it, I don’t think that the legal topic was worded particularly poorly, I just think that our strategic norms of judging/debating create a lot of problems in generating the type of education a lot of us want. But one of the most striking thing for me about last year’s topic was that I learned more from Repko’s post about his day at the Supreme Court than I did from all the debates I judged combined. In any event, how to create the types of narrow debates that will general real sustainable expertise on topics is tough. I think that we’ve got to learn how to become accepting as a community of analytical smart arguments to answer carded-yet-stupid arguments, maybe start accepting intrinsicness (something that I might post on some other day) as a way to eliminate politics DAs and consultation CPs, and start modifying our theory dispositions to be willing to call out bullshit CPs (see DHeidts new judge philosophy), and finally moving away from the cult of new and surprise arguments (see below). This will also involve changing the way we teach kids as they enter debate; I know I, for one, am going to change the way I teach camp this summer to include at least a little of these thoughts. Of course, the focus must remain on winning above all else, but I think that that pursuit can be synthesized with a change in some of our debate practices. 2. Why an elite or technical discourse is important My second conclusion is directed at people who decry the topic process because it’s too technical, too narrow, drown out the personal or the things that people want to talk about. Again, my opinion is that this is backwards. I think it’s a major problem that more of the people who conduct policy and who are influential in the process are not well-schooled in the actual empirical pragmatic details of the policies that they are advocating. I’ve read a significant amount about Iraq lately, and got to talk to a bunch of people who were intimately involved in the process, and one of the primary problems was that too much of our policy was executed in a cavalier and emotion-laden fashion. The dangerous pursuit of the “liberation of the oppressed” Iraqis at the expense of all the obvious problems entailed with that pursuit, the complete “lack of a plan,” for how to stabilize the country, and an utter ignorance of the technical or real policy issues facing a peacebuilding operation of that magnitude---these are all issues that come up REPEATEDLY when discussing the reason we went into Iraq in such a cavalier and short-sighted manner. A bunch of the more scathing indicts of the topic committee’s work---that the topic is too technical, that it undermines creativity etc…these are traits that for me are reflected in some of the most loathsome policymakers we have. Bush is by all accounts an idiot when it comes to policy expertise, but he’s the president that most people would love to have a beer with, and one who has let his personal conviction guide his policymaking more than any I can remember. His administration appears to conceive of the world in relatively simple generic conceptual dichotomies (stay the course vs. cut and run, terrorists are good or evil, our intelligence is either 100% accurate or its not). Is that really what we want our topics to boil down to? A be nice to the Middle East topic? Because **its in the extra 60 words that the real problems with policy are revealed**, and its there that we find the difference between an effective invasion that removes a horrible dictator from power and one which kills thousands of people and causes the region to implode.

#### **1-DA**

#### **Econ is strong now and will grow**

**World Bank 21 (**June 8th 2021, <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2021/06/08/the-global-economy-on-track-for-strong-but-uneven-growth-as-covid-19-still-weighs>)//AK

A year and a half since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the global economy is poised to stage its most robust post-recession recovery in 80 years in 2021. But the rebound is expected to be uneven across countries, as major economies look set to register strong growth even as many developing economies lag. Global growth is expected to accelerate to 5.6% this year, largely on the strength in major economies such as the United States and China. And while growth for almost every region of the world has been revised upward for 2021, many continue to grapple with COVID-19 and what is likely to be its long shadow. Despite this year’s pickup, the level of global GDP in 2021 is expected to be 3.2% below pre-pandemic projections, and per capita GDP among many emerging market and developing economies is anticipated to remain below pre-COVID-19 peaks for an extended period. As the pandemic continues to flare, it will shape the path of global economic activity. The United States and China are each expected to contribute about one quarter of global growth in 2021. The U.S. economy has been bolstered by massive fiscal support, vaccination is expected to become widespread by mid-2021, and growth is expected to reach 6.8% this year, the fastest pace since 1984. China’s economy – which did not contract last year – is expected to grow a solid 8.5% and moderate as the country’s focus shifts to reducing financial stability risks. Lasting Legacies Growth among emerging market and developing economies is expected to accelerate to 6% this year, helped by increased external demand and higher commodity prices. However, the recovery of many countries is constrained by resurgences of COVID-19, uneven vaccination, and a partial withdrawal of government economic support measures. Excluding China, growth is anticipated to unfold at a more modest 4.4% pace. In the longer term, the outlook for emerging market and developing economies will likely be dampened by the lasting legacies of the pandemic – erosion of skills from lost work and schooling; a sharp drop in investment; higher debt burdens; and greater financial vulnerabilities. Growth among this group of economies is forecast to moderate to 4.7% in 2022 as governments gradually withdraw policy support. Among low-income economies, where vaccination has lagged, growth has been revised lower to 2.9%. Setting aside the contraction last year, this would be the slowest pace of expansion in two decades. The group’s output level in 2022 is projected to be 4.9% lower than pre-pandemic projections. Fragile and conflict-affected low-income economies have been the hardest hit by the pandemic, and per capita income gains have been set back by at least a decade. Regionally, the recovery is expected to be strongest in East Asia and the Pacific, largely due to the strength of China’s recovery. In South Asia, recovery has been hampered by serious renewed outbreaks of the virus in India and Nepal. The Middle East and North Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean are expected to post growth too shallow to offset the contraction of 2020. Sub-Saharan Africa’s recovery, while helped by spillovers from the global recovery, is expected to remain fragile given the slow pace of vaccination and delays to major investments in infrastructure and the extractives sector. With relief from the pandemic tantalizingly close in many places but far from reach in others, policy actions will be critical. Securing equitable vaccine distribution will be essential to ending the pandemic. Far-reaching debt relief will be important to many low-income countries. Policymakers will need to nurture the economic recovery with fiscal and monetary measures while keeping a close eye on safeguarding financial stability. Policies should take the long view, reinvigorating human capital, expanding access to digital connectivity, and investing in green infrastructure to bolster growth along a green, resilient, and inclusive path. It will take global coordination to end the pandemic through widespread vaccination and careful macroeconomic stewardship to avoid crises until we get there.

#### **Strikes are terrible for the economy**

**Haas and Stack 83 (**Haas, A., & Stack, S. (1983). Economic Development and Strikes: A Comparative Analysis. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *24*(1), 43–58. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4106362>)//AK

Theorists of class conflict have debated the nature of the relationship between economic development and the incidence of strikes. The liberal perspective contends that such developmentsas the growth in size of corporations and the separationof owner- ship from control enable modern management to institutionalize industrial conflict in the form of collective bargaining. In contrast, writers in the radical perspective argue that conflict will increase in late industrializationowing to such forces as the bi- polarizationof classes and an increasein union strength.The presentpapertests these structuralisttheories by using data from a sampling of seventy-one nations represent- ing a wide range in economic development. A polynomial regression analysis indi- cates that strikevolume, a chief measureof overall strikeactivity,follows a parabolic curve-increasing until a GNP per capita of about $4,700 is reached and then declining. No support is found for the radical thesis of an upswing in strike activity at high levels of economic development. The findings on control variables indicate that the inflationrate and mass-mediadevelopmenthave significantlypositive effects on strike activity. Finally, a democraticpolitical climate tends to lower strike volume. Research on the determinants of industrial disputes has pursued a number of re- current themes. First, there is the economic paradigm which links current eco- nomic conditions such as unemployment, real wage change, and profit rates to the incidence of strikes (Yoder, 1940; Rees, 1952; Weintraub, 1966; Ashenfelter and Johnson, 1969; Farber, 1978; Edwards, 1978, 1981). Second, there are those who stress structural factors in industrial organization, such as plant size, the extent of unionization, absentee ownership, industrial specialization, and the degree of centralization in collective bargaining (Britt and Galle, 1972, 1974; Kerr and Seigel, 1954; Crouch and Pizzorno, 1981; Lincoln, 1978). Third, some have stressed contextual factors such as the degree of institutionalization of col- lective bargaining and the political climate as mediating the linkage between so- cial conditions and strikes (Shorter and Tilly, 1974; Snyder, 1975). In contrast to this macrosociological or structuralist literature, another tradition calls for a microsociological approach which investigates the impact of the nature of management-worker relations in explaining individual cases of strikes (Batstone, Boraston, and Frenkel, 1978; Gouldner, 1954; Stern, 1978). Finally, there is a body of work testing theories on the effect of industrialization on strike rates (Ross and Hartman, 1960; Mann, 1975; Hibbs, 1976; Cronin, 1979; Korpi and Shalev, 1979). Macrosociological theories of poltical economy reveal a debate over the relation- ship between the level of economic development and strikes. Authors from vari- ous schools of thought tend to agree only on the thesis that strikes tend to increase during the period of early industrialization. These are the times of widespread social and economic problems such as the uprootedness felt by people involved in the necessary and large-scale rural-to-urban migration, eighteen-hour workdays, mass impoverishment, overcrowded housing, fits and starts in the business cycle, and so on. Such conditions are the breeding grounds of industrial disputes (Ross and Hartman, 1960:44; Mann, 1975). However, theorists disagree about the period of late industrialization. On the one hand, many writers in the radical tra- dition contend that such forces as the bipolarization of classes will produce a period of intensified class antagonisms and industrial conflicts in late industriali- zation (Korpi, 1978; Korpi and Shalev, 1979). On the other hand, liberal political economists expect class war to be increasingly institutionalized and contained through such processes as collective bargaining. Such liberal authors have spoken of the withering away of the strike owing to such developments as the separation of ownership from control and such other imperatives of technological development as the shrinking in the relative size of the blue-collar labor force (Ross and Hartman, 1960; Clegg, 1976; Galbraith, 1967; Kerr and Seigel, 1954).special attention was drawn to two opposed theories of the long-term effects of industrializationor strike volume. The results give support to the liberal position in this debate. The effect of economic development on strikes follows a parabolic curve. The position of the radicals that strikes should follow a linear increase with late industrialization was not supported. More work, especially that following a micromethodological pattern, is needed to detect exactly what conditions in late industrialization are responsible for the general decline in strike volume. Several investigations using (postwar) time-series data on strikes in industrial nations have found a resurgence of strike activity in recent years (Korpi, 1978; Korpi and Shalev, 1979, 1980; Hibbs, 1976, 1978). How, then, might an explana- tion be constructed for the opposed findings of the present paper? While it is true that several industrial nations such as Sweden have had a marked increase in strikes in the 1970s, this level of strike activity is considerably less on the average than that found in the nation at the mid-stages of industrialization.While there are signs of a resurgence of strike activity in some industrial countries, the objective magnitude of the resulting level of activity is overshadowed by that of nations at a GNP level of $4-5,000 U.S. 1977 dollars. There is a possibilty that the radical position would be supported by an alterna- tive specification using a cubic development term: S= bE + b2E2+ b3E3+ c This would represent a curve wherein strike activity increases up to mid-industrial- ization then decreases to late industrialization where the curve swings upward again, although not to the level of mid-industrialization.This cubic polynomial was tested in a separate analysis and did not provide a significantfit for the curve. On the whole, the upswing in strike activity noted by the radicals for some nations is offset by a decline in other nations. It is still too early to discount the radical position altogether. History is not over. If the trend toward an increase in strike activity continues in the nations where it has already developed and spreads to other industrialnations, the cubic model may provide the definitive statement on individual disputes. Such would provide ma- terial for a synthesis of sorts between the two opposed positions.

#### **Economic decline goes Nuclear.**

**Tønnesson 15**, Stein. "Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace." International Area Studies Review 18.3 (2015): 297-311. (the Department of Peace and Conflict, Uppsala University, Sweden, and Peace research Institute Oslo (PRIO), Norway)

Several **recent works on China and Sino–US relations have made substantial contributions to** the **current understanding of how and under what circumstances a combination of nuclear deterrence and economic interdependence may reduce the risk of war between major powers**. At least four conclusions can be drawn from the review above: first, **those who say that interdependence may both inhibit and drive conflict are righ**t. **Interdependence raises the cost of conflict for all sides but** asymmetrical or unbalanced dependencies and negative trade expectations may generate tensions leading to trade wars among inter-dependent states that in turn increase the risk of military conflict(Copeland, 2015: 1, 14, 437; Roach, 2014). The risk may increase if one of the interdependent countries is governed by an inward-looking socio-economic coalition (Solingen, 2015); second, the **risk of war between China and the US should not just be analysed bilaterally but include their allies and partners**. Third party countries could drag China or the US into confrontation; third, in this context it is of some comfort that the three main economic powers in Northeast Asia (China, Japan and South Korea) are all deeply integrated economically through production networks within a global system of trade and finance (Ravenhill, 2014; Yoshimatsu, 2014: 576); and fourth, **decisions for war and peace are taken by very few people, who act on the basis of their future expectations**. International relations theory must be supplemented by foreign policy analysis in order to assess the value attributed by national decision-makers to economic development and their assessments of risks and opportunities. **If leaders on either side of the Atlantic begin to seriously fear or anticipate their own nation’s decline then they may blame** this on external dependence, appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, **contemplate the use of force to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately refuse to be deterred by either nuclear arms or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. Such a dangerous shift could happen abruptly**, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party. Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. **The greatest risk is not that a territorial dispute leads to war under present circumstances but that changes in the world economy alter those circumstances in ways that render inter-state peace more precarious**. If China and the US fail to rebalance their financial and trading relations (Roach, 2014) then **a trade war could** result, **interrupt**ing **transnational production networks, provoking social distress, and exacerbating nationalist emotions.** **This could have unforeseen consequences in the field of security, with nuclear deterrence remaining** the only factor to protect the world from Armageddon, and **unreliably** so. Deterrence could lose its credibility: one of the two **great powers might gamble that the other** **yield in a cyber-war or conventional limited war,** **or third party countries might engage** in conflict with each other, **with a view to obliging Washington or Beijing to intervene**.

#### **Extinction**

**Edwards 17** [Paul N. Edwards, CISAC’s William J. Perry Fellow in International Security at Stanford’s Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies. Being interviewed by EarthSky. How nuclear war would affect Earth’s climate. September 8, 2017. earthsky.org/human-world/how-nuclear-war-would-affect-earths-climate] Note, we are only reading parts of the interview that are directly from Paul Edwards --

In the nuclear conversation, what are we not talking about that we should be?

**We are not talking enough about the climatic effects of nuclear war**. The “nuclear winter” theory of the mid-1980s played a significant role in the arms reductions of that period. But with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the reduction of U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals, **this aspect of nuclear war has faded from view. That’s not good. In the mid-2000s, climate scientists** such as Alan Robock (Rutgers**) took another look at nuclear winter theory. This time around, they used much-improved and much more detailed climate models than those available 20 years earlier.** They also tested the potential effects of smaller nuclear exchanges. The result: an exchange involving just 50 nuclear weapons — the kind of thing we might see in an India-Pakistan war, for example — could loft 5 billion kilograms of smoke, soot and dust high into the stratosphere. That’s enough to cool the entire planet by about 2 degrees Fahrenheit (1.25 degrees Celsius) — about where we were during the Little Ice Age of the 17th century. Growing seasons could be shortened enough to create really significant food shortages. So the climatic effects of even a relatively small nuclear war would be planet-wide. What about a larger-scale conflict? A **U.S.-Russia war currently seems unlikely, but if it were to occur, hundreds or even thousands of nuclear weapons might be launched. The climatic consequences would be catastrophic: global average temperatures would drop as much as 12 degrees Fahrenheit (7 degrees Celsius) for up to several years — temperatures last seen during the great ice ages. Meanwhile, smoke and dust circulating in the stratosphere would darken the atmosphere enough to inhibit photosynthesis, causing disastrous crop failures, widespread famine and massive ecological disruption. The effect would be similar to that of the giant meteor believed to be responsible for the extinction of the dinosaurs. This time, we would be the dinosaurs**. Many people are concerned about North Korea’s advancing missile capabilities. Is nuclear war likely in your opinion? At this writing, **I think we are closer to a nuclear war than we have been since the early 1960s.** In the North Korea case, both Kim Jong-un and President Trump are bullies inclined to escalate confrontations. President **Trump lacks impulse control, and there are precious few checks on his ability to initiate a nuclear strike**. We have to hope that our generals, both inside and outside the White House, can rein him in. North Korea would most certainly “lose” a nuclear war with the United States. But many millions would die, including hundreds of thousands of Americans currently living in South Korea and Japan (probable North Korean targets). Such vast damage would be wrought in Korea, Japan and Pacific island territories (such as Guam) that any “victory” wouldn’t deserve the name. Not only would that region be left with horrible suffering amongst the survivors; it would also immediately face famine and rampant disease. Radioactive fallout from such a war would spread around the world, including to the U.S. It has been more than 70 years since the last time a nuclear bomb was used in warfare. What would be the effects on the environment and on human health today? To my knowledge, most of the changes in nuclear weapons technology since the 1950s have focused on making them smaller and lighter, and making delivery systems more accurate, rather than on changing their effects on the environment or on human health. So-called “battlefield” weapons with lower explosive yields are part of some arsenals now — **but it’s quite unlikely that any exchange between two nuclear powers would stay limited to these smaller, less destructive bombs.**

### **2– CP-Pandemics**

#### **Text: A Just government ought to recognize a conditional right of workers to strike whereby Healthcare Workers are not permitted to strike during a pandemic.**

#### **Strikes During a Pandemic decks preparedness – responsivity is slowed, faith is deterred, and resources are overstretched. Its try or die for medical preparedness to mitigate the next pandemic.**

**Jamaluddin et al. 21** [Jamaluddin, J., Baharum, N. N., Jamil, S. N., & Kamel, M. A. M. (2021). Doctors Strike During COVID-19 Pandemic in Malaysia: Between Right and Wrong. *Voices in Bioethics*, *7*. <https://doi.org/10.52214/vib.v7i.8586>] DD HJ

Although doctor strikes do not seem to increase patient mortality, they can disrupt delivery of healthcare.[32] Disruptions in delivery of service from prolonged strikes can result in decline of in-patient admissions and outpatient service utilization, as suggested during strikes in the UK in 2016.[33] When emergency services were affected during the last strike in April, regular service was also significantly affected. Additionally, people might need to seek alternative sources of care from the private sector and face increased costs of care. HCWs themselves may feel guilty and demotivated because of the strikes. The public health system may also lose trust as a result of service disruption caused by high recurrence of strikes. During the COVID-19 pandemic, as the healthcare system remains stretched, the potential adverse effects resulting from doctor strikes remain uncertain and potentially disruptive. In the UK, it is an offence to “willfully and maliciously…endanger human life or cause serious bodily injury.”[34] Likewise, the General Medical Council (GMC) also requires doctors to ensure that patients are not harmed or put at risk by industrial action. In the US, the American Medical Association code of ethics prohibits strikes by physicians as a bargaining tactic, while allowing some other forms of collective bargaining.[35] However, the American College of Physicians prohibits all forms of work stoppages, even when undertaken for necessary changes to the healthcare system. Similarly, the Delhi Medical Council in India issued a statement that “under no circumstances doctors should resort to strike as the same puts patient care in serious jeopardy.”[36] On the other hand, the positions taken by the Malaysian Medical Council (MMC) and Malaysian Medical Association (MMA) on doctors’ strikes are less clear when compared to their Western counterparts. The MMC, in their recently updated Code of Professional Conduct 2019, states that “the public reputation of the medical profession requires that every member should observe proper standards of personal behavior, not only in his professional activities but at all times.” Strikes may lead to imprisonment and disciplinary actions by MMC for those involved. Similarly, the MMA Code of Medical Ethics published in 2002 states that doctors must “make sure that your personal beliefs do not prejudice your patients' care.”[37] The MMA which is traditionally meant to represent the voices of doctors in Malaysia, may hold a more moderate position on strikes. Although HCW strikes are not explicitly mentioned in either professional body’s code of conduct and ethics, the consensus is that doctors should not do anything that will harm patients and they must maintain the proper standard of behaviors. These statements seem too general and do not represent the complexity of why and how a strike could take place. Therefore, it has been suggested that doctors and medical organizations should develop a new consensus on issues pertaining to medical professional’s social contract with society while considering the need to uphold the integrity of the profession. Experts in law, ethics, and medicine have long debated whether and when HCW strikes can be justified. If a strike is not expected to result in patient harm it is perhaps acceptable.[38] Although these debates have centered on the potential risks that strikes carry for patients, these actions also pose risks for HCWs as they may damage morale and reputation.[39] Most fundamentally, strikes raise questions about what healthcare workers owe society and what society owes them. For strikes to be morally permissible and ethical, it is suggested that they must fulfil these three criteria:[40] a. Strikes should be proportionate, e., they ‘should not inflict disproportionate harm on patients’, and hospitals should as a minimum ‘continue to provide at least such critical services as emergency care.’ b. Strikes should have a reasonable hope of success, at least not totally futile however tough the political rhetoric is. c. Strikes should be treated as a last resort: ‘all less disruptive alternatives to a strike action must have been tried and failed’, including where appropriate ‘advocacy, dissent and even disobedience’. The current strike does not fulfil the criteria mentioned. As Malaysia is still burdened with a high number of COVID-19 cases, a considerable absence of doctors from work will disrupt health services across the country. Second, since the strike organizer is not unionized, it would be difficult to negotiate better terms of contract and career paths. Third, there are ongoing talks with MMA representing the fraternity and the current government, but the time is running out for the government to establish a proper long-term solution for these contract doctors. One may argue that since the doctors’ contracts will end in a few months with no proper pathways for specialization, now is the time to strike. However, the HCW right to strike should be invoked only legally and appropriately after all other options have failed. CONCLUSION The strike in Malaysia has begun since the drafting of this paper. Doctors involved assure that there will not be any risk to patients, arguing that the strike is “symbolic”.[41] Although an organized strike remains a legal form of industrial action, a strike by HCWs in Malaysia poses various unprecedented challenges and ethical dilemmas, especially during the pandemic. The anonymous and uncoordinated strike without support from the appropriate labor unions may only spark futile discussions without affirmative actions. It should not have taken a pandemic or a strike to force the government to confront the issues at hand. It is imperative that active measures be taken to urgently address the underlying issues relating to contract physicians. As COVID-19 continues to affect thousands of people, a prompt reassessment is warranted regarding the treatment of HCWs, and the value placed on health care.

#### **Disease causes extinction – weakening health care preparedness is the death knell**

**Ord ‘20** (Toby Ord is a moral philosopher, Oxford University, Future of Life Institute. Ord has advised the World Health Organization, the World Bank, the World Economic Forum, the US National Intelligence Council, the UK Prime Minister’s Office, Cabinet Office, and Government Office for Science; “Why we need worst-case thinking to prevent pandemics”; The Guardian; D.A. April 18th 2020, [Published March 6th 2020]; <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2020/mar/06/worst-case-thinking-prevent-pandemics-coronavirus-existential-risk>)

[TITLE]: Why **we need worst-case thinking to prevent pandemics** The world is in the early stages of what may be the most deadly pandemic of the past 100 years. In China, thousands of people have already died; large outbreaks have begun in South Korea, Iran and Italy; and the rest of the world is bracing for impact. We do not yet know whether the final toll will be measured in thousands or hundreds of thousands. **For all our advances** in medicine, **humanity remains** much more **vulnerable** **to pandemics** than we would like to believe. To understand our vulnerability, and to determine what steps must be taken to end it, it is useful to ask about the very worst-case scenarios. Just how bad could a pandemic be? In science fiction, we sometimes encounter the idea of a **pandemic** so severe that it **could cause** the **end of** civilisation, or even of **humanity** itself. Such a risk to humanity’s entire future is known as **an existential risk**. We can say with certainty that the novel coronavirus, named Covid-19, does not pose such a risk. **But could the next pandemic?** To find out, and to put the current outbreak into greater context, let us turn to the past. In 1347, death came to Europe. It entered through the Crimean town of Caffa, brought by the besieging Mongol army. Fleeing merchants unwittingly carried it back to Italy. From there, it spread to France, Spain and England. Then up as far as Norway and across the rest of Europe – all the way to Moscow. Within six years, the Black Death had taken the continent. Tens of millions fell gravely ill, their bodies succumbing to the disease in different ways. Some bore swollen buboes on their necks, armpits and thighs; some had their flesh turn black from haemorrhaging beneath the skin; some coughed blood from the necrotic inflammation of their throats and lungs. All forms involved fever, exhaustion and an intolerable stench from the material that exuded from the body. There were so many dead that mass graves needed to be dug and, even then, cemeteries ran out of room for the bodies. The **Black Death devastated Europe**. In those six years, between a quarter and half of all Europeans were killed. The Middle East was ravaged, too, with the plague killing about one in three Egyptians and Syrians. And it may have also laid waste to parts of central Asia, India and China. Due to the scant records of the 14th century, we will never know the true toll, but our best estimates are that somewhere between 5% and 14% of all the world’s people were killed, in what may have been the greatest catastrophe humanity has seen. The Black Death was not the only biological disaster to scar human history. It was not even the only great bubonic plague. In AD541 the plague of Justinian struck the Byzantine empire. Over three years, it took the lives of roughly 3% of the world’s people. When Europeans reached the Americas in 1492, the two populations exposed each other to completely novel diseases. Over thousands of years, each population had built up resistance to their own set of diseases, but were extremely susceptible to the others. The American peoples got by far the worse end of the exchange, through diseases such as **measles**, **influenza** and, especially, **smallpox**. During the next 100 years, a combination of invasion and disease took an immense toll – one whose scale may never be known, due to great uncertainty about the size of the pre-existing population. We can’t rule out the **loss** of more than **90% of the population** of the Americas during that century, though the number could also be much lower. And it is very difficult to tease out how much of this should be attributed to war and occupation, rather than disease. At a rough estimate, as many as 10% of the world’s people may have been killed. Centuries later, **the world had become** so **interconnected** that a truly global pandemic was possible. Towards the end of the first world war, a devastating strain of influenza, known as the 1918 flu or [**Spanish flu**](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/sep/09/spanish-flu-pandemic-centenary-first-world-war), spread to six continents, and **even remote Pacific islands**. About a third of the world’s population were infected and between 3% and 6% were killed. This death toll **outstripped that of the first world war**. Yet even events like these fall short of being a threat to humanity’s long-term potential. In the great bubonic plagues we saw civilisation in the affected areas falter, but recover. The regional 25%-50% death rate was not enough to precipitate a continent-wide collapse. It changed the relative fortunes of empires, and may have substantially altered the course of history, but if anything, it gives us reason to believe that human civilisation is likely to make it through future events with similar death rates, even if they were global in scale. The Spanish flu pandemic was remarkable in having very little apparent effect on the world’s development, despite its global reach. It looks as if it was lost in the wake of the first world war, which, despite a smaller death toll, seems to have had a much larger effect on the course of history. The full history of humanity covers at least 200,000 years. While we have scarce records for most of these 2,000 centuries, there is a key lesson we can draw from the sheer length of our past. **The chance of human extinction** from natural catastrophes of any kind **must have been very low** for most of this time – or we would not have made it so far. But **could these risks have changed?** Might the past provide false comfort? Our **population** now is a **thousand times greater** than it was for most of human history, so there are vastly **more opportunities** for new human **diseases to originate**. And our **farming practices** have created vast numbers of animals living in unhealthy conditions within **close proximity to humans**. This increases the risk, as many major diseases originate in animals before crossing over to humans. Examples include **HIV** (chimpanzees), **Ebola** (bats), **Sars** (probably civets or bats) and **influenza** (usually pigs or birds). We do not yet know where Covid-19 came from, though it is very similar to coronaviruses found in bats and pangolins. Evidence suggests that diseases are crossing over into human populations from animals **at an increasing rate**. Modern civilisation may also **make it** much **easier for a pandemic to spread**. The higher **density of people** living together in cities increases the number of people each of us may infect. Rapid **long-distance transport** greatly increases the distance pathogens can spread, **reducing** the **degrees of separation** between any two people. Moreover, we are no longer divided into isolated populations as we were for most of the past 10,000 years. Together these effects suggest that we might expect more new pandemics, for them to spread more quickly, and to reach a higher percentage of the world’s people. But we have also changed the world in ways that offer protection. We have a healthier population; improved sanitation and hygiene; preventative and curative medicine; and a scientific understanding of disease. Perhaps most importantly, we have public health bodies to facilitate global communication and coordination in the face of new outbreaks. We have seen the benefits of this protection through the dramatic decline of endemic infectious disease over the past century (though we can’t be sure pandemics will obey the same trend). Finally, we have spread to a range of locations and environments unprecedented for any mammalian species. This offers special protection from extinction events, because it requires the pathogen to be able to flourish in a vast range of environments and to reach exceptionally isolated populations such as uncontacted tribes, Antarctic researchers and nuclear submarine crews. It is hard to know whether these combined effects have increased or decreased the existential risk from pandemics. This uncertainty is ultimately bad news: we were previously sitting on a powerful argument that the risk was tiny; now we are not. We have seen the indirect ways that our actions aid and abet the origination and spread of pandemics. But **what about cases where we** have a much more direct hand in the process – where we **deliberately use**, **improve or create the pathogens?** Our understanding and control of pathogens is very recent. Just 200 years ago, we didn’t even understand the basic cause of pandemics – a leading theory in the west claimed that disease was produced by a kind of gas. In just two centuries, we discovered it was caused by a diverse variety of microscopic agents and **we worked** out **how to grow them** in the lab, to **breed** them for **different traits**, to sequence their genomes, to **implant new genes** and to create entire functional viruses from their written code. **This progress is continuing at a rapid pace**. The past 10 years have seen major qualitative breakthroughs, such as the **use of the gene editing tool Crispr** to efficiently insert new genetic sequences into a genome, and the use of gene drives to efficiently replace populations of natural organisms in the wild with genetically modified versions. This progress in **biotechnology seems unlikely to fizzle out** anytime soon: there are no insurmountable challenges looming; no fundamental laws blocking further developments. But **it would be optimistic to assume that this uncharted new terrain holds only familiar dangers.** To start with, let’s set aside the risks from malicious intent, and consider only the risks that can arise from well-intentioned research. Most scientific and medical research poses a negligible risk of harms at the scale we are considering. But there is a small fraction that uses live pathogens of kinds that are known to threaten global harm. These include the agents that cause the Spanish flu, smallpox, Sars and H5N1 or avian flu. And a small part of this research involves making strains of these pathogens that pose even more danger than the natural types, **increasing their transmissibility, lethality or resistance to vaccination or treatment**. In 2012, a Dutch virologist, Ron Fouchier, published details of an experiment on the recent H5N1 strain of bird flu. This strain was extremely deadly, killing an estimated 60% of humans it infected – far beyond even the Spanish flu. Yet its inability to pass from human to human had so far prevented a pandemic. Fouchier wanted to find out whether (and how) H5N1 could naturally develop this ability. He passed the disease through a series of 10 ferrets, which are commonly used as a model for how influenza affects humans. By the time it passed to the final ferret, his strain of H5N1 had become directly transmissible between mammals. The work caused fierce controversy. Much of this was focused on the information contained in his work. The US National Science Advisory Board for Biosecurity ruled that his paper had to be stripped of some of its technical details before publication, to limit the ability of bad actors to cause a pandemic. And the Dutch government claimed that the research broke EU law on exporting information useful for bioweapons. But it is not the possibility of misuse that concerns me here. Fouchier’s research provides a clear example of well-intentioned scientists enhancing the destructive capabilities of pathogens known to **threaten global catastrophe**. Of course, such experiments are done in secure labs, with stringent safety standards. It is highly unlikely that in any particular case the enhanced pathogens would escape into the wild. But just how unlikely? Unfortunately, we don’t have good data, due to a lack of transparency about incident and escape rates. This prevents society from making well-informed decisions balancing the risks and benefits of this research, and it limits the ability of labs to learn from each other’s incidents. **Security for highly dangerous pathogens has been deeply flawed, and remains insufficient**. In 2001, Britain was struck by a devastating outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in livestock. Six million animals were killed in an attempt to halt its spread, and the economic damages totalled £8bn. Then, in 2007, there was another outbreak, which was traced to a lab working on the disease. Foot-and-mouth was considered a highest-category pathogen, and required the highest level of biosecurity. Yet the **virus escaped** from a badly maintained pipe, leaking into the groundwater at the facility. After an investigation, the **lab’s** licence was renewed – only for another leak to occur two weeks later. In my view, this track record of escapes shows that even the highest biosafety level (BSL-4) is insufficient for working on pathogens that **pose a risk of global pandemics** on the scale of the Spanish flu or worse. Thirteen years since the last publicly acknowledged outbreak from a BSL-4 facility is not good enough. It doesn’t matter whether this is from insufficient standards, inspections, operations or penalties. **What matters is the poor track record in the field, made worse by a lack of transparency and accountability**. With current BSL-4 labs, an escape of a pandemic pathogen is only a matter of time. One of the most exciting trends in biotechnology is its rapid democratisation – the speed at which cutting-edge techniques can be adopted by students and amateurs. When a new breakthrough is achieved, the pool of people with the talent, training, resources and patience to reproduce it rapidly expands: from a handful of the world’s top biologists, to people with PhDs in the field, to millions of people with undergraduate-level biology. The Human Genome Project was the largest ever scientific collaboration in biology. It took 13 years and $500m to produce the full DNA sequence of the human genome. Just 15 years later, a genome can be sequenced for under $1,000, and within a single hour. The reverse process has become much easier, too: online DNA synthesis services allow anyone to upload a DNA sequence of their choice then have it constructed and shipped to their address. While still expensive, the price of synthesis has fallen by a factor of 1,000 in the past two decades, and continues to drop. The first ever uses of Crispr and gene drives were the biotechnology achievements of the decade. But within just two years, each of these technologies were used successfully by bright students participating in science competitions. Such democratisation promises to fuel a boom of entrepreneurial biotechnology. But since biotechnology can be misused to lethal effect, democratisation also means proliferation. As the pool of people with access to a technique grows, so does the chance it contains someone with malign intent. People with the motivation to wreak global destruction are mercifully rare. But they exist. Perhaps the best example is the **Aum Shinrikyo** cult in Japan, active between 1984 and 1995, which sought to bring about the destruction of humanity. It attracted several thousand members, including people with advanced skills in chemistry and biology. And it demonstrated that it was not mere misanthropic ideation. It launched multiple lethal attacks using VX gas and sarin gas, killing more than 20 people and injuring thousands. It **attempted to weaponise anthrax**, but did not succeed. What happens when the circle of people able to create a global pandemic becomes wide enough to include members of such a group? Or members of a **terrorist organisation or rogue state** that could try to build an omnicidal weapon for the purposes of extortion or deterrence? The main candidate for biological **existential risk** in the coming decades thus stems from technology – particularly the risk of misuse by states or small groups. But this is not a case in which the world is blissfully unaware of the risks. Bertrand Russell wrote of the danger of extinction from biowarfare to Einstein in 1955. And, in 1969, the possibility was raised by the American Nobel laureate for medicine, Joshua Lederberg: “As a scientist I am profoundly concerned about the continued involvement of the United States and other nations in the development of biological warfare. **This process puts the very future of human life on earth in serious peril**.” In response to such warnings, we have already begun national and international efforts to protect humanity. There is action through public health and international conventions, and self-regulation by biotechnology companies and the scientific community. **Are they adequate?** National and international work in public health offers some protection from engineered pandemics, and its existing infrastructure could be adapted to better address them. Yet even for existing dangers this protection is uneven and under-provided. Despite its importance, **public health is underfunded worldwide**, and **poorer countries** remain **vulnerable** to being overwhelmed by outbreaks. Biotechnology companies are working to limit the dark side of the democratisation of their field. For example, unrestricted DNA synthesis would help bad actors overcome a major hurdle in creating extremely deadly pathogens. It would allow them to get access to the DNA of controlled pathogens such as smallpox (whose genome is readily available online) and to create DNA with modifications to make the pathogen more dangerous. Therefore, many synthesis companies make voluntary efforts to manage this risk, screening their orders for dangerous sequences. But the **screening methods are imperfect**, and they only cover about 80% of orders. There is significant room for improving this process, and a strong case for making screening mandatory. We might also look to the scientific community for careful management of biological risks. Many of the dangerous advances usable by states and small groups have come from open science. And we’ve seen that science produces **substantial accident risk**. The scientific community has tried to regulate its dangerous research, but with limited success. There are a variety of reasons why this is extremely hard, including difficulty in knowing where to draw the line, lack of central authorities to unify practice, a culture of openness and freedom to pursue whatever is of interest, and the rapid pace of science outpacing that of governance. It may be possible for the scientific community to overcome these challenges and provide strong management of global risks, but it would require a willingness to accept serious changes to its culture and governance – such as treating the security around biotechnology more like that around nuclear power. And the scientific community would need to find this willingness before catastrophe strikes. **Threats to humanity**, **and how we address them, define our time**. The advent of nuclear weapons posed a real risk of human extinction in the 20th century. There is strong reason to believe the risk will be higher this century, and increasing with each century that technological progress continues. Because these anthropogenic risks outstrip all natural risks combined, they set the clock on how long humanity has left to pull back from the brink. I am not claiming that extinction is the inevitable conclusion of scientific progress, or even the most likely outcome. What I am claiming is that there has been a robust trend towards increases in the power of humanity, which has reached a point where **we pose a serious risk to our own existence**. How we react to this risk is up to us. Nor am I arguing against technology. Technology has proved itself immensely valuable in improving the human condition. The problem is not so much an excess of technology as a lack of wisdom. Carl Sagan put this especially well: “Many of the dangers we face indeed arise from science and technology – but, more fundamentally, because we have become powerful without becoming commensurately wise. The world-altering powers that technology has delivered into our hands now require a degree of consideration and foresight that has never before been asked of us.” Because we cannot come back from extinction, we cannot wait until a threat strikes before acting – we must be proactive. And because gaining wisdom takes time, **we need to start now.** I think that we are likely to make it through this period. Not because the challenges are small, but because we will rise to them. The very fact that these risks stem from human action shows us that human action can address them. **Defeatism would be both unwarranted and counterproductive – a self-fulfilling prophecy**. Instead, we must address these challenges head-on with clear and rigorous thinking, guided by a positive vision of the longterm future we are trying to protect.

### **3-DA**

#### **Biden’s reconciliation bill passes now but compromises are delicate**

**Caygle and Everett 10/20** (Heather and Burgess, Congress reporters at Politico) “Dems edge closer to ditching disarray” <https://www.politico.com/news/2021/10/20/dems-edge-closer-ditching-disarray-516312> EE, DebateDrills

Nancy Pelosi and Chuck Schumer’s strategy to force through Democrats’ domestic agenda flamed out spectacularly in September. They’re ready to try it all over again.

With their party’s long-sought priorities on the line, the speaker and Senate majority leader are hustling to clinch a deal **as soon as possible** that would lock in evasive centrists on a framework for President Joe Biden’s $2 trillion social spending package. **That framework**, in turn, **would free up needed progressive votes for a bipartisan infrastructure bill** by Oct. 31.

It’s a rerun of the playbook Democratic leaders used just weeks ago, [only to have it blow up](https://www.politico.com/news/2021/10/01/house-democrats-biden-infrastructure-deal-514878) in their faces. But **Democrats insist it actually might work this time**, with political and legislative incentives aligning more neatly than they did in September.

Pelosi and Schumer are telling their members they need to secure an agreement on the social spending bill by the end of this week. The House could even vote by the end of the month.

“**We’re getting there**. **The gaps are closing**. **The vibe** in our caucus **is different**. Folks are being more clear-eyed about: ‘We’ve got to get this done,’” said Sen. Chris Coons (D-Del.), who is close to Biden. “There’s a lot of reasons why these next 10 days are critical. **To chip shot this into December is really, really problematic**.”

Democrats are also getting more specific, with Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) tossing a carbon tax and a green utilities program overboard while insisting on means testing much of the bill. Biden also told progressives Tuesday that an expanded boost to the child tax credit could be made shorter and that free community college could be jettisoned.

Biden’s price tag for the bill at the moment is around $2 trillion and he wants to lock down an agreement before heading overseas at the end of this month for climate talks, according to Democrats familiar with Tuesday’s discussions.

Rep. Jimmy Gomez (D-Calif.) said he left Biden’s meeting with progressives thinking “the president is committed to getting this done as soon as possible. And I was kind of surprised by that.”

Gomez said things remain “touch and go” and it’s unclear how much is finalized, even as Democratic leaders hope to close in on a framework in the coming days.

But it’s clear the momentum has shifted in recent days. Biden and Democrats are having substantive conversations about which programs will stay in the bill, which priorities will be cut and how to knit the rest together into a package both centrists and liberals can support.

“He's being decisive, he’s showing leadership,” Rep. Debbie Dingell (D-Mich.) said of Biden after progressives’ two-hour Tuesday meeting at the White House. “I think it’s going to get done this time.”

There’s still much more to get through, however. **And Democrats have a crunch of deadlines waiting later this year** that they must balance with [their last, best chance](https://www.politico.com/news/2021/10/17/democrats-agenda-last-chance-516160) to capitalize on their full control of Washington and pass once-in-a-generation legislation that would significantly shore up the nation’s social safety net.

Manchin and Sen. Kyrsten Sinema (D-Ariz.) are the toughest votes to secure, but both were whirlwinds of activity on Tuesday. Each of the centrists met with Biden. And while Manchin was in the Democratic lunch with his colleagues settling on a quick timeline, Sinema was meeting with senior White House staff, according to her office. Sinema’s office declined to comment on her commitment to finishing things by the end of the week.

Though the odds are still stacked against the party, Democrats say it’s clear **there’s a renewed sense of urgency among party leaders**. Schumer is nudging his holdouts more than ever before, Pelosi is free from the constraints of [an agreement with moderates](https://www.politico.com/news/2021/08/24/gottheimer-house-dems-pelosi-deal-506819) that imploded and Biden is finally engaged in a meaningful way. Plus, nearly everyone has accepted the bill won’t be $3.5 trillion, as originally proposed.

**“There’s a real consensus that it’s time,”** said the party’s No. 3 Senate leader, Patty Murray (D-Wash.). **“We all see the timeline**, there’s a lot of struggle about what’s going to go in a bill that’s literally half the size of what people envisioned.”

A month ago, some Democrats privately grumbled that Pelosi was working with an artificial deadline based on an agreement she made with moderates in her chamber — but one that didn’t motivate, and maybe even alienated, key Senate holdouts from cutting a deal. Manchin and Sinema, specifically, are still fuming that the House hasn’t passed the Senate’s bipartisan infrastructure bill.

Still, just a few weeks later, several Democrats involved in the negotiations insist that even the centrists much-maligned by their party's base for chipping away at the bill are springing into action. At a caucus meeting Tuesday, Manchin listened intently to his colleagues in what one attendee called a “turning point, in that there was more of a focus on urgency.”

Importantly, Democrats on all sides are coming to grips with the reality that all of their demands will not be met. The Obamacare subsidies that House Democratic leaders have pushed for are still in the package, while liberals’ demand for a massive Medicare expansion — something Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) called non-negotiable last week — may be significantly pared back.

While jettisoning some policy proposals and slimming the bill seem like unwelcome developments for Democrats, the more specific negotiations indicate that the party is **actually down to brass tacks**. Still, Gomez said some of the discussion involved “trial balloons to see what the reactions of the different factions are.”

Sen. Jon Tester (D-Mont.) said on Tuesday morning that the “fact we don’t have a deal and have been gone for 10 days [on recess] means we’ve got to do better.” But after meeting with Biden Tuesday afternoon, his opinion had changed: “I think there’s a lot that’s happened the last 10 days, I just wasn’t aware of it. We’re getting to a point where we can move pretty well.”

It's critical for Pelosi and Schumer to show they can govern in a sharply divided Congress with the thinnest of majorities. Biden needs a huge win ahead of a global climate summit in Glasgow. And every Democrat wants to put a victory on the board to boost Virginia gubernatorial candidate Terry McAuliffe, whose loss would be [a major setback](https://www.politico.com/news/2021/10/16/democrats-reckoning-virginia-governor-race-516086) to the party’s agenda and midterm prospects.

Plus, the nation's highway trust fund runs dry at the end of October and will need more money from Congress — which the bipartisan infrastructure bill will supply once it clears the House.

House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-Md.) insisted Tuesday that Democratic leaders are still pushing to finalize both a roughly $2 trillion social infrastructure bill and pass the $550 billion infrastructure bill by the end of the month. But even if party leaders can get their warring factions to agree to a framework for the spending bill after weeks of public feuding, that too will amount to a triumph after months of jockeying.

“We're working very hard to have both of those bills ready to be passed by the House of Representatives before that date,” Hoyer told reporters. “Now, if we make significant progress, that'll also be success towards those ends.”

#### **The plan gets lumped in with the reconciliation bill and causes conflict**

**Mueller 09/21**/2021 (Eleanor, labor reporter) “Unions squeeze pro-labor priorities into Democrats’ spending bill” Politico, <https://www.politico.com/news/2021/09/21/unions-reconciliation-bill-513423> EE, DebateDrills

**Tucked amid the investments** in child care, higher education and clean energy **are below-the-radar provisions that would make it easier for workers to organize**, such as giving the National Labor Relations Board sharper teeth and empowering it to conduct union elections online.

Both of those policies are also included in the Protecting the Right to Organize Act — an overhaul of U.S. labor law Democrats drafted to resuscitate tapering union membership, which is stalled in the Senate.

How much the language in the spending bill could really move the needle on the fortunes of organized labor remains to be seen. It must also survive the Byrd rule, which allows only spending-related legislation to move through the reconciliation process that Democrats intend to use to pass the bill. Democrats have had one of their other top priorities — immigration reform — stymied by the rule already.

Union officials are pouring time, money and energy into making sure the provisions — which they helped shape — make it a**cross** **the finish line**. If they are successful, it could constitute the biggest pro-union shift in U.S. labor law since the National Labor Relations Act was enacted in 1935, labor experts said.

**“Labor is not only all over supporting it, it has helped craft it,”** American Federation of Teachers President Randi Weingarten said in an interview.

Some on the employer side of the table say the provisions are far too consequential to be tucked into a massive spending bill.

“These are cataclysmic questions of the most fundamental policy that have gargantuan implications for the way labor and management is going to work together or not work together in this country,” said attorney Michael Lotito, who represents employers for the law firm Littler. “And **this type of fundamental policy change is being done using a backdoor approach**.”

**Republican lawmakers have** also **denounced the tactic.**

"The PRO Union Bosses Act was dead upon arrival in the Senate, so Speaker Pelosi and Committee **Democrats are manipulating the legislative process to enact portions**,” said Rep. Virginia Foxx (N.C.), the top Republican on the House Education and Labor Committee.

**Unions and their allies have seen the reconciliation bill as a possible vehicle for the labor provisions** since they were introduced in the PRO Act.

#### **Infrastructure only passes if reconciliation does**

**Cochrane et al 10/18/2021** (Emily Cochrane, Luke Broadwater, and Jonathan Weisman, NYT reporters) Biden Meets With Feuding Democrats and Expresses Confidence a Deal Can Be Reached, <https://www.nytimes.com/live/2021/10/01/us/infrastructure-bill-house#house-infrastructure-delay-vote> EE, DebateDrills

President Biden, facing an intraparty battle over his domestic agenda, put his own $1 trillion infrastructure bill on hold on Friday, telling Democrats that a vote on the popular measure must wait until Democrats pass his far more ambitious social policy and climate change package.

It was largely a bid to mediate the impasse that has stalled a planned vote on the bipartisan infrastructure bill, which progressives refuse to support until they see action on the remainder of Mr. Biden’s agenda in a major budget bill to expand health care, education, climate change initiatives and paid leave.

“I’m telling you, we’re going to get this done,” Mr. Biden said at the Capitol after huddling with Democrats who have been feuding over the two bills. He added: “It doesn’t matter when. It doesn’t matter whether it’s in six minutes, six days or six weeks. We’re going to get it done.”

In private remarks, he counseled Democrats that while he wanted both pieces of legislation to become law, final passage of the Senate-passed infrastructure bill needed to wait until the party agreed to the details of the broader reconciliation package. But he also warned liberal Democrats that a proposed $3.5 trillion price tag would probably need to drop in order to accommodate centrist holdouts, and he tossed out a range of figures around $2 trillion as a possible alternative.

“He is the president of the United States, and he says that he wants to get this done, and he basically linked them together,” said Representative Henry Cuellar, Democrat of Texas. “I think if we get it done, there’ll be a victory. The question is when do we get that victory?”

Mr. Cuellar noted that moderates had an agreement with Speaker Nancy Pelosi of California to vote on the bill this week, and said it was up to her how to handle that promise.

On Friday evening, Ms. Pelosi indefinitely postponed a vote on the infrastructure bill that she had promised to moderates who had publicly pushed for a stand-alone vote. She wrote in a letter to colleagues, “Clearly, the bipartisan infrastructure bill will pass once we have agreement on the reconciliation bill.”

“Our priority to create jobs in the health care, family and climate agendas is a shared value,” she wrote, adding that leading lawmakers were “still working for clarity and consensus.”

Representative Pramila Jayapal of Washington, the chairwoman of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, said Mr. Biden “was very clear” that the two bills were tied together.

#### **Failure of the infrastructure package locks in catastrophic climate change---extinction**

Paul **Bledsoe 9/4**, strategic adviser at the Progressive Policy Institute and a professorial lecturer at American University’s Center for Environmental Policy. He served on the White House Climate Change Task Force under former President Bill Clinton, “Climate devastation is upon us. Congress must act.,” NY Daily News, 9-4-2021, https://www.nydailynews.com/opinion/ny-oped-climate-congress-20210904-mqbe75qni5b77ocke5orzrmjce-story.html?outputType=amp

Many Democrats publicly expressed the need to **act** on **climate** change, and offered legislation at the federal and state level. Yet while the ability of Democrats to pass needed legislation was hindered by some divisions within their own ranks, resistance came **primarily** from **Republicans** who overwhelmingly opposed any serious actions to limit climate change and the greenhouse gas emissions that cause it. With a few prominent exceptions like former Sen. John McCain, most Republicans derided climate concerns as alarmism and claimed any attempts to limit emissions would be devastating to the U.S. economy.

Fast forward 20 years, and our climate situation has grown **immeasurably more grave**. As predicted climate change impacts are inflicting huge human and economic costs in the U.S., with much worse to come without immediate action. Yet stunningly, our **broken politics on climate change seem much the same as decades before**.

**Dem**ocrat**s**, beginning with President Biden, are **desperately pushing** to enact **hundreds of billions of dollars in climate change and clean energy measures** later this month as part of a wider economic and budget bill. These actions can **cut U.S. emissions by 50% below 2005 levels by the end of the decade**, and put the U.S. in a **strong**er **position** to **force other nations to act in key climate negotiations in November**.

But right now **Republicans** are **unified in opposition** to any but cursory climate actions. John Barrasso of Wyoming, the top Republican on the Senate Energy Committee, claimed the Biden climate measure was a “spree to impose this green new disaster on every American,” willfully ignoring the real climate disasters all around us that Biden’s legislation will help limit. This summer, every single Republican member of the key Senate Finance Committee voted against tax incentives for solar, wind, geothermal, electric vehicles and dozens of other clean energy sources.

The **stakes of the climate crisis** are **far more profound** and **long-lasting** than most leaders seem to recognize. What’s needed is a **united**, bipartisan **front** like that the U.S. created during the Cold War, in part to **force other key nations like China to cut their emissions as aggressively as we do**. An inkling that this **may be possible** is found in bipartisan support for recent legislation promoting American technology innovation to compete globally, and significant bipartisan support for **infrastructure legislation**.

But **slow action** to cut emissions **won’t work**. We must act **decisively** and **quickly** **now** in Congress **this fall** to create a clean energy future and cut emissions that are destabilizing our climate. Otherwise, we are **consign**ing **ourselves** and **all of those who come after us** to a **devastated and denuded world**.

#### **Infrastructure is key for the U.S. economy**

**Renshaw \*\*and Hunnicutt 21** – White House Reporter at Reuters. M.A. in Political Science from Rutgers and B.A. in journalism from Temple University. \*\*AND Investment Reporter at Reuters with degree from London School of Economics and Pomona College. [Jarrett \*\*and Trevor, “U.S. risks losing its ‘edge’ without big infrastructure spending, Biden says”, Reuters, 10/5/21, https://www.reuters.com/world/us/biden-looks-shift-focus-dc-gridlock-swing-state-benefits-2021-10-05/]//AV

President Joe Biden warned on Tuesday that failure to pass his huge social and infrastructure spending package could contribute to **America's decline,** while lawmakers in his Democratic Party wrangled over its price tag. Squabbling Democratic moderates and progressives dealt Biden a setback last week when they failed to move ahead with his proposed $1 trillion infrastructure bill or a planned $3.5 trillion social spending bill, which is now facing cuts. "These bills are not about left versus right or moderate versus progressive," Biden said in Michigan, arguing the bills would make the United States more competitive and restore its role as a world leader. "**We're at risk of losing our edge as a nation ... To oppose these investments is to be complicit in America's decline**," he said. Democrats fear that if they fail to pass the infrastructure bill they could be punished by angry voters in November 2022 congressional elections. Rebuilding U.S. infrastructure was one of Biden's main election promises. The larger "Build Back Better" bill Biden proposed includes childcare, housing and healthcare benefits, free community college tuition and clean energy subsidies, all of which the White House said would not increase the country's debt because they would be paid for by taxes on the wealthy and corporations. Biden said the investments were urgent, citing such adversaries as China, which he said had spent around three times as much as the United States on infrastructure as a share of its economy. "Our competitors aren't hanging around waiting to see what we're going to do," he said.

## **4-Framing**

#### **Pleasure and pain are intrinsically valueable and disvalueable – everything else regresses. Evolutionary knowledge is reliable – broad consensus and robust neuroscience prove.**

**Blum et al. 18**

Kenneth Blum, 1Department of Psychiatry, Boonshoft School of Medicine, Dayton VA Medical Center, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, USA 2Department of Psychiatry, McKnight Brain Institute, University of Florida College of Medicine, Gainesville, FL, USA 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA 5Department of Precision Medicine, Geneus Health LLC, San Antonio, TX, USA 6Department of Addiction Research & Therapy, Nupathways Inc., Innsbrook, MO, USA 7Department of Clinical Neurology, Path Foundation, New York, NY, USA 8Division of Neuroscience-Based Addiction Therapy, The Shores Treatment & Recovery Center, Port Saint Lucie, FL, USA 9Institute of Psychology, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary 10Division of Addiction Research, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC. North Kingston, RI, USA 11Victory Nutrition International, Lederach, PA., USA 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA, Marjorie Gondré-Lewis, 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA 13Departments of Anatomy and Psychiatry, Howard University College of Medicine, Washington, DC US, Bruce Steinberg, 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA, Igor Elman, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, David Baron, 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA, Edward J Modestino, 14Department of Psychology, Curry College, Milton, MA, USA, Rajendra D Badgaiyan, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, Mark S Gold 16Department of Psychiatry, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA, “Our evolved unique pleasure circuit makes humans different from apes: Reconsideration of data derived from animal studies”, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 28 February 2018, accessed: 19 August 2020, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6446569/>, R.S.

**Pleasure** is not only one of the three primary reward functions but it also **defines reward.** As homeostasis explains the functions of only a limited number of rewards, the principal reason why particular stimuli, objects, events, situations, and activities are rewarding may be due to pleasure. This applies first of all to sex and to the primary homeostatic rewards of food and liquid and extends to money, taste, beauty, social encounters and nonmaterial, internally set, and intrinsic rewards. Pleasure, as the primary effect of rewards, drives the prime reward functions of learning, approach behavior, and decision making and provides the **basis for hedonic theories** of reward function. We are attracted by most rewards and exert intense efforts to obtain them, just because they are enjoyable [10]. Pleasure is a passive reaction that derives from the experience or prediction of reward and may lead to a long-lasting state of happiness. The word happiness is difficult to define. In fact, just obtaining physical pleasure may not be enough. One key to happiness involves a network of good friends. However, it is not obvious how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to an ice cream cone, or to your team winning a sporting event. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure [14]. Pleasure as a hallmark of reward is sufficient for defining a reward, but it may not be necessary. A reward may generate positive learning and approach behavior simply because it contains substances that are essential for body function. When we are hungry, we may eat bad and unpleasant meals. A monkey who receives hundreds of small drops of water every morning in the laboratory is unlikely to feel a rush of pleasure every time it gets the 0.1 ml. Nevertheless, with these precautions in mind, we may define any stimulus, object, event, activity, or situation that has the potential to produce pleasure as a reward. In the context of reward deficiency or for disorders of addiction, homeostasis pursues pharmacological treatments: drugs to treat drug addiction, obesity, and other compulsive behaviors. The theory of allostasis suggests broader approaches - such as re-expanding the range of possible pleasures and providing opportunities to expend effort in their pursuit. [15]. It is noteworthy, the first animal studies eliciting approach behavior by electrical brain stimulation interpreted their findings as a discovery of the brain’s pleasure centers [16] which were later partly associated with midbrain dopamine neurons [17–19] despite the notorious difficulties of identifying emotions in animals. Evolutionary theories of pleasure: The love connection BO:D Charles Darwin and other biological scientists that have examined the biological evolution and its basic principles found various mechanisms that steer behavior and biological development. Besides their theory on natural selection, it was particularly the sexual selection process that gained significance in the latter context over the last century, especially when it comes to the question of what makes us “what we are,” i.e., human. However, the capacity to sexually select and evolve is not at all a human accomplishment alone or a sign of our uniqueness; yet, we humans, as it seems, are ingenious in fooling ourselves and others–when we are in love or desperately search for it. It is well established that modern biological theory conjectures that **organisms are** the **result of evolutionary competition.** In fact, Richard Dawkins stresses gene survival and propagation as the basic mechanism of life [20]. Only genes that lead to the fittest phenotype will make it. It is noteworthy that the phenotype is selected based on behavior that maximizes gene propagation. To do so, the phenotype must survive and generate offspring, and be better at it than its competitors. Thus, the ultimate, distal function of rewards is to increase evolutionary fitness by ensuring the survival of the organism and reproduction. It is agreed that learning, approach, economic decisions, and positive emotions are the proximal functions through which phenotypes obtain other necessary nutrients for survival, mating, and care for offspring. Behavioral reward functions have evolved to help individuals to survive and propagate their genes. Apparently, people need to live well and long enough to reproduce. Most would agree that homo-sapiens do so by ingesting the substances that make their bodies function properly. For this reason, foods and drinks are rewards. Additional rewards, including those used for economic exchanges, ensure sufficient palatable food and drink supply. Mating and gene propagation is supported by powerful sexual attraction. Additional properties, like body form, augment the chance to mate and nourish and defend offspring and are therefore also rewards. Care for offspring until they can reproduce themselves helps gene propagation and is rewarding; otherwise, many believe mating is useless. According to David E Comings, as any small edge will ultimately result in evolutionary advantage [21], additional reward mechanisms like novelty seeking and exploration widen the spectrum of available rewards and thus enhance the chance for survival, reproduction, and ultimate gene propagation. These functions may help us to obtain the benefits of distant rewards that are determined by our own interests and not immediately available in the environment. Thus the distal reward function in gene propagation and evolutionary fitness defines the proximal reward functions that we see in everyday behavior. That is why foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding. There have been theories linking pleasure as a required component of health benefits salutogenesis, (salugenesis). In essence, under these terms, pleasure is described as a state or feeling of happiness and satisfaction resulting from an experience that one enjoys. Regarding pleasure, it is a double-edged sword, on the one hand, it promotes positive feelings (like mindfulness) and even better cognition, possibly through the release of dopamine [22]. But on the other hand, pleasure simultaneously encourages addiction and other negative behaviors, i.e., motivational toxicity. It is a complex neurobiological phenomenon, relying on reward circuitry or limbic activity. It is important to realize that through the “Brain Reward Cascade” (BRC) endorphin and endogenous morphinergic mechanisms may play a role [23]. While natural rewards are essential for survival and appetitive motivation leading to beneficial biological behaviors like eating, sex, and reproduction, crucial social interactions seem to further facilitate the positive effects exerted by pleasurable experiences. Indeed, experimentation with addictive drugs is capable of directly acting on reward pathways and causing deterioration of these systems promoting hypodopaminergia [24]. Most would agree that pleasurable activities can stimulate personal growth and may help to induce healthy behavioral changes, including stress management [25]. The work of Esch and Stefano [26] concerning the link between compassion and love implicate the brain reward system, and pleasure induction suggests that social contact in general, i.e., love, attachment, and compassion, can be highly effective in stress reduction, survival, and overall health. Understanding the role of neurotransmission and pleasurable states both positive and negative have been adequately studied over many decades [26–37], but comparative anatomical and neurobiological function between animals and homo sapiens appear to be required and seem to be in an infancy stage. Finding happiness is different between apes and humans As stated earlier in this expert opinion one key to happiness involves a network of good friends [38]. However, it is not entirely clear exactly how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to a sugar rush, winning a sports event or even sky diving, all of which augment dopamine release at the reward brain site. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure. Remarkably, there are pathways for ordinary liking and pleasure, which are limited in scope as described above in this commentary. However, there are **many brain regions**, often termed hot and cold spots, that significantly **modulate** (increase or decrease) our **pleasure or** even **produce the opposite** of pleasure— that is disgust and fear [39]. One specific region of the nucleus accumbens is organized like a computer keyboard, with particular stimulus triggers in rows— producing an increase and decrease of pleasure and disgust. Moreover, the cortex has unique roles in the cognitive evaluation of our feelings of pleasure [40]. Importantly, the interplay of these multiple triggers and the higher brain centers in the prefrontal cortex are very intricate and are just being uncovered. Desire and reward centers It is surprising that many different sources of pleasure activate the same circuits between the mesocorticolimbic regions (Figure 1). Reward and desire are two aspects pleasure induction and have a very widespread, large circuit. Some part of this circuit distinguishes between desire and dread. The so-called pleasure circuitry called “REWARD” involves a well-known dopamine pathway in the mesolimbic system that can influence both pleasure and motivation. In simplest terms, the well-established mesolimbic system is a dopamine circuit for reward. It starts in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) of the midbrain and travels to the nucleus accumbens (Figure 2). It is the cornerstone target to all addictions. The VTA is encompassed with neurons using glutamate, GABA, and dopamine. The nucleus accumbens (NAc) is located within the ventral striatum and is divided into two sub-regions—the motor and limbic regions associated with its core and shell, respectively. The NAc has spiny neurons that receive dopamine from the VTA and glutamate (a dopamine driver) from the hippocampus, amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex. Subsequently, the NAc projects GABA signals to an area termed the ventral pallidum (VP). The region is a relay station in the limbic loop of the basal ganglia, critical for motivation, behavior, emotions and the “Feel Good” response. This defined system of the brain is involved in all addictions –substance, and non –substance related. In 1995, our laboratory coined the term “Reward Deficiency Syndrome” (RDS) to describe genetic and epigenetic induced hypodopaminergia in the “Brain Reward Cascade” that contribute to addiction and compulsive behaviors [3,6,41]. Furthermore, ordinary “liking” of something, or pure pleasure, is represented by small regions mainly in the limbic system (old reptilian part of the brain). These may be part of larger neural circuits. In Latin, hedus is the term for “sweet”; and in Greek, hodone is the term for “pleasure.” Thus, the word Hedonic is now referring to various subcomponents of pleasure: some associated with purely sensory and others with more complex emotions involving morals, aesthetics, and social interactions. The capacity to have pleasure is part of being healthy and may even extend life, especially if linked to optimism as a dopaminergic response [42]. Psychiatric illness often includes symptoms of an abnormal inability to experience pleasure, referred to as anhedonia. A negative feeling state is called dysphoria, which can consist of many emotions such as pain, depression, anxiety, fear, and disgust. Previously many scientists used animal research to uncover the complex mechanisms of pleasure, liking, motivation and even emotions like panic and fear, as discussed above [43]. However, as a significant amount of related research about the specific brain regions of pleasure/reward circuitry has been derived from invasive studies of animals, these cannot be directly compared with subjective states experienced by humans. In an attempt to resolve the controversy regarding the causal contributions of mesolimbic dopamine systems to reward, we have previously evaluated the three-main competing explanatory categories: “liking,” “learning,” and “wanting” [3]. That is, dopamine may mediate (a) liking: the hedonic impact of reward, (b) learning: learned predictions about rewarding effects, or (c) wanting: the pursuit of rewards by attributing incentive salience to reward-related stimuli [44]. We have evaluated these hypotheses, especially as they relate to the RDS, and we find that the incentive salience or “wanting” hypothesis of dopaminergic functioning is supported by a majority of the scientific evidence. Various neuroimaging studies have shown that anticipated behaviors such as sex and gaming, delicious foods and drugs of abuse all affect brain regions associated with reward networks, and may not be unidirectional. Drugs of abuse enhance dopamine signaling which sensitizes mesolimbic brain mechanisms that apparently evolved explicitly to attribute incentive salience to various rewards [45]. Addictive substances are voluntarily self-administered, and they enhance (directly or indirectly) dopaminergic synaptic function in the NAc. This activation of the brain reward networks (producing the ecstatic “high” that users seek). Although these circuits were initially thought to encode a set point of hedonic tone, it is now being considered to be far more complicated in function, also encoding attention, reward expectancy, disconfirmation of reward expectancy, and incentive motivation [46]. The argument about addiction as a disease may be confused with a predisposition to substance and nonsubstance rewards relative to the extreme effect of drugs of abuse on brain neurochemistry. The former sets up an individual to be at high risk through both genetic polymorphisms in reward genes as well as harmful epigenetic insult. Some Psychologists, even with all the data, still infer that addiction is not a disease [47]. Elevated stress levels, together with polymorphisms (genetic variations) of various dopaminergic genes and the genes related to other neurotransmitters (and their genetic variants), and may have an additive effect on vulnerability to various addictions [48]. In this regard, Vanyukov, et al. [48] suggested based on review that whereas the gateway hypothesis does not specify mechanistic connections between “stages,” and does not extend to the risks for addictions the concept of common liability to addictions may be more parsimonious. The latter theory is grounded in genetic theory and supported by data identifying common sources of variation in the risk for specific addictions (e.g., RDS). This commonality has identifiable neurobiological substrate and plausible evolutionary explanations. Over many years the controversy of dopamine involvement in especially “pleasure” has led to confusion concerning separating motivation from actual pleasure (wanting versus liking) [49]. We take the position that animal studies cannot provide real clinical information as described by self-reports in humans. As mentioned earlier and in the abstract, on November 23rd, 2017, evidence for our concerns was discovered [50] In essence, although nonhuman primate brains are similar to our own, the disparity between other primates and those of human cognitive abilities tells us that surface similarity is not the whole story. Sousa et al. [50] small case found various differentially expressed genes, to associate with pleasure related systems. Furthermore, the dopaminergic interneurons located in the human neocortex were absent from the neocortex of nonhuman African apes. Such differences in neuronal transcriptional programs may underlie a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders. In simpler terms, the system controls the production of dopamine, a chemical messenger that plays a significant role in pleasure and rewards. The senior author, Dr. Nenad Sestan from Yale, stated: “Humans have evolved a dopamine system that is different than the one in chimpanzees.” This may explain why the behavior of humans is so unique from that of non-human primates, even though our brains are so surprisingly similar, Sestan said: “It might also shed light on why people are vulnerable to mental disorders such as autism (possibly even addiction).” Remarkably, this research finding emerged from an extensive, multicenter collaboration to compare the brains across several species. These researchers examined 247 specimens of neural tissue from six humans, five chimpanzees, and five macaque monkeys. Moreover, these investigators analyzed which genes were turned on or off in 16 regions of the brain. While the differences among species were subtle, **there was** a **remarkable contrast in** the **neocortices**, specifically in an area of the brain that is much more developed in humans than in chimpanzees. In fact, these researchers found that a gene called tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) for the enzyme, responsible for the production of dopamine, was expressed in the neocortex of humans, but not chimpanzees. As discussed earlier, dopamine is best known for its essential role within the brain’s reward system; the very system that responds to everything from sex, to gambling, to food, and to addictive drugs. However, dopamine also assists in regulating emotional responses, memory, and movement. Notably, abnormal dopamine levels have been linked to disorders including Parkinson’s, schizophrenia and spectrum disorders such as autism and addiction or RDS. Nora Volkow, the director of NIDA, pointed out that one alluring possibility is that the neurotransmitter dopamine plays a substantial role in humans’ ability to pursue various rewards that are perhaps months or even years away in the future. This same idea has been suggested by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, a professor of biology and neurology at Stanford University. Dr. Sapolsky cited evidence that dopamine levels rise dramatically in humans when we anticipate potential rewards that are uncertain and even far off in our futures, such as retirement or even the possible alterlife. This may explain what often motivates people to work for things that have no apparent short-term benefit [51]. In similar work, Volkow and Bale [52] proposed a model in which dopamine can favor NOW processes through phasic signaling in reward circuits or LATER processes through tonic signaling in control circuits. Specifically, they suggest that through its modulation of the orbitofrontal cortex, which processes salience attribution, dopamine also enables shilting from NOW to LATER, while its modulation of the insula, which processes interoceptive information, influences the probability of selecting NOW versus LATER actions based on an individual’s physiological state. This hypothesis further supports the concept that disruptions along these circuits contribute to diverse pathologies, including obesity and addiction or RDS.

#### **Thus, the standard is maximizing expected well-being or act hedonistic util. Prefer additionally –**

#### **1] Outweighs – A] Predictability – most authors assume util when discussing the cost/benefit tradeoffs of policy**

#### **2] Death is bad and outweighs – a) agents can’t act if they fear for their bodily security which constrains every ethical theory,**

**Case**

Framing

#### **Probability should be contextualized in magnitude and timeframe – otherwise, our actions would always be the safest bet**

#### **Their card concedes the authority of pain/pleasure – the reason dominations bad is because it causes pain**

#### **Ballot shouldn’t be viewed as a referendum on mitigating oppression given the nature of debate – there has to be a loser, and in that case you would be saying one debater isn’t doing it good enough, which is incredibly violent**

#### **Racism being bad doesn’t answer the question of why it’s bad – conceptions of pain**

#### **Extinction scenarios are much more probable due to Trump – Biden hasn’t done much better – their framing cards are outdated**

Javorsky, 18

Emily Javorsky, Emilia Javorsky is a Boston-based physician-scientist focused on the invention, development and commercialization of new medical therapies. She also leads an Artificial Intelligence in Medicine initiative with The Future Society (TFS) at the Harvard Kennedy School of Government. “Why Human Extinction Needs a Marketing Department.” Xconomy. January 15, 2018. <https://www.xconomy.com/boston/2018/01/15/why-human-extinction-needs-a-marketing-department/>, RJP

Experts at Oxford University and elsewhere have estimated that the risk of a global human extinction event this century—[or at least of an event that wipes out 10 percent or more of the world’s population](http://globalprioritiesproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Global-Catastrophic-Risk-Annual-Report-2016-FINAL.pdf)— is [around 1 in 10](http://www.existential-risk.org/concept.pdf). The most probable culprits sending us the way of the dinosaur are mostly anthropogenic risks, meaning those created by humans. [These include](http://globalprioritiesproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Global-Catastrophic-Risk-Annual-Report-2016-FINAL.pdf) climate change, nuclear disaster, and more emerging risks such as artificial intelligence gone wrong (by accident or nefarious intent) and bioterrorism. A recent search of the scientific literature through [ScienceDirect](http://www.sciencedirect.com/) for “human extinction” returned a demoralizing 157 results, [compared](http://www.existential-risk.org/concept.pdf) to the 1,627 for “dung beetle.” I don’t know about you, but this concerns me. Why is there so little research and action on [existential risks](https://nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html)(risks capable of rendering humanity extinct)?

A big part of the problem is a lack of awareness about the real threats we face and what can be done about them. When asked to estimate the chance of an extinction event in the next 50 years, [U.S. adults in surveys reported chances ranging from 1 in 10 million to 1 in 100](https://80000hours.org/articles/extinction-risk/#fn-2), certainly not 10 percent. The awareness and engagement issues extend to the academic community as well, where a key bottleneck is a lack of talented people studying existential risks. Developing viable risk mitigation strategies will require widespread civic engagement and concerted research efforts. Consequently, there is an urgent need to improve the communication of the magnitude and importance of existential risks. The first step is getting an audience to pay attention to this issue.

That won’t be easy. Our social media-driven digital echo chambers present us with topics we already care about, so if you don’t already think about existential risk, it is unlikely you’ll come across it. Furthermore, in today’s media environment, research data must compete with a sea of misinformation, spin, and a daily deluge of “breaking” headlines. We have understandably become desensitized to alarms, especially on topics that have been sensationalized like “extinction.” We can only hear “the sky is falling” so much before we stop listening.

To succeed at getting the message across about existential risks, we need to get creative in figuring out how to capture public attention. Just presenting data will likely not be sufficient. Nor do I think the answer is to hyperbolize the evidence, as that dilutes the credibility of the conversation. We need alternative strategies.

One solution is for creative people such as designers, artists, and marketing experts to get involved, as their toolkit extends beyond analyzing data. These people are uniquely equipped to translate information about risks into human wants, needs, values, and aesthetics.

Creative depictions of existential risks are common in science fiction and film but fictional doom-and-gloom isn’t usually designed to build public outcry for change or to spur policy debate. However, translating existential risks into something that people can experience first-hand can effectively engage an audience and entice them to learn more about a topic and, hopefully, into action.

The power of such a personal, creative experience hit home with me at a dinner I attended late last year at the [World Frontiers Forum](https://www.worldfrontiersforum.org/). The dinner, called The Last Supper, was hosted by Sam Kass, a former White House chef, with a menu created by Carolina Curtin of Café ArtScience, a restaurant in Cambridge, MA. The meal featured ingredients that will likely not be available to future generations due to climate change. I was shocked to see coffee and chocolate included in this lineup of endangered ingredients. For me, these aren’t even ingredients, they’re vital food groups. The abstract concept of “climate change” was converted into a direct impact on my basic needs and desires. Imagine if every Chipotle had menu items marked that would not be available in 2075? X’s on a world map showing the areas that will no longer be able to produce your favorite Starbucks single origin brew? The message gets you thinking, and wanting to learn more.

The risk of “AI gone wrong” was similarly translated into a fun, interactive activity thanks to the creativity of game designer Frank Lantz, director of the NYU Game Center. Last year, he released an addictive video game he designed called “[Universal Paperclips](http://www.decisionproblem.com/paperclips/),” which was inspired by an AI thought experiment from Oxford philosopher Nick Bostrom. The game explores in a frightening and engaging way how programming a super-intelligent AI to do a seemingly benign task, making as many paperclips as possible, could lead to the destruction of the universe.

Another striking example is the work of Dan Borelli of Harvard’s Graduate School of Design. He led an art-based project at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Nyanza Superfund site in his hometown of Ashland, MA, where a chemical dye manufacturing plant contaminated the groundwater and soil for years up until the 1970s. [Borelli placed colored filters on streetlights](http://www.ashlandnyanzaproject.com/thestreetlights/) that corresponded to the contamination levels in that area. Imagine driving through a town where streetlamps eerily change color, from red and orange to blue and purple. You’re likely curious and concerned once you realize the meaning.

Likely the strongest case for creativity as a tool to spur meaningful change is the effort of Tesla. The company’s creative expression comes in the form of beautiful and desirable products that also mitigate climate change risk. Tesla has shaped the future of sustainable transportation by introducing electric cars that are aesthetically and functionally superior to most fossil fuel-based models. Yes, consumers who already care about climate change will want to purchase the product, but others will want cool, sexy cars regardless of the benefits to humanity. By repositioning electric vehicles as high-end products, Tesla managed to increase awareness and put sustainable transportation on the map as a societal value.

While creativity may be able to open the door to curiosity, it must be connected to accurate information and opportunities for actionable change. Although it’s not looking good for our species, there are many ways to intervene and help prevent threats from becoming reality. We can pressure governments to enact policy changes (nuclear disarmament treaties), support triple-bottom line companies (which value environmental and social impact, not just the financial bottom line), invest in technical solutions (novel antibiotics and green energy), divest from companies contributing to risks (fossil fuels), and donate to organizations that are mitigating specific risks ([Machine Intelligence Research Institute](https://intelligence.org/)) and existential risks ([Future of Life Institute](https://futureoflife.org/) and [Future of Humanity Institute](https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/)). Employing creativity to raise awareness of existential risks is a vital strategy for engaging new audiences and shifting the tides towards learning and action. The future of our species depends on it.

#### **Unions are exclusive—increases monopoly over representation**

**Vernuccio 14** F. Vincent Vernuccio, senior fellow at the Mackinac Center for Public Policy. He served as the Mackinac Center's director of labor policy between 2012 and 2017, 11-11-2014, "Choice vs. Compulsion: Unions’ Monopoly Privilege," Mackinac Center, [https://www.mackinac.org/20701 //](https://www.mackinac.org/20701%20//) EH

The **NLRA gives unions exclusive representation or monopoly bargaining power** if they have been selected by a majority of the employees in a collective bargaining unit: **Representatives** designated or selected for the purposes of collective bargaining by the majority of the employees in a unit appropriate for such purposes, shall be the exclusive representatives of all the employees in such unit for the purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment.[6] **If unions choose to be the exclusive representative of workers, they automatically receive a legal monopoly over negotiation and representation**. The cost of maintaining this monopoly is that unions cannot discriminate against nonunion members and are legally required to represent all workers equally. Likewise, workers who do not want this representation must accept the union contract and cannot negotiate on their own behalf or represent themselves. In a 1997 Mackinac Center study, Robert P. Hunter, a former regional director of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, defines the problem with exclusive representation: When a union is selected to represent employees in an "appropriate" unit of workers, the union alone has the legal authority to speak for all employees, including those who neither voted for nor joined the labor organization. No other union, individual or representative may negotiate terms and conditions of employment, and the individual employee is effectively deprived of the opportunity to represent his or her own interests.[7] Almost all union contracts include exclusive representation because of the legal privileges and protections that come along with it. Besides the monopoly bargaining and forced negotiations, private sector unions also receive the ability to limit other unions from organizing the workers into a different union, a practice sometimes referred to as “raiding.”[8]

## **Higher wages**

#### **High wages don’t solve worker struggles**

**Bach et al 18** Katie Bach, Sarah Kalloch, and Zeynep Ton, 10-29-2018, "Higher Wages Aren’t Enough to Turn Mediocre Jobs into Good Ones," Harvard Business Review, <https://hbr.org/2018/10/higher-wages-arent-enough-to-turn-mediocre-jobs-into-good-ones> // EH

Higher wages are good for retail and other low-wage service workers. So, we applaud Amazon’s decision and hope others will do the same. Higher wages are also necessary for many companies that are stuck in a vicious cycle of bad jobs, bad operations, bad customer service, low productivity, and high costs. But **higher wages alone are not enough to break this vicious cycle.** Unless accompanied by other changes, **higher wages will** likely **reduce company profits and will not turn bad jobs into good ones.** Drawing on the concept of “efficiency wages,” some economists argue that higher pay can by itself improve performance by enabling companies to attract and retain better people and by motivating employees to work harder. But without other changes, we expect these **benefits** to be **small**. As one of us has witnessed first-hand while working at a large retailer, even highly skilled and motivated workers will not be able to be as productive as expected because the company’s operational systems got in their way, wasting rather than maximizing their skills and enthusiasm. We see roadblocks like this all the time and, if you do any store shopping, so do you. For example: Constant display changes that take hours to set up and break down — hours that could have been spent on much-higher-value work like helping customers and trying out process improvements. Last-minute promotion or delivery changes that require managers to spend their time on last-minute schedule changes, which then disrupt employees’ lives and drive absenteeism, turnover, and understaffing, all of which increases the likelihood of errors. Employees who are not empowered to improve their work or solve customer problems. They need management approval for even the smallest things, such as accepting a return or making a price change. When they have an idea for improvement, they are shut down by a manager who is already overwhelmed with all the firefighting she or he has to do. Equipment and technology — such as scan guns, refrigerators, and training or scheduling software — that frequently breaks down, forcing employees to spend hours on the phone with help desks or just go without critical equipment for days or weeks. Stores overwhelmed by a daily stream of directives from headquarters, dozens of sales reports to read, and 100+ management tools to use. Raising the minimum wage won’t make any of these obstacles go away. It just means companies are wasting their employees’ time and paying more for it. In addition, these obstacles will likely hurt motivation and increase turnover by reducing workers’ sense of achievement, pride, and meaning.

#### **Unions are inherently capitalist which the aff strengthens**

**Saba 69** Paul Saba, founder and editor of the Encyclopedia of Anti-Revisionism Online, 05-1969"Unions: Capitalist or Workers’ Organizations?," Encyclopedia Of Anti-Revisionism On-Line, <https://www.marxists.org/history/erol/australia/unions-1.htm/> // EH

**Trade union and parliamentary politics confine the working people to capitalism**. They put blinkers on them, limit their vision. **Trade union and parliamentary politics generate the idea that social change can be achieved “constitutionally**,” that is, **through peaceful negotiation with the capitalist class.** There are about three million Australian porkers organized in trade unions. The large trade union apparatus in Australia continually stimulates the erroneous idea that the unions themselves can force the capitalist class to give way and hand over their factories to the working class. **Calls for strengthening trade union organization, for building job organization flow from this wrong idea.** The job is not **to strengthen trade union organization** for that **only strengthens the hold of the capitalist class over the working class.** The **job is to smash up the trade union bureaucracy by bringing revolution**ary Marxism-Leninism, the thought of Mao Tse-tung **to the working class**. The job of lifting revolutionary class consciousness is at once **the job of breaking with trade union politics**. This means pointing out the limits of trade unions, showing how the capitalist class controls them through the union bureaucracy. Today **trade unions are necessary for the capitalist class**. They are a burden on the backs of the working class. We do not want to make the burden heavier. As we have said **the** Australian **working class** is striving to find the revolutionary path. It is absolutely essential that its **energies should not be diverted into “strengthening trade unions.” Rather it should be directed into STRENGTHENING REVOLUTIONARY ORGANIZATION**.

#### **Bringing down capitalism is a prereq to unions succeeding**

#### **Unions are essentially labor cartels, which have a worse effect on the economy AND the worker.**

**Sherk 2009** [James (Research Fellow, Labor Economics at the Heritage Foundation), 21 May 2009, “What Unions Do: How Labor Unions Affect Jobs and the Economy”, The Heritage Foundation, <https://www.heritage.org/jobs-and-labor/report/what-unions-do-how-labor-unions-affect-jobs-and-the-economy>] //DebateDrills LC

**Unions function as labor cartels. A labor cartel restricts the number of workers in a company or industry to drive up the remaining workers' wages**, just as the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) attempts to cut the supply of oil to raise its price. **Companies pass on those higher wages to consumers through higher prices, and often they also earn lower profits. Economic research finds that unions benefit their members but hurt consumers generally, and especially workers who are denied job opportunities.**

**The average union member earns more than the average non-union worker. However, that does not mean that expanding union membership will raise wages: Few workers who join a union today get a pay raise.** What explains these apparently contradictory findings? The economy has become more competitive over the past generation. Companies have less power to pass price increases on to consumers without going out of business. Consequently, **unions do not negotiate higher wages for many newly organized workers. These days, unions win higher wages for employees only at companies with competitive advantages that allow them to pay higher wages, such as successful research and development (R&D) projects or capital investments.**

**Unions effectively tax these investments by negotiating higher wages for their members, thus lowering profits**. Unionized companies respond to this union tax by reducing investment. Less investment makes unionized companies less competitive.

**This, along with the fact that unions function as labor cartels that seek to reduce job opportunities, causes unionized companies to lose jobs.** Economists consistently find that unions decrease the number of jobs available in the economy. **The vast majority of manufacturing jobs lost over the past three decades have been among union members**--non-union manufacturing employment has risen. Research also shows that **widespread unionization delays recovery from economic downturns.**

Some unions win higher wages for their members, though many do not. But with these higher wages, **unions bring less investment, fewer jobs, higher prices, and smaller 401(k) plans for everyone else**. On balance, labor cartels harm the economy, and enacting policies designed to force workers into unions will only prolong the recession.